

**CHELAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 29, 30, 2008**

MONDAY, DECEMBER 29

Present: Buell Hawkins, Ron Walter and Keith W Goehner, County Administrator Cathy Mulhall and Clerk of the Board. Also present are constituent Shiloh Burgess, Assistant Community Development Director David Grimes, Planner Kristi DeLozier, and Commissioner Elect Doug England.

9:08:50 AM OPENING – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Shiloh Burgess leads in the Pledge of Allegiance

9:09:44 AM BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Shiloh Burgess, David Grimes and Kristi DeLozier present to discuss Burgess family property on Easy Street, and possible certificate of exemption.

9:17:32 AM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried that based upon the facts presented today to support the creation of the lot as presented.

9:19:01 AM BOARD DISCUSSION CONTINUES:

- Retail Space for Winery as Discussed with Tom Vetter. Further discussion to continue on Tuesday during Community Development Agenda
- Adoption of the City of Chelan Standards and Impacts on Tuscan Village, MOU between the Chelan County regarding UGA of June 26, 1997, (1999) and 2007. It is later determined that no 1999 MOU exists but rather was a typographical error in the staff report.

9:31:43 AM APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Moved by Commissioner Goehner, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins, and carried unanimously that the Board approve the December 22, 2008 minutes as corrected.

9:36:26 AM CONSENT AGENDA:

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried unanimously that the Board approve the following action items (**pulling**) item **(a)** and **item (c)**:

- Vouchers as submitted and listed
- Payroll changes:
 - a) **(Pulled)** Darlene Sharar, Public Works, New Hire
 - b) Robin Stone, Prosecuting Attorney, New Hire
 - c) **(Pulled)** Mike Kaputa, Natural Resources, Sick Leave Accrual
 - d) Kayla Robbins, Auditor, Length of Service Increase Correction

- Donation of Annual Leave 16 hours to Margaret Driscoll 20081229B4-1

9:47:21 AM BOARD DISCUSSION

- Sunnyslope Sewer Extension Discussion Information
- Avalanche Assessment Notice to Kahler Glen Homeowners' Association
- Information from Sandy Mackie regarding Tuscan Village 20081229C8-1

10:06:18 AM ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

County Administrator, Cathy Mulhall

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Commissioners' 2009 Budget
2. Animal Control Services Agreement – Wenatchee Humane Society. Letter of intent is to be presented for further contract changes and hearing for fees.
3. Dissolution of Television Reception Improvement District #1
4. Manson Business Association Request for Funding for Directional Sign

10:58:41 AM ACTION ITEMS

Moved by Commissioner Goehner, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins, and carried unanimously that the Board approve the following action item:

(pulling) item **1(a)** and **1(b)** for further review

1. **Contracts**
 - a) **(Pulled)** Animal Control Services Agreement – Wenatchee Humane Society
 - b) **(Pulled)** Service Agreement Amendment – NCW Conservation & Development Council
2. **Resolutions**
 - a) Adoption of **Resolution No. 2008 – 187** Dissolution of Television Reception Improvement District #1
3. **Budget Request**
 - a) Manson Business Association Request for Funding for Directional Sign in the Amount of \$6,000.00 20081229B4-2
4. **Hearing Notice**
 - a) Monitor Water System Grant Final Hearing January 12, 2009 at 11:30 a.m. 20081229H6-1

11:02:45 AM 11:00 A.M. NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Mike Kaputa, Natural Resources Director

DEPARTMENTAL DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Pulled Payroll Change Notice for Mike Kaputa, Natural Resources, Sick Leave Accrual
- RC&D Dues to Natural Resources
- Notice from Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery re: Farm Bureau Update
- Public Lands Dialogue Meeting
- Discussions with Forest Service regarding Land Exchanges

11:21:50 AM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried unanimously that the Board approve the following previously pulled action item:

1. **Contracts**

- b) **(ADDED)** Service Agreement Amendment – NCW Conservation & Development Council
20081229A5-1

11:23:28 AM BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Salary Reductions, Cell Phone Stipends

11:24:45 AM RECESS

11:32:13 AM PUBLIC HEARING – ADOPTION OF TITLE III FUNDING ALLOCATION

Commissioner Walter opens public hearing regarding the Title III Funding National Forest Service Related Safety Net Payments under PL 106-393. Mike Kaputa of the Natural Resources Department notes that three sources are under those funds. They are Fire Marshall, Natural Resources Department and the Sheriff Search and Rescue. No public comment has been received and no one from the public is present to comment.

11:34:25 AM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried unanimously that the Board approve the following action items:

1. **Resolution for Adoption**

- a) Adoption of **Resolution No 2008 – 188** for Title III National Forest Related Safety Net Payment Under PL 106-393.

11:35:14 AM RECESS

1:32:07 PM PUBLIC HEARING – Continued Hearing for Comprehensive Plan Adoption Capital Facilities and City Code Amendments

Commissioner Walter opens the public hearing to consider adoption of the City of Cashmere, the City of Entiat, the City of Leavenworth, the City of Wenatchee and the City of Chelan Zoning Codes as well as the Chelan County Capital Facilities Plan.

Planning staff member Lilith Yanagumachi gives staff overview of what has occurred to date. The Planning Commission recommended approval on the City of Cashmere zoning code, the City of Entiat Comp Plan Map Amendment and zoning map and zoning code, the re-adoption of the City of Leavenworth documents and approval of the City of Wenatchee's updated Comprehensive Plan.

The City of Chelan documents were continued, discussion and testimony were taken. No action was given and no recommendation was made. The continued hearing is set for January

26, 2009 at 7 p.m. The Planning Commission asked all those in attendance and any other interested party who may hear about the proceeding to submit any additional comments in writing by January 16. They took all the comments that were made very seriously and they wanted to digest those comments against the criteria that are outlined in the code for review and adoption of these documents before they made any final recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. The Planning Commission reviewed the Capital Facilities project list, which you have seen during the budget hearing, and recommended approval.

Commissioner Hawkins notes the omission of a project that needs to be on the Capital Facilities list in order to be considered a part of the stimulus package. We can amend the list at that time.

Planner Yanagimachi shares information that was presented at the Planning Commission Hearing, which was continued. The minutes from that meeting have not been completed and approved at this time. Staff feels the recommendations in the transmittal document are accurate.

Today's agenda items are not a project review for any current or future development. In reviewing the City's documents, staff looks at the adopted criteria in Title 14 of the Chelan County Code to insure that GMA consistency requirements are in place. The County has already adopted with all of the cities, the county wide planning policies, the MOU for 1997, and the Title 14 adoption process. The City documents also have been through a public adoption process by each city and approved by the respective cities.

If there are development concerns this would be addressed by the application process, even concerns that might result in a moratorium. That would be something that would be worked out through the application process with the city and with the developer themselves.

The Planning Commission members have taken the comments and letters submitted into consideration with the City of Chelan in particular. Discussion was intense and productive. Staff believes the Planning Commission has a clear understanding of criteria for review of city documents and adoption of. The Planning Commission wanted additional time to review the materials and criteria, therefore the motion was made to continue the hearing.

The Planning Commission believes that, while the land and its residents are part of the County, that they are taxpayers and still under County jurisdiction, it was the Planning Commission's role to look carefully at the potential impacts of adopting city documents. The concern is how these adoptions would affect the residents within the County.

To take any action on the City of Chelan documents, since the documents have not been recommended to the Board, staff would remind the Board that to take any action today on the City of Chelan would be premature and in violation of the code that we have in place. Commissioner Hawkins asks for clarification that the Planning Department did research that

the code requires that they have a recommendation or a stated no recommendation to which Lillith Yanagimachi replies that is correct.

The letter that was received from Sandy Mackie should be considered at a continued or future hearing. The City of Chelan has not been heard today as it was the understanding that the City of Chelan was due to the fact that the Planning Commission had not completed their hearing process, the City of Chelan would not be commenting today.

Commissioner Hawkins shares his concern that Tuscan had asked if they needed to come today and address their concerns to the Board as there was a specific request from counsel to have a meeting in January. Since this was the scheduled meeting before the Board the Board allowed Tuscan to speak today on the matter. It is a scheduled time so if the city chooses not to be here and there is testimony presented by Tuscan, Commissioner Hawkins believes the County has the authority to hear it and the City to get that information from the tape. This process will not impede the City to give testimony at a later date shares Lillith Yanagimachi.

Staff recommends that a formal letter may be appropriate for specific questions to the City for an avenue to get those questions answered.

Commissioner Goehner clarifies the statement that questions regarding the development standards would be addressed by the projects as they develop. Mrs. Yanagimachi shares that if there is a conflict between the City and the County development standards or how they will fit together they are addressed with each application. She states that is how the planning department expects the City of Chelan's documents to be handled as well. They are proposing about 900 acres of an unincorporated UGA. They are proposing that we adopt these documents to help address the 900 acres. That is a lot of different developments. If something comes up within those areas that is a point of conflict or concern that would be addressed between the developer and the City, with the County only acting in its role as a processor, processing the application through. This is a good position for the County to be in as this allows the City to determine how to develop future lands.

Commissioner Goehner shares that there are some lands, specifically in Chelan in the South Shore area, that call into question how urban those lands are. But by definition they are in the Urban Growth area. They are being asked to meet road standards that are not appropriate for the development area that is being affected. The comment has been made that the standards have been analyzed by staff and they meet the standard of the GMA and they are in compliance. There has been some intimation that we, at the County level just carte blanche endorse what the City does. We should have a dialogue with that to determine whether that is totally appropriate.

Mrs. Yanagimachi states that when the cities adopt standards, and we follow up and adopt those standards the County is outlining what is in place for all development. It is giving them a

clear path for their development. The County and the City do not have a whole lot of wiggle room to say we are going to apply it here but not here. If there is a conflict, not necessarily saying we do not think it should apply because it does not fit the character of the area. It is not really a conflict but more of a personal viewpoint. That has already been determined that is the UGA and that is going to be a future city, so here are the standards that apply. When it does get annexed that is what is going to be in place. If there is a different kind of conflict, one that can be resolved, for example the City of Wenatchee requires sidewalks. They also provide avenues for future development of sidewalks. That is something we work out on a case by case basis.

Commissioner Goehner shares that he understands the UGA is where the potential city will be built out to. In the small cities that we are talking about in Chelan County there are some areas that are not going to be built out like the city core is presently. It just will not happen in the course of time. What we are trying to do however, is come up with a set of standards that is going to match the flat ground as well as the area in hills. There needs to be a standard that has some allowance or flexibility for development.

Planner Yanagimachi states the County has done a good job of that but the cities may not have done so. The City of Chelan needs to address this or as we have done in the past adopt certain documents excluding certain portions.

Commissioner Walter shares that we have a lot of examples where past practice, where CTED has handed down population project numbers and the cities have expanded basically the UGA's to accommodate those numbers. What they have not done is they have not then done the due diligence required in those areas to plan to bring the services to those areas. We have many instances where the cities expect the developer to do all the infrastructure improvements which is unrealistic. He feels the County needs to change how we consider the expansion of the UGA's and the whole adoption of the city development regulations within the UGA's especially in the more rural areas. On the Commission road trip we saw an area above Chelan that he doubts younger people in this room will see the development in that area that is in the current UGA. He is speaking of the Butte area. The day of the automatic adoption of the City UGA expansion and the development regulation is over in his mind.

Commissioner Hawkins agrees with Commissioner Walter that GMA specifically stated that cities before designating a UGA are supposed to develop their plan for urban infill. That is what the law says. It is not on a whim and a hope that development will come in and will basically extort from them the money necessary to upgrade our infrastructure. He does not believe this is the intent of GMA.

Commissioner Goehner asks about the agreement that was done in 2007, and speaking to the comment of separate development regulations for different areas. It would appear that is the intent of the Interlocal agreement to set an area aside as having different standards than just

the city standards. There is a defined area that has different standards or different conditions for development than the rest of the UGA, the Butte area and around the north side.

Lilith Yanagimachi shares the Interlocal agreement that addresses the South Shore and allows for and is consistent with the MOU. As she reads Sandy Mackie's letter and saw how he was interpreting some of the Interlocal agreement, it makes that perspective understandable as well. It will be up to the Board to determine how to address those conflicts and how the City is interpreting both of the documents and how it affects the development.

Commissioner Hawkins states he may have to come back as a private citizen as he was very instrumental in writing the agreement. He states a revenue sharing agreement was put into place that was designed to make the City whole for those fees that they would not collect directly from the developer in this case. That agreement specifically only applies to the South Shore area in that area of the Urban Growth Area expansion.

Planner Yanagimachi shares that it is possible that is the conflicting points on how they planned those fees, which fees, and whether it was built infrastructure or loss of future revenue fees. Those are the type of questions that are dealt with on the application by application basis.

Commissioner Hawkins shares that an application on the South Shore area that is currently in the EIS stages. One of the things that has to be answered by the City but the City has chosen throughout the process from his viewpoint is not to address it. Commissioner Hawkins also states he does not feel the City intends to do anything differently as far as collaborative engagement with the developers than what they have done up to this point.

It must be determined as far as where the liability is and if the County has the authority to step in and make a call or if the developer needs to take other actions with the City.

1:53:18 City of Cashmere Zoning Code Updates to the Zoning code (Title 17)

The Planning Commission recommended approval of the City of Cashmere Zoning Code and by staff and also recommended approval of these documents which is Title 17, which we would be adopting in its entirety to replace the previous Title 17. The changes are only for changes to definitions, District Use Chart, storage standards, signs, wireless communication facilities, flagpoles/towers, and caretaker's residences. Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Goehner questions the issue of flag poles. It is unclear what the standards are. Can flag poles be separated from towers? They seem to be different structures to Commissioner Goehner.

Planner Yanagimachi shares that they have added a whole chapter on wireless communication facilities and a whole section on flag poles, towers, and tower structures. The height appears to be 15 feet greater than the established district height requirement. This means that a flag

pole can be 15 feet taller than the tallest building allowed which are typically 25 or 35 feet. There also is a CUP application if you wish to apply for something taller.

No public comment is given.

1:56:43 PM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Goehner, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins, and carried unanimously that the Board approve the City of Cashmere code update as presented and as recommended and supported by the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Action will be taken on Tuesday, January 6 by signed resolution.

1:57:15 PM City of Entiat Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment Zoning Map and Code

The City of Entiat is looking to update the City's Comprehensive Plan Map, Zoning Map and Zoning Code (Title 18). There is a portion of the map that affects the UGA changing a low density area residential along the highway to a high intensity residential housing in the same area. This would be higher density and smaller lot sizes. This is located by Treasure Haven. No one from the public is present to comment.

1:58:44 PM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried unanimously that based on recommendation of staff and the recommendation of the Planning Commission, the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Board approves the City of Entiat Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment Zoning Map and Zoning Code. Action will be taken on Tuesday, January 6 by signed resolution.

1:59:14 PM Recommend Re-adoption of the City of Leavenworth: Re-adopting

The City of Leavenworth's documents have already been adopted in 2004. However, in the 2007 cycle all previous documents were rescinded. After review the impact of that decision and discussions with the City of Leavenworth, it was determined that these three sections of code should have remained in effect. They are 14.08 Old World Bavarian Architecture Theme and 14.20 Signs, and 14.12 Parking Facility Landscape. Staff recommends re-adoption those documents as were previously in code through resolution 2004-14.

Commissioner Goehner questions why they were rescinded in 2007. Staff states it is due to a blanket rescission to all embedded items as a matter of clean up. This used to be in our Title 11. When the clean up was done the County opted to take those zones out of and adopt the zoning by reference as we do every other city. It was not in the County's best interest to have Leavenworth zoning within out zoning. The blanket rescission removed everything such as that. This is the zoning that Leavenworth feels needs to be in the Urban Growth Area, the Bavarian sign themes and the Old Bavarian theme. The others are in place in the zoning now.

The Commissioners did not have this information in their packets but rather in a binder in the Commission Chambers. Commissioner Goehner is assured by staff that this only addressing

Old World Bavarian Architectural Themes and the signs. The parking facility landscaping is consistent with the County requirements. It does not speak to any requirements for extension of services for any kind of development. No one from the public is present to comment.

2:04:20 PM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Goehner, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins and carried unanimously, noting that in inadvertently deleting Old World Bavarian Architectural Themes, Signs and Parking Facility Landscaping, based upon the discussion during this hearing, the recommendation of and the Planning Commission, the Board readopts the two chapter designations for the City of Leavenworth. Action will be taken on Tuesday, January 6 by signed resolution.

2:05:02 PM Recommend Approval of City of Wenatchee Comprehensive Plan

A revised Comprehensive Plan was submitted by the City of Wenatchee which included changes to the Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements. Additionally, the UGA boundary was changed to match the County Comprehensive Plan Map (County Resolution 2008-64). Finally, several map designations were changed but none in the UGA. The City made general annual updates to their Comprehensive Plan generally to the Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements. They also addressed decisions made by the Board in the 2007 cycle related to where the UGA Boundary lies. This made consistency with what the County has approved and there were several map designation changes but none within our Urban Growth Area. The Planning Commission and Staff are recommending approval of the document.

Commissioner Hawkins questions the statement of changes within our Urban Growth Area. Do the maps now show the map error was discovered in the Lower Sunnyslope that was omitted when the County transitioned from the Sunnyslope UGA to the Wenatchee UGA? It is affirmed that it is included in the Wenatchee UGA.

Another area of concern was Lower Squilchuck area. The Planning Staff note that change has occurred placing the UGA goes back to where it was before. No one from the public is present to comment.

When dealing with transportation elements in the UGA, the City came to the TransPo process very late in the game. Is the City asking anything that is inconsistent with what has been set up in the TransPo Plan in terms of mitigation or standards? Staff has not done an analysis on this. This is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment not a code revision. It is then a governing vision document; it is the actual code that would determine how things work.

Commissioner Hawkins feels that it is possible to adopt everything except the transportation element and have that continued to have the time to researched and make sure there is no

inconsistency. Because they came late to the process, Commissioner Hawkins would hate to have two documents that are inconsistent with each other.

Planner Yanagimachi would prefer to have the whole document on hold until the next hearing as opposed to adopting a portion.

2:09:54 PM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried that the Board continue the hearing on the Wenatchee Comprehensive Plan Amendment until Tuesday, Feb 10, at 1:30 for time to look at the Plan for assurance there are no inconsistencies between the TransPo Plan (set to be adopted by the County in 2009) to insure there is no inconsistency.

2:12:56 PM City of Chelan

Staff shares there was a motion by Planning Commissioner, regarding the City of Chelan as discussed earlier in today's hearing, to continue the City of Chelan documents to allow the Planning Commissioner to more carefully review the letters that were submitted and the testimony that was given in light of the criteria that was outlined for adoption. Staff feels the Planning Commission is taking their job very seriously and recommends that the Board continue the hearing until February 10, 2008 at 1:30 p.m.

Commissioner Goehner states the 2007 Interlocal Agreement as mentioned earlier clearly sets out parameters for development within a specific area. In reading through the documents and the testimony by the Chelan attorney and others with the City, the City seems very adamant on the type of development and how the infrastructure would be developed. It seems to almost supersede the 2007 agreement. It seems to Commissioner Goehner that the City and County created a specific standard for a very specific land area in addition to the more traditional standards for UGA adoption.

Planner Yanagimachi feels that question should be posed to the City. However, the document does say that the development should not decrease the current level of services. That is something the City and the developers have to work through and is the big question for this particular area.

Commissioner Goehner is asking more directly for a confirmation of his interpretation of what took place at the Planning Commission meeting and in this testimony. Is it fair to say that the City has been adamant in their stance toward development of the utilities? It is confirmed that the City has a process to work through for development and development pays for development is what was stated by the attorney and the City representative. It is her understanding that as development comes in then they look at how to plan for that development, infrastructure and needs for that area. The developer is asked to make those plans available as opposed to the City doing that.

Commissioner Hawkins asks Planner Yanagimachi feels this stance by the City in to delegation of their planning responsibility to private developer's squares with GMA? Her response is that GMA says that development should be planned for at the time of the expansion of the Urban Growth Area and she also feels that is a pretty clear document under GMA. The GMA is the process that is supposed to determine the establishment of an Urban Growth Area and what projects are allowable in an Urban Growth Area and where the boundary would be placed. She does not know about the historical records in which the Urban Growth Area was expanded to determine what the justification was at that time and how it was set up. She would understand that this Interlocal Agreement was a part of that justification and here is how we can plan for that. Now there is a dispute on the Interlocal Agreement and how the planning is done. There is also a dispute resolution in the Interlocal Agreement that should be activated. Mrs. Yanagimachi was responsible for the application intake which requires to go through an EIS and requires by law all viable alternatives be considered in the analysis and that is part of the EIS. How does the City's decision to not consider all alternatives besides the City's sewer square with that process is a question posed by Commissioner Hawkins. The response is that this is the core of the issue because it is up to the City to determine which options are viable for them. The City determines their priorities and how this will be interpreted and what would be looked at and to what level it would be considered viable. The Planning Department has a balancing act as they are looking at a document that has already gone through a public process and has been scrutinized by that community and the opportunity to develop the community they desire by their vision statement. This is really a community decision not so much outside perspective.

2:20:40 PM PUBLIC COMMENT

Dan Beardslee speaks representing the Tuscan Group. He also represents other land owners in the South Shore UGA. He feels if you were to adopt the City of Chelan's development standards you would effectively put a moratorium on future development in that UGA area. On its face that does not make any sense. The public process that adopted these development standards was a number of years ago. Mr. Beardslee participated in that process. No one ever thought about the City interpreting their development standards to mean that they were the sole provider for water and sewer in any of the UGA areas. It never came up that he recollects. That is a new twist on the idea. That is the only objection that these property owners have including Tuscan Village about the adoption of the development standards, is the City's insistence the City become the sole provider for water and sewer services. Up to this point that simply was not the case. Before the City took over the Isenhart and the Chelan River Irrigation Districts, development was allowed out there. For instance the Apple Blossom Center was in the Chelan River Irrigation District and the City provided domestic water. That was fine. This is the new twist. The city's plan to provide sewer and water and to put the backbone infrastructure on the backs of proposed developments simply won't work. The facts before you speak for themselves. The December 26 letter from Sandy Mackie is before you. If 1000 unit development has 75% of the total UGA area cannot afford to build that infrastructure and make it economically viable it

simply is not going to happen. So the plan is more of a prayer than a plan. He respectfully requests that the Board postpones action at least until the matter is taken by the Planning Commission and until some of the issues are cleared away.

Commissioner Hawkins shares that it is not uncommon practice for cities within Chelan County to have other water and sewer providers. Within the City of Wenatchee residents in the City of Wenatchee get water from a PUD system. It has been anticipated that the PUD would be the provider for a service area that extends all the way up to the foothills. Other entities besides a municipal water/sewer system have been provided to newly annexed areas. The City of East Wenatchee neither provides sewer or water services which are provided by separate districts. This is not uncommon at all. The City of Chelan has been all over the place on this issue. There are two short plat applications in this South Shore UGA where the City has taken a position that they do not have to be the provider of municipal water and sewer. Their original position was that you cannot approve this because you don't have municipal water. Where are you going to get water? Where is that going to come from? It is not going to happen. So effectively they said again - moratorium. You have a standard that are not standards then - that is their interpretation. We are the sole provider except when we don't think we are and we don't know where that line is. These areas are in the UGA. The City decided not to provide sewer and water. They are short plats. One is down lake from Denny Evan's house and one is on the Butte.

Commissioner Hawkins asks if Mr. Beardslee is implying that the City's interpretation and enforcement of their code is arbitrary and capricious. He feels that is the interpretation and there is documentation on it.

Mr. Denny Evans speaks as a member of Tuscan development to request that the County stay involved as much as possible. The City of Chelan has failed to look at the alternatives that are not only cost effective but are efficient in the water and sewer system. Technology times have changed. Many of the cities around the State have realized you cannot continue to increase the size of the pipes and increase reception sites for treating sewer and keep dumping more and more effluent into the streams and rivers. They are asking the City to take a look at the possibility of putting in a system like this not only for costs but down the road for the City as well. If this gets passed, the City will maintain the stance they have, the Tuscan project is dead. They will quite possibly lose 1 year and at the end they will come back and ask to get back into the County. This area is still in the County and under your wing. They are asking help bring the City to the table and to come to an agreement or understanding. He feels that Commissioner Walter had it right because if the City were to come to Tuscan and say we will hook you up at no cost. The City could not do it as their planning is so far behind. Some people believe it is behind five years, probably in his lifetime. If you go with one of the new systems, it can be put in at half the price of bringing in water and sewer from the City. It saves the City of the cost of upgrading their system as well. This would save the city the cost of upsizing the infrastructure. This is a win win for everyone.

Commissioner Walter asks if the City is not considering both ecologically favorable and economically viable alternatives in the opinion of Mr. Evans. In GMA that is one of the requirements of GMA. The GMA requires that the City is to have in place under the Urban Growth Area is expanded they are to have in place an understanding of how services will be provided in that area. Under the EIS they are to look at the alternatives and determine which way is best.

Mr. Sandy Mackie of Perkins Coie and Attorney for Tuscan Village is present to comment. Due to inclement weather he has arrived late. He references the December 26 letter he has submitted. He was somewhat concerned when staff advised the Planning Commission that based on a meeting between two attorneys and the 1997 agreement and that somehow there was no choice and they had taken the discretion away. He summarized in his letter that the policy makers ought to be able to address. He asked that the Board take a look at this information today due to the three people that were a part of the 2007 agreement are here as opposed to new counsel. He adds that two things that should be addressed. The 1997 agreement says the regulations that were in place would be adopted. There was also a provision for considering development regulations and there was a provision for disputes in the event there was a dispute. There was an agreement that they would not load up and require a great deal of additional development on the part of developers. Just on the 1997 agreement there was an opportunity for the Board of County Commissioners to say and for the County staff to say that it appears to us that there was supposed to be a process to look at the impact to the extent that we think there is a dispute that they can call it a dispute. But of concern to Mr. Mackie is that at the Planning Commission Meeting there was no mention of the 2007 agreement. Yet in 2007 you entered into an agreement with the City of Chelan but the third party beneficiaries (the owners on the South Shore) that a number of things would occur. In the recitals it states that the development and utilities the City would be the provider where appropriate, that the contract was looking for cost effective and efficient utility service in the area, there also would be mutual agreement with respect to utility service and there would be no requirement for annexation but that there would be neutrality on annexation. The ordinance that they are asking you to adopt requires a no protest to annexation. They already have two short plats requiring no protest to annexation on the South Shore. The City of Chelan was supposed to plan for the area and they do not have a general sewer plan, they don't have a general water plan for the area. The general sewer plan they have turned in was sent back to them with a note from the Department of Ecology in October saying you are required to consider re-use/recycle systems. Tuscan has one of the best designers in the State of Washington who has made it very clear and it will show that it is a site that can be served by a re-use/recycling system. When you see a response from your scoping notice from the Public Works Director stating you will not even consider it, it seems the County Commissioners when they said they are going to plan for providing cost effective utility service in the area, you would assume they would do that following state law which requires they consider it. The notion that somehow the City has the absolute right to provide utility services and the only choice you give to us is to accept utility services that cost \$10 million to get the first drop of water and sewer to the site. From there is it \$20 - \$25 million

for utility service. This kills the project for \$60,000 per unit for the first units. At \$20,000 per unit the banks quit talking to you. The proposal that he made in his most recent letter was you have a Planning commission that is going to make recommendations to you. You have an EIS that is going to come through. You have a project which allows a hearing in front of your Hearing Examiner which is a very good place if the City can make the case that is the best place to serve and it is cost effective and it efficient, and that it is all consistent with the 2007 agreement, let them make the case there. Don't let two attorneys meet in a room that Mr. Mackie was initially invited to and then told he could not attend. When they did not consider all of the 1997 agreement and when they did not consider all of the 2007 agreement to all of a sudden to cut it off and say your only choice is to go with the City or by January 9 of this year withdraw. His suggestion is to put off the action on Chelan. There are actually two parts of Chelan. One is not part of the 2007 agreement and one is under the UGA and 2007 agreement. The 2007 agreement says this is going to be a special district. It is going to be subject to rules that are a little different than any of the other UGA's. The process is not to prejudge but just to say we are not going to adopt the development standards in the 2007 UGA area. We want to see what the EIS is and we want to live by the terms of the 2007 agreement looking for cost effective utility service that promotes the orderly development of the area as by the agreement of both parties of the area. By finishing the EIS and by having the Hearings Examiner hold his hearings it is the best way to find out who should serve and what is the most cost effective service. If the City has some constitutional right to provide service they can show that to the Hearings Examiner and if they make a compelling case to the Hearings Examiner, that is fine. To provide that kind of service you have to have a sewer plan in place, have a water plan in place and comply with State law and be approved by Ecology and the Department and Health and the City of Chelan does not have any of those. Let Tuscan finish the process that was started and don't force them to withdraw. Tell the City of Chelan at the very least there is a dispute as to cost effective service to the area under the 1997 agreement and the 2007 agreement. Use the EIS to consider the alternatives, and allow the Hearings Examiner to make his decision and recommendation on the plat and the PDD. This allows the county then to exercise its rights under all of the agreements. This project is too important to withdraw based upon a County Administrative Decision that may or may not have considered all the facts.

Commissioner Hawkins shares with Mr. Mackie his previous comments and questions with respect to the interpretation of regulations regarding GMA and EIS. Commissioner Hawkins regrets he will not be in his position for the finish of this. Commissioner Hawkins understands Mr. Mackie's position and was part of the group that negotiated the Interlocal Agreement, and he knows what the intent was. He will come back as a private citizen and speak to that. Commissioner Hawkins believes special circumstances were created for the Tuscan Village Development and also believes that is being circumvented now. It has been discussed to continue this until a time certain in February so that may be likelihood.

Commissioner Goehner shares that a lot of Mr. Mackie's comments were covered prior to his arrival. It had been mentioned earlier by Commissioner Goehner regarding a separate

agreement was set aside for the Tuscan area. It seems we need to have a legal decision or interpretation of whether or not this can be set aside. It seems quite clear what the intent if the 2007 agreement was. There are some key phrases pointed out earlier in correspondence about the appropriateness of the development, about the infrastructure. Those are the kinds of things that really need to be resolved with the City of Chelan. It does appear that they are very set and firm in their way. If we are going to have good development, we need to have some flexibility. Commissioner Goehner shares he is not intending growth in a random fashion but for the more typical Urban Growth Area and then an Urban Growth Area that has a clearly defined purpose in its development.

Mr. Mackie states that one of the points that Commissioner Goehner makes is in both municipal law and contract law is where you have two agreements dealing with similar issues. The term is impermenteria. You read them together so that you read them so they do not conflict. And to the extent there is a conflict, the more recent and the more specific tends to prevail. That is just municipal law, contract law 101. So that is what was behind Mr. Mackie's letter, was in listening to Planner Yanagimachi's discussion with the Planning Commission people took into consideration that there is a contract. The 2007 Interlocal Agreement is a contract under State Law which allows two municipalities to contract as to a specific purpose which is legal for both of them - and which you have done. They did say there is a different set of rules out there. It is his understanding that the Planning Commission will be meeting on the 26th. That proceeding is still on and you are going to set this aside.

Commissioner Walter requests clarification that an application is in process heading to the Hearings Examiner which is pending.

That is confirmed by Mr. Mackie that an application for planned development is pending. Mr. Mackie also shares that when they got the issues about utilities there is also a plat that has about 14 lots, the core road and provides a specific mechanism that you can tie development agreements to and all the conditions to. It is a lot easier to tie it to the plat than to the zoning. That will talk about utility service and transportation service and those items. Those are all coming to the Hearings Examiner. There is an EIS scoping notice out that everyone has responded to. Mr. Mackie was to meet with the GMA EIS Consultant, Mr. Largent, to go through the draft. He is organizing all the issues that they asked him to look at; one of those was utility alternatives. All of that information will be available by the 16th. There will be a comment period for response and that should happen probably in April or May on the current time table.

Planner Yanagimachi shares the scoping letters come in from all the different agencies and then the Planning Staff compile a list of different topics that can be addressed and that list has not come back from the consultant. Once that has been returned, the County has to sign off on that list and the City will need to review it as well. That will make sure that every issue will be addressed in the document. Once that is approved then the final draft document will go to the Planning Department. Then it will go through the typical 45 day review period.

Commissioner Walter states that it appears the City of Chelan and Chelan County to clarify issues of the 2007 agreement such as possibly the requirement of annexation.

Mr. Mackie agrees the document very clearly states they will remain neutral. There are some policy issues between the City and the County. He also suggests that because that document is so tied to the South Shore, and the development tied to the South Shore, the Tuscan Property and other properties so he would hope that the Tuscan property owners would be invited to meetings. Possibly the new City Manager would be able to meet and discuss that.

Mr. Bob Jankelson Tuscan owner speaks. Mr. Jankelson requests Mr. Hawkins ask him the same question as to whether the City of Chelan's interpretation and enforcement of their own development standards could be viewed as arbitrary and capricious. Mr. Jankelson responds, yes. He would like to add some humor into an analogy. Page 12, 13 and 14 of Mr. Mackie's December 14 letter specifically about the Chelan County Planning Committee lay out that State Department of Ecology RCW's. It very clearly states that the City must consider those options. We know the posture of the City. His question is when Bob Hild and Mr. Jankelson go up the State Highway and we get to the sign that says to slow down before Entiat, and eventually we have to go to 40 mph. If we get stopped doing 70 does Mr. Jankelson just tell them that he is staff at the City of Chelan and I preempt State Law. It is a simple analogy. If in fact these are the precedent laws (RCW's) can he just ignore State Law by saying he is City staff? If the City is allowed to persist in the path they are going, they are going to have to deal with the State Statutes they found they have violated. He feels this is worth the Commissioners consideration. He assures the Board he will honor the speed limit. The other point to make by Mr. Mackie, Mr. Evans and Mr. Beardslee have brought up is that you are basically imposing a moratorium on all development in the South Shore for the pretty indefinite future. The reality is that the City does not have Federal permits adequate to discharge the effluent this project would create through their sewer system. At best that would be 5-9 years out if they applied tomorrow. We have not only the issue of cost but also they cannot deliver. From the standpoint that there are three or four standards that we have to look at if we are responsible citizens. One is cost. But that is secondary to environmental impact. Third are the fellow citizens and the economic impact on them. The fourth is timeliness of course. Is it better bring a pipe 300 yards across the road and have water for the entire development, or to tear up 4 ½ miles of environmentally sensitive shoreline for both water and sewer. The 300 yards he is speaking of is the Bear Mountain options as one of the options. Is it prudent to turn your faucet on and use 393,000 gallons and just flush it down the toilet and out the City system? That is what the City is asking the citizens of the Chelan Valley to do. The experts have estimated that we can recycle 393,000 gallons a day for agricultural usage. That would be effluent that had to be processed through the City system. First, they do not even have a Federal Permit for discharge. So when we look at the four issues, timeliness the answer is obvious, cost the answer is obvious, environmental responsibility the answer is obvious, and responsibility to our fellow citizens to preserve the environment and to provide economic stimulus the choice is obvious.

Commissioner Goehner asks that if in fact the City does not have the capacity or the Federal Permits what is their basis for accepting this in the UGA was. It is Commissioner Goehner's understanding that when they incorporate additional area into the UGA area they are to have plans in place. Or at least the capacity and ability to reach that - rather than designate an UGA and saying they will get to it when they get to it. It does state they are supposed to have the ability to service it. Commissioner Goehner does not see an indication they do have the capacity.

Mr. Jankelson shares that the UGA process was initiated by Mr. John Guenther in the feeling that because they are close to the City as this would be number one, collegial. He did not want to go into their neighborhood without enjoining them in the process. Frankly, from there it went down hill.

Commissioner Hawkins asks Mr. Jankelson, noting that it has been very painful for him over the last 7-8months. It may take another six months to get resolution with the City of Chelan. Is Mr. Jankelson prepared and have the stomach to stick with this for another six months?

Mr. Jankelson responds we have a new City Administrator who has shown some very positive proactive approach in going out and looking for answers. We have a new Mayor. It is a new administration. Under the old administration it would not be possible to continue on. If they see positive signs of collegiality, cooperation, and just plain reason with the new administration, then the answer is yes. If we have positive decisions on January 9 with the new City Administrator, yes. The answer depends on if the City is going to persist in their contention that they are the sole providers of water and sewer. If we see new administration with a new attitude, showing signs of reason and rationality, he will stick with it. If not, he has communicated with Commissioner Hawkins where he will go personally.

Mr. Jankelson shares that on January 9, the City Administrator will make a decision by written notice on the City's position on the matter.

Commissioner Walter questions how the City of Chelan can take the position that they have taken. This does not seem to be a logical position. Where is the City Council and Mayor at on their understanding of what is going on in this matter?

Mr. Jankelson replies the staff has been intensely devoted to keeping all information from Council. The Tuscan partners had an open house and invited Mr. Mackie and a number of engineers from environmental processes and a letter was sent to the council members reciting the RCW's that it was okay. The City Council countered and said no you cannot go to this public meeting. Mr. Jankelson shares this was just a public informational meeting. Candidly, the City Council is frightened. They are now getting cc's and some of the information that you are getting so he does not know what affect that is having. There were three Council members did attend defying the directive of their counsel.

Lilith Yanagimachi responds that question was also brought up at the Planning Commission meeting in which the City Attorney responded on the record that he did not feel it was appropriate for the Council Members to attend educate themselves about the project.

Mr. Jankelson adds the City Council will not be voting on this matter. It is basically the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners and the Hearing Examiner. The City Attorney and Staff have the Council and the Mayor so paranoid about attending any informative meeting that they are invited but they share they have been informed they cannot come. These are public meetings.

Commissioner Hawkins shares that he attended one of the pre application meetings where it was discovered by the City Community Development Director and the Public Works Director back in September or October the County had not adopted the development regulations that would allow the City to impose its own development. It was at that point in time that these documents you have come before you. It was an “ah ha” moment for the City. Really the application was set to go forward through the EIS process and the Hearings Examiner. Debate the City’s merit on what their requiring of the developer, that would come out during the public hearing. The Hearings Examiner would make an up or down vote. Commissioner Hawkins feels the City is trying to tie the hands of the Hearings Examiner so that there is adopted code as you know by the County that compels him act in a certain way.

Bob Jankelson also feels there are vendettas. The Public Works Director wrote to the State Department of Ecology after they had gone through the conservancy board raising questions and suggesting the conservancy board should not go through the process to secure their water rights. That is not the job of the Public Works Director of the City of Chelan. He has been on a crusade to try to get DOE to rescind their water rights.

3:09:09 PM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried that the Board continue this hearing on the approval of the City of Chelan’s Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulation Amendments to a date and time certain of February 10, 2009 at 1:30 p.m. Approved.

Staff clarifies that according to Commissioner Goehner’s request to have the attorney review the 2007 Interlocal Agreement and the area that could be treated separately in this adoption process if there is no conflict in doing so.

3:10:37 PM Chelan County Capital Facilities Project List

Staff shares that the Planning Commission and the Staff recommend approval by the Board of Commissioners which would amend the Chelan County Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Hawkins has question on the Economic Stimulus Package and spoke of the Pioneer Irrigation Trail Project was that needed to put on the Capital Facilities List. He does not recall that decision was made. He requests that we amend the list to add the Pioneer Irrigation District Trail Project. The cost of that is \$7.75 million. Staff will add that.

Commissioner Goehner has questions regarding the Fairgrounds listing of capital planning and the designation of sources of funds. There has not been commitment of these funds. Staff shares that this list has been provided and they assume it is in the budget for what is possible. Staff shares that the capital projects are estimates of what the departments are expecting to happen.

Commissioner Hawkins states this analogy by Senator Parlette that this list is somewhat akin to a letter to Santa Claus considering the money that we have available.

Commissioner Goehner questions the figures that have been inserted. He does not see where we will have \$1.1 million for REET dollars in 2009. We do not have an ice arena building in the plan. There are some things there we do have funds for that are more realistic. Reet II funds are on here as being dedicated to a specific source project. We have not made an obligation to those funds.

Commissioner Walter shares that on the Commissioners Office we have a commitment from REET II to the Malaga Community Park for \$100,000. We have more commitments for REET II than we have in REET II. We have asked the Expo Manager to come up with a capital plan, but we have not had that discussion yet. We also asked for a feasibility analysis and compare that with the other capital needs we have before we can consider it for 2009.

County Administrator had discussions with the Expo Manager but no indications were given that this would be a reality. Cathy Mulhall shares that this is somewhat of a wish list because in order to apply for LOTS funds it has to be on the Capital Facilities List and it has to have some ability to be paid. It is not known how else to list them.

Planner Yanagimachi feels this should be somewhat of a realistic list. It is recommended by staff to list this as under a feasibility study. This is somewhat realistic but a financially constrained list. Future revenues or funds may not be known, and sometimes it is placed in with grant funding.

Grants, loans or donations would be more appropriate for funding list for these projects at the fairgrounds according to Commissioner Walter. It will be changed to the more appropriate listing for funding. These will not be done in 2009. Changing the names to large and small arena buildings would be better for the listing. More discussions will follow regarding the priorities of projects.

Commissioner Goehner asks about the Natural Resources projects that are listed with no dollar amounts associated with them. Staff has tried to get these numbers but have not had a response.

Commissioner Walter feels this could be accomplished by asking if they could supply the Round 9 SRF Board Project. Commissioner Walter will get those figures for staff.

3:28:25 PM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried unanimously that the Board approve the Chelan County Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Project list noting the changes that were made and reference today will be changed and clarified in final document next week. Action will be taken on Tuesday, January 6 by signed resolution.

3:29:39 PM RECESS

Moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried that the Board recesses until Tuesday session.

DECEMBER 30, 2008

9:31:28 AM OPENING:

Commissioner Walter opens session. Jasmine Latimer of Citizen Washington and her father Wayne Latimer are attending.

9:31:48 AM ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Goehner, seconded by Commissioner Walter and carried that in light of the fact that Commissioner Hawkins has served this Commission for the last 7 ½ years the Board allow Commissioner Hawkins to conduct the meeting today for his last day of his tenure.

9:31:40 AM PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

**Public Works Interim Director Jolene Gosselin-Campbell,
Assistant Director Paula Cox**

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Local Agency Agreement Time Extension for American Fruit Road
2. Resolution for No Parking on Cedar Brae Road
3. Draft Transportation Plan
4. Manson Community Council and Fire District Request for No Parking During Winter Months from 2:30 a.m. to 6:30 a.m. on Wapato Way and Henry Gray Street
5. Temporary GIS Employee
6. No Parking on Cedar Brae Road (Tie this to Snowmobile Resolution Dates)
7. West Monitor Bridge Funding Approved

10:17:13 AM ACTION ITEMS:

Moved by Commissioner Goehner, seconded by Commissioner Walter, and carried unanimously that the Board approve the following action items (**adding**) item **1(b)**:

1. **Agreement**

a) Local Agency Agreement between Chelan County and Washington State Department of Transportation for Time Extension on American Fruit Road
20081229A5-2

b) (**Added**) Local Agency Agreement between Chelan County and Washington State Department of Transportation for Manson Blvd Improvement Project
20081229A5-3

2. **Resolution**

a) Adoption of Resolution No. 2008 - No Parking on Cedar Brae Road

10:18:33 AM BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Humane Society Contract and Letter of Intent
- Voucher View - Account Overages

10:28:04 AM ADDED ACTION ITEM:

Moved by Commissioner Walter, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried unanimously that the Board approve the following (**added**) action items:

1. **Memorandum of Understanding**

a) (**Added**) MOA with Wenatchee Valley Humane Society for 2009 Services Prior to Hearing for Change of Fees on January 26, 2008. 20081229A5-4

b) (**Added**) Contact between Chelan County and Wenatchee Valley Humane Society for Services in 2009. 20081229A5-5

10:42:53 AM RECESS

11:01:09 AM COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Assistant Director David Grimes

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Interlocal Agreement Update Regarding Fire Marshal Services. Present are Fire Chief Randy Johnson and Fire Marshall Dick Gornley. Interlocal Agreement remains in effect for four more years. It is the request to spend the next few months revising the agreement.

11:14:33 AM CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING FROM DECEMBER 23, 2008

PROPOSED FEE CHANGES

Commissioner Hawkins opens continued hearing. Present are Dan Beardslee Karen Peele and Sherry Meadows. Interim Assistant Director Grimes informs Board of the changes as requested by the Board and the work involved in these fees.

([11:31:13 AM](#) SBA. Hearing deferred until conclusion of Fee Hearing.)

[11:31:58 AM](#) Continuation of Proposed Fee Hearing

Public testimony was closed at December 23 meeting.

[11:32:36 AM](#) ACTION

Moved by Commissioner Walter, seconded by Commissioner Goehner and carried unanimously that the Board approve the following action items noting changes by Board:

1. Resolution

- a) Adoption of **Resolution No. 2008 - 189** Approval of Revised Fee Schedule for Services and Application Processing Cost for the Chelan County Community Development Department

[11:33:58 AM](#) SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET APPROPRIATION – SBA.

Chairman Hawkins states hearing deferred until conclusion of Fee Hearing with changes as outlined by County Administrator..

- \$290,000 Distressed Counties Tax Fund
- \$ 50,000 Community Services & Housing
- \$ 6,800 ORV
- \$ 3,200 Law Library

[11:34:43 AM](#) ACTION

Moved by Commissioner Goehner, seconded by Commissioner Walter, and carried unanimously that the Board approve the following action items (while adding law library and ORV funds):

1. Resolution for December SBA

- a) Adoption of **Resolution No. 2008 – 190** for the December Supplemental Budget Appropriation for the following funds:
 - a. \$290,000 Distressed Counties Tax Fund
 - b. \$ 50,000 Community Services & Housing
 - c. \$ 6,800 ORV
 - d. \$ 3,200 Law Library

[11:35:51 AM](#) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISCUSSION ITEMS CONTINUE:

- Winery Retail Space
- Upcoming
- Rockery on Lake Chelan

[11:51:04 AM](#) ADJOURN:

Moved by Commissioner Goehner, seconded by Commissioner Walter and carried unanimously that the Board adjourn until Monday, January 5, 2009.

Adjourn

THURSDAY, JANUARY 1, 2009 HOLIDAY – HAPPY NEW YEAR!!!

FILED CORRESPONDENCE:

- Letter from Governor Gregoire regarding Funding of Dispute Resolution Center
20081229C8-2
- Gathering our Voice Homegrown Ski Areas for North Central Washington
20081229C8-3
- City of Wenatchee Letter and Report on Chelan Douglas County Homeless Program
20081229C8-4
- Property Tax Assessment and Administration Journal 20081229C8-5
- Complaint from Robert Stewart, Motion for Order, Notice of Appeal, Summons,
20081229C8-6
- Wade and Elizabeth Detillian Summons regarding Land Use Petition
20081229C8-7
- Washington State Office of Public Defense Notice to Award Funds 2008C-8a
- Charter Communications Notice of FOX in HDTV 20081229F1-1
- Email Communications from Chip Jenkins regarding Stehekin Update
20081229C8-8
- Letter to Mr. Steve Johnson from WSDOT regarding Bicycle Safety on Peshastin
Interchange 20081229C8-9
- Letter from Alexander (Sandy) Mackie Dated December 26 regarding the Development
Standards for the Lake Chelan South Shore 2008C-8a
- Summons in the Matter of Brian Wright Land Use Petition 20081229C8-10
- JoAnne Tucker Letter regarding Animal Control 20081229C8-11

Vouchers Approved for Payment (2008 Budget)	20081229B4-3
Current Expense	
	\$ 77,106.41
Other Funds	<u>645,338.00</u>
Total All Funds	\$722,444.41

BOARD OF CHELAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

RON WALTER, CHAIRMAN

JANET K. MERZ, Clerk of the Board