

# **YAKIMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**

## Open Record Public Hearing Minutes

Wednesday, September 8, 2021, 6:00 PM

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/379825941>

United States: +1 (571) 317-3122 Access Code: 379-825-941

**I. Call to Order:** Doug Mayo (Chair) called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

**A. Roll Call:** A quorum was present.

1. **Commissioners Present:** Jerry Mellen, Doug Mayo, Kyle Curtis, and Jerry Craig. Mike Shuttleworth joined the meeting before the open public record hearing.
2. **Commissioners Absent:** None (two vacant positions).
3. **Yakima County Planning Staff Present:** Noelle Madera, Tua Vang, Phil Hoge, Olivia Story, and Aman Walia.
4. **Public Present:** Johnathan Thompson, Terry Walker, Trudy Walker, Teo Tocce, and Eugene Thompson.
5. **Virtual Public Present:** Mike, 1(509)840-3385, 1(509)952-0302, Connor Phelps, Mya Stivner, Jeffrey Davis, Kailan Dunn Jr., Roxanne Thompson, Sue Dunn, Kailan Dunn, and Tiffany.

**B. Approval of August 11, 2021 meeting minutes.**

There being no objections to the meeting minutes, The Planning Commission approved the August 11, 2021 minutes and were declared approved by the chair.

## II. Public Comment: None.

### III. Open Record Public Hearing - LRN2021-00001/SEP2021-00010 Naches Emergency Urban Growth Area (UGA) Amendment

**Doug Mayo** - We'll move on to the open public record hearing. We got the rules of order. Public Rules of Procedure. All persons speaking to the Planning Commission shall stand, approach the rostrum and microphone, if provided, and identify themselves by name, address and whom they represent. Testimony shall be kept factual and on the subject. The Chair is charged with the responsibility of discouraging and stopping irrelevant, unnecessarily long, repetitive, or abusive testimony, and at the onset may limit the length of testimony. Time permitting, an opportunity will be provided for additional public comment from previous speakers after everyone who so desires has had an opportunity to testify. All comments shall be directed to the Chair, and interruptions, demonstrations, applause or other distractions during or at the conclusion of anyone's testimony are not permitted. Anyone making "out of order" comments shall be subject to removal from the meeting, and the Chair may call a recess in, or adjourn, the meeting in the event of excessive disruption. Speakers shall not question one another. Instead, questions from Speakers shall be addressed to the Chair. Upon request of a majority of Planning

45 Commission members present, the Chair may allow direct questioning of an expert  
46 witness who has previously testified on behalf of an opponent or proponent, or on other  
47 business before the Commission. If written statements are made, a copy shall be  
48 presented to the Planning Commission and to the Secretary. The first item shall be  
49 LRN2021-00001/SEP2021-00010 Naches Emergency UGA Amendment. Introduce exhibits  
50 into the record. Each of you should have gotten a packet and then there is another  
51 packet of papers on our desk when we got here. And so we'll enter all of that into the  
52 record. And now we go to public testimony, and I ask any of you that wish to speak have  
53 you signed in. Do you have the sign-in paper?

54  
55 **Tua** - Yes, I believe everybody is already signed in.  
56

57 **Doug Mayo** - Well I was just going to call them in order that they signed in.  
58

59 **Tua** - Ok, could we actually go through a quick presentation.  
60

61 **Doug Mayo** - We should do that.  
62

63 **Tua** - For the record and you can call for public testimony.  
64

65 **Doug Mayo** - That would be typically on the agenda.  
66

67 **Tua** - The applicant Jeff Ranger for the Town of Naches, he actually couldn't make it  
68 today and so, they typically make their presentation about the proposal but since he  
69 can't be here, I'll just do a quick presentation about what we discussed at the study  
70 session and then we can move forward to public testimony if that's ok? Ok, alright so  
71 moving ahead, my name is Tua Vang. I'm a senior project planner, long range planning,  
72 Yakima County. This proposal was brought to us back in March of this year. Basically, it  
73 was a request by the Town of Naches to look at bringing in approximately 40.17 acres for  
74 residential use. I just want to clarify something. I know that I got a lot of comments,  
75 neighbor's comments, about that this is not an emergency. And you are absolutely  
76 correct, it isn't an emergency, but it's an out-of-cycle comp plan amendment to a map  
77 rezone to the comp plan. And so we typically have a biennial amendment which is every  
78 two years. A five-year UGA update and then an eight-year comprehensive plan update  
79 required by growth management. And so this out-of-cycle ones, which would be this  
80 year, when the Town of Naches made this request, that is just what we call it. It's just an  
81 emergency request because it's out-of-cycle. And yes, there is no emergency, however,  
82 that is just what we called it. But I just want to make that clear about that before we  
83 move forward. This proposal is for eight parcels. A lot of you have seen the maps, four of  
84 them to the north and three of them, I'm sorry five of them to the north and three of them  
85 to the east. I can show you a map of that here in a little bit once we move into the public  
86 testimony portion of it. Typically what we have to do for Urban Growth Area  
87 amendments, we review it to see if it is consistent with the Growth Management Act. We  
88 look at reviewing it under the County Code, under the major rezone and plan  
89 amendment review criteria, and look at the county-wide planning policies, and then in  
90 any city or town's comp plans, their capital facilities plan to make sure they're consistent  
91 with that. A lot of that information is in the staff report and it has been reviewed under  
92 that. A second portion of it, we have to do a land capacity analysis and basically what  
93 we look at is the current land that is vacant for development and then what is being

94 proposed at hand to accommodate the projected population for the next 25-years. Third  
95 portion of it because seven of the eight parcels are designated AG, agricultural land, we  
96 have to do an AG de-designation criteria review, and it's in the comp plan, and we have  
97 to look at it to see whether it meets 8 out of 10 for it to be, 8 out of 10 impacts in order for  
98 it to be in favor of de-designating the property. Not that it says it has to be, but it has to  
99 meet that criteria if it is being considered to be de-designated. The land capacity analysis  
100 currently right now there are 41 acres of vacant land in the city, 24 outside in the  
101 unincorporated UGA. As of right now, the Town of Naches only needs 23 acres of  
102 residential land for development. Altogether, in consideration for land capacity analysis,  
103 you have to look at the vacant residential land, commercial, and community facilities  
104 land, altogether, and that's what comes up with the total 54 years of growth. So you can  
105 have more community facilities land and less residential land, or vice versa, and it all  
106 comes out based on the equation it's still 54 years of growth. And so with this proposal,  
107 basically the 40.17 acres it's going to increase the urban growth area years of growth to  
108 66 years. The four small parcels, they're all less than one acre in size. They all have homes  
109 on them. If they were brought into the Urban Growth Area, it would be considered  
110 developed and they would be, wouldn't count against the town's years of growth. The  
111 AG de-designation criteria, like I said 7 out of the 8 parcels are designated AG so you  
112 have to look at that, must obtain 8 "yes" impacts to agriculture in order for you to consider  
113 in favor of de-designating. Here are the results for that. If you look at this you have soil. All  
114 the soils are prime or better so it's not an impact to AG. Proximity to Urban Growth Area,  
115 it's less than a mile. Predominant parcel size, it looks at it, if it's less than 10 acres it could  
116 be a potential impact to AG. There's available public facilities within this area because  
117 all of the parcels are adjacent to Urban Growth Area. Some of them are adjacent to the  
118 Urban Growth Area and the city or the Town of Naches. Tax status of these, none of these  
119 are taxed for AG production or open space. One of the Planning Commission members  
120 asked at the last study session as to whether if any of them were being taxed for  
121 agriculture production. I looked at all of them. The only one that's not, is the R-10/5  
122 property, the farthest one to the north by the canal. So none of them are being taxed for  
123 AG use or open space. The availability of public services, there's police, fire, fire station,  
124 county paved roads, city paved roads. Land use settlement patterns, they're all  
125 adjacent to the town so everywhere else around there, it's either developed or being  
126 developed. You got small parcels. You got a combination of different stuff, a bunch of  
127 agricultural lands, within the Urban Growth Area that are still being used for AG. Intensity  
128 of nearby land uses an impact to AG. There is one property to the south of the properties  
129 to the east that is zoned General Commercial. But then again, if you look at the map you  
130 can see that there is an intensity of uses and there is a combination of different types of  
131 uses there. History of land development, within half a mile, I looked at several different  
132 parcels around the subject parcels that we're talking about today, there has been more  
133 than 15 subdivisions within half a mile. Now subdivisions meaning could it be one lot to  
134 four lots being in the rural, most of them, everybody is kind of parcelling off their farmhouse  
135 and then leaving the rest and then somebody coming and building another house on it  
136 and then 15 years from that then they could divide on that property too. Land use under  
137 alternative uses, back to that, that's kind of what it is being assessed as, they're all non-  
138 AG, besides the R-10/5 property. So out of all those, a total of 9 "yeses" except for one  
139 parcel to the east, I can't remember off the top of my head who owns that parcel but  
140 it's a 15-acre parcel and I can show you that here in a second. So exhibits, we got total,  
141 a combination, of 18 letters from adjoining property owners and neighbors. We got a  
142 letter from HLA. A letter from the Department of Commerce, State of Washington

143 Ecology, and Mr. Mills & Ms. Mills sent another comment letter. They actually own one of  
144 the properties that's being proposed to be brought into the Urban Growth Area. To sum  
145 it up, Exhibit 1 all the neighbors oppose it. They don't want it. They think it's an impact to  
146 their rural living, impact to agriculture, and basically, they're saying there is enough land  
147 to be developed within the Urban Growth Area. HLA, as part of the Urban Growth Area  
148 amendment, GMA requires that the proponent has to do a capital facilities addendum,  
149 and basically what this involves, it provides, it asks questions like, how are you going to  
150 fund the proposal, where are you getting the funding from, what are you proposing to  
151 do with stormwater, timeline for you to bring in water/sewer and then basically it has to  
152 be adopted, an ordinance, the addendum has to be adopted by an ordinance by the  
153 city council or town council. And we haven't got that yet but HLA's letter says that Jeff is  
154 actually working on that right now. State of WA Department of Commerce commented.  
155 They wanted us to consider by sharing this letter with you, and all of that stuff that you  
156 guys got to the right of you are all of the exhibits that you didn't get besides the comment  
157 letters that were emailed to you. And so they're just for you to view. But the Department  
158 of Commerce basically just wanted us to consider working with the city and looking at  
159 sizing it down to 20-years, removing lands that are not going to be served within the next  
160 20-years, and adding lands that are ready for development. Now that's something that  
161 we've always considered and that something that we always wanted to do, however,  
162 that's for another conversation, but you have their comment and it's something for you  
163 to consider. Exhibit 4, Ecology says that these proposed areas are areas that have been  
164 historically identified as areas where lead arsenic was used for pesticide and so that at  
165 the time of development basically, they would have to get the testing done before any  
166 development goes up. When that comes up. Exhibit 5, the Mills again, they do not want  
167 their property in the Urban Growth Area, and I just wanted to make sure that I shared that  
168 with you. Let me finish this up and I'll show you where the Mills property is at real quick.  
169 Again, I mean staff recommendation, we, we're working with the town, the town's saying  
170 that they need more land for development. Didn't go into the details as to why or why  
171 they can't develop on those smaller lots or why they can't go ask other farmers stuff, sell  
172 their lands and whatnot. That's something we leave up for the town to do but when the  
173 town comes and proposes something like this to us, we just take it and consider it, look at  
174 it, review it. All their UGAs are oversized. They're all over 20-years of growth. And so,  
175 anyways, staff recommends approval of all parcels to be added into the Urban Growth  
176 Area and then if you guys have any questions you guys can go ahead and ask them. Mr.  
177 Chairman I am going to bring those pictures up real quick of those parcels. So, this is the  
178 Mills property. Is this not sharing?

179  
180 **Noelle Madera** - Can you just point it out on that map Tua?

181  
182 **Tua Vang** - Ok, here we go. Let me see if I can share this. Ok, so anyways, the Mills  
183 property is this one to the north here. I'm going to highlight it for you there. And then this  
184 one is that's the 15-acre parcel to the east there, that doesn't, it still gets an 8 out of 10  
185 yes impacts to agriculture, but it's the one that's only got 8 the rest got 9, and so.

186  
187 **Noelle Madera** - Are you sharing something Tua? I'm not seeing these. I'm not seeing  
188 anything being shared.

189  
190 **Doug Mayo** - So Tua, the long parcel there is the Mills property that doesn't want to be a  
191 part of this?

192  
193 **Tua Vang** – Yes. This one is the one I believe they said that they just bought. Phil says he  
194 can't see the shared screen.  
195  
196 **Noelle Madera** – We can't see anything being shared on GoToMeetings. And if there was  
197 a question, I didn't hear what the question was and if you could repeat it.  
198  
199 **Doug Mayo** – Just confirming which is the Mills property.  
200  
201 **Noelle Madera** – Yes.  
202  
203 **Tua Vang** – Can you guys see the screen now and did you hear Doug?  
204  
205 **Noelle Madera** – Yes.  
206  
207 **Tua Vang** – Ok. Yes, it's this one right here.  
208  
209 **Noelle Madera** – Tua I didn't hear the question (x2).  
210  
211 **Tua Vang** – Ok. Doug basically asked which one is the Mills property? It's the one that I  
212 highlighted here. You see that Noelle?  
213  
214 **Noelle Madera** – Yes.  
215  
216 **Tua Vang** – Ok. Except for this little parcel here. That's somebody else's, owns that one.  
217 But yes, it's that one Doug. So if that one's not considered that one's not brought into the  
218 Urban Growth Area then basically it would be these small ones that are already  
219 developed and this top one that is in the R-10/5 here that's not in the Agriculture zoning  
220 district but it is being farmed. Ok. Do you have any more questions? Anybody, or? Ok so  
221 if there aren't any more questions, then Chairman you can go ahead and move to  
222 testimonies if you would like. And so we can do it one or two ways. Phil you call the folks  
223 online or we can take the folks that are here, presently first. It's up to you what you would  
224 like to do.  
225  
226 **Doug Mayo** – I think we'll start with the people that are here. They would come forward,  
227 state your name and I would like to, also if you would, put the map back up and if you  
228 would just go over and show us where your property is.  
229  
230 **Trudy Walker** – But we didn't want to talk. And we weren't asked but we were signed up.  
231  
232 **Sue Dunn** – Can you tell where our property is?  
233  
234 **Doug Mayo** – Just a minute can you turn that off?  
235  
236 **Tua Vang** – Yes.  
237  
238 **Doug Mayo** – Sorry but.  
239  
240 **Trudy Walker** – So we're not going to talk.

241  
242 **Doug Mayo** - So is there anybody here to talk?  
243  
244 **Johnathan Thompson** - I'm the first one that signed up on there so it makes sense if I go  
245 first.  
246  
247 **Doug Mayo** - Well? You must be Jonathan Thompson.  
248  
249 **Johnathan Thompson** - I understand that I just come up to the podium there.  
250  
251 **Doug Mayo** - Put your mask on, please.  
252  
253 **Johnathan Thompson** - Oh yes, yes it's deadly. Alright, my name is J. L. Thompson,  
254 Thompson's Farm. We're at the, oh I'm never good at these maps.  
255  
256 **Tua Vang** - That's the Old Naches Highway.  
257  
258 **Johnathan Thompson** - The Old Naches, so we're, let's see that's proposed right? So  
259 we're...  
260  
261 **Doug Mayo** - Can you turn off...?  
262  
263 **Johnathan Thompson** - I'm right along Kailan's property.  
264  
265 **Olivia Story** - You're part of the green part. The green overhang.  
266  
267 **Johnathan Thompson** - Is it the green?  
268  
269 **Doug Mayo** - Are you part of the Thompson with the corn maze and the pumpkins?  
270  
271 **Johnathan Thompson** - Correct! Correct!  
272  
273 **Doug Mayo** - Ok I don't think that's where you are but ok.  
274  
275 **Johnathan Thompson** - Well like I said I'm not very good at looking at that. Right there.  
276  
277 **Doug Mayo** - Yes, they're right there.  
278  
279 **Johnathan Thompson** - There's a bunch of different little parcels in there. And so I don't  
280 know, I just, I came here to represent the farm and family. Give you our opinion of what's  
281 going on here. I understand to stick to the fact so I won't make any speculation on  
282 exactly why this is happening, why it is, but I do believe there is a couple of issues here,  
283 obviously the thin property, he eluded to the property south of this proposed annexation  
284 doesn't seem to have been considered. Actually it's closer to the sewer treatment plant  
285 than the proposed annexation and it would fit more logically into the development of  
286 the town. That also, the fact that you're going to run this development up against the  
287 graveyard of this town, where a lot of our family's buried and when there's funerals there,  
288 from time to time, and you're going to have a construction site perpetually there for a  
289 foreseeable future right next to this, which doesn't have to happen. It's happening I won't

290 speculate why, cause that's not factual, but there is no reason to do what they're doing  
291 other than, well like I'm saying, there's other places to build the housing that is wanted.  
292 And so I would ask why it's important to have this particular 40-acre lot versus the other  
293 places already that are in urban growth, which are developable right now and you don't  
294 have to jump through any hoops. The pieces that is south of this proposed area is already  
295 in commercial, so you don't even have to, you just have to transfer it out of commercial  
296 into residential and bam, lickety-split, you got this done. So, I'm sure I'm not seeing some  
297 things all the professionals here are but I do think I see some things that maybe you don't.  
298 So that's what I got to say. Any questions?

299  
300 **Tua Vang** - Actually I did read your letter and I did see that you did comment on those  
301 things. No, I appreciate your comments and the Planning Commission will look at them  
302 at and consider them.

303  
304 **Johnathan Thompson** - Okay.

305  
306 **Doug Mayo** - Anyone else?

307  
308 **Eugene Thompson** - I'm last on the list to sign in.

309  
310 **Tua Vang** - It doesn't matter. If you guys could speak up a little bit. The folks at home  
311 can't really hear that well.

312  
313 **Eugene Thompson** - I'm Eugene Thompson, I represent Suntaree and Roxanne Thompson  
314 at 9131, 9133 Old Naches Highway where this little divot in here right across from Dunn  
315 Farm. And I got the email you see and I did a whole lot of math homework on that. Just  
316 looking at what's in Naches what appears to be the available number of lots and if they  
317 want to develop Naches for Naches and not move into the Yakima County area, I  
318 believe there's enough lots, granted one house per lot, not a duplex, triplex apartment  
319 building, anything like that to serve population growth. But I believe there's an excess still  
320 of about 23 lots. So moving out of Naches, I don't know why Naches, they don't want  
321 houses built. They don't want neighbors so people in the county need to accommodate  
322 new neighbors. I'm not really sure what's going on there. Other spots I just didn't really  
323 know with like the flood plains. I know you can build on that if raise the lands. I'm just  
324 curious because I've seen that in the Zillah area where there's marshes swamps and other  
325 areas, does that incurred by the builder is that a cost to Naches, and if you have to put  
326 in three feet of rock and backfill to raise it out of a plain who incurs the cost? Also with  
327 that is when you're running sewer lines and city water lines, I'm curious who incurs the  
328 cost? Because that is a big relevance to the issue is how close these outside areas are to  
329 city utilities. Zillah Lakes is a prime example. I actually reside in Zillah. My parents, sisters,  
330 they're in that Naches property area. Zillah Lakes had a heck of a time because they  
331 didn't really plan their sewage correctly and they to pump uphill to get to, from Zillah  
332 Lakes to Zillah. So I'm not sure who incurred that cost. I thought there was some grant  
333 things like that. So I'm not sure if this is cheaper for the taxpayer for whomever might want  
334 to come and build? The only other comments, I see it as two ways in particular I invested  
335 in it because I'm one of the potential heirs of my parent's property. My sister is the primary.  
336 I'd be considered secondary. I may be there someday. My childhood home not really  
337 there because the lots around it have already torn up the orchards. It's still nice open  
338 country land. Not what I'm used to. But if the area across from it, Dunn's property ends

339 up with a minimum of one house per 0.2 acres, you're looking at what 30 neighbors? At  
340 least one or two cul-de-sacs that go in there. I know my mother does not appreciate that.  
341 Neighbors that bring in anywhere from barking dogs to trash on the street or sidewalk.  
342 She wants to retire in the country. So country dream, be out in the country. You could  
343 view it as those dreams. Same with Dunns. I'm sure they're on the phone. I thought I saw  
344 them on there. If they have a dream of giving it to their kids, grandkids. Even if they're not  
345 actively using it now, as what's shown on satellite images, maybe he's just old and  
346 doesn't have the energy, but he still wants his kids, grandkids, someone else to farm it in  
347 the future, not resilient residential. That's up to him I believe, that's his choice that he can  
348 make or his heirs can make. In along with that, it's six acres, it may not meet all the criteria  
349 for AG impact. I think she can do quite a bit with six acres, anywhere from heirloom hops  
350 for microbreweries. You can still make money. Corn mazes and pumpkin patches or  
351 expanding ones that already exist can bring in money. Possibly a rare breed of grape for  
352 a small winery for drinking money. It can still be agricultural. It's already irrigated. The  
353 pipes are still in the ground I believe, the last time I drove by. And the soil is good. The  
354 gradient's good and we see all that in the AG impact and have cultural things like that.  
355 So I think it's still viable even if it doesn't specifically meet all the criteria, most of those  
356 criteria that knock it down, is because it's near the city. Inevitably, everything is near city.  
357 Cities always grow despite the fact that enrollment in the school is down. I don't know if  
358 that's the chicken or egg. I don't know if it's down because there's not enough housing  
359 or the other way around if people aren't interested in moving into Naches. Building  
360 houses might not necessarily prove that but looking at school enrollment, but the marker  
361 could be an indicator. But that's the other inevitability, is okay, well eventually everything  
362 becomes city. 50 years from now, 100 years from now, city should grow. But if it does, look  
363 at the old highway and all the other properties along the old highway going all along  
364 the county road is pretty big and pretty spacious. You can see how their size versus these  
365 small ones in the city. I know that you can't guarantee who comes in and who develops,  
366 and what they do, that's their choice when they get there. My parent's primary concern  
367 is, it's going to be highly packed. Just like the other one that came in on the other part  
368 of the city from someone I think is biased in the development of that area. If it's going to  
369 be an inevitability, it'd be one thing if it's one house per acre. Six neighbors. Nice big  
370 lawns. You still have that country feel. If it's duplexes and 30 houses. I lived everywhere in  
371 cities, duplexes, apartment buildings, suburbs, cul-de-sacs, you want to come back to  
372 the country when you're older. Everything else on old highway are pretty big, pretty  
373 spacious. City of Zillah, commercial businesses that come in are supposed to adhere to  
374 their motif. They want all the new businesses to look like some kind of Tuscan winery  
375 theme. So restaurants have to conform to that. I doubt there's any kind of stipulation that  
376 says these lots need to be bigger, conform to a county type motif would be nice but I  
377 think that's primarily the concerns of my parents is again why aren't they developing in  
378 Naches if this is about Naches population and why are they creeping into the county.  
379 And other things that J. L. said I can't go into conspiracy theories or things that don't  
380 have solid proof just conjectures. So I guess that's all I really have to say. Any questions?  
381 I kind of talk fast on that.

382

383 **Doug Mayo** - Ok let's go to the phone calls. Tua who's got the control on that?

384

385 **Tua Vang** - Hey Phil? Why don't you go ahead and go through and call one by one and  
386 see who wants to testify virtually?

387

388 **Phil Hoge** - Okay, can everybody hear me?

389  
390 **Noelle Madera** - Yes, I can.

391  
392 **Phil Hoge** - Okay. How about...? I don't know who that first person testifying was so I hope  
393 I'm not repeating but Kailan Dunn Jr.?

394  
395 **Kailan Dunn Jr.** - Yes, can you hear me?

396  
397 **Phil Hoge** - Yes.

398  
399 **Kailan Dunn Jr.** - Okay, yes, my name is Kailan Dunn Jr. I own three parcels that are  
400 adjoining two on the from the east side and my father and mother who you will hear  
401 from, yes, right there, here soon, owns some parcels just to the west and. My, I grew up in  
402 this area and ended up purchasing some parcels right next to my parents with the dream  
403 someday of being able to farm more parcels, and my wife and I, both moved out here  
404 from the West Valley area. We lived in a development out there and we moved out here  
405 to, with the one purpose of just being able to raise our daughters in the country in a rural  
406 area where they run around, drive four-wheelers, have cattle, have orchards, and just  
407 live a rural lifestyle. I, I'm very worried about what the city of Naches is proposing here as.  
408 It really takes away from why we moved out here and it takes away from being able to  
409 have cattle right up against the growth, Urban Growth Boundary, where someone's  
410 trying to tell us that we can't raise cattle there, and one thing that I think that frustrates  
411 me I heard earlier is the soil and kind of how good it is for agriculture, and I am in the  
412 agriculture fruit industry myself and one thing that we all know is this, this area is very good  
413 ground for lots of varieties of pears and apples in particular honey crisp apples I'm sure  
414 all of us like to eat and so it's just I hate to see agricultural ground taken especially when  
415 they're in good senior water rights and this is very old agricultural ground. So I'm just very  
416 much opposed this as, this isn't why we moved out here and I don't know if we would  
417 stay out here if this was the case. I think all of my neighbors and myself included are out  
418 here so we do not have to have neighbors right next door. So also another issue I see is  
419 spraying. When we spray for our pears and my parents spray on their apples, that's going  
420 to be a major concern. I know it has been on many other properties where drift of spray  
421 is an issue and I don't want to have to deal with that. I work full-time in town and I want  
422 to be able to farm on the side and I just don't want to have to deal with the regulations  
423 of having an Urban Growth Boundary right next door. So, if, are there any questions at  
424 this time from anybody? I can go on all night because, this is, I'm very, very passionate.  
425 I'm very passionate about this and it's just something that I hope does not happen. And  
426 you probably hear my daughters in the background, sorry.

427  
428 **Doug Mayo** - Yes, thank you.

429  
430 **Phil Hoge** - Thank you Mr. Dunn. The next person I'll call on is someone named Mike.  
431 There's no last name given. It's not Mike Shuttleworth. It's another Mike apparently. I'll  
432 send you an. You're somehow Mike but not through the platform we're using because I  
433 cannot unmute you.

434  
435 **Noelle Madera** - Yes, I don't know that we've heard from that Mike the whole time so  
436 I'm not sure.

437  
438 **Phil Hoge** - I think you're right. He may have, he may have mic, unconnected mic or  
439 something. So let's move onto the next person. Someone named Tiffany. We don't have  
440 a last name again and she's the same situation. She's showing as muted but I cannot  
441 unmute her.

442  
443 **Doug Mayo** - Is there another phone number they should call or...  
444  
445 **Phil Hoge** - There is a phone number. They could call in on yes.  
446  
447 **Doug Mayo** - Assuming they can hear us.  
448  
449 **Phil Hoge** - Is it on the agenda?  
450  
451 **Kyle Curtis** - It is on the agenda yes.  
452  
453 **Phil Hoge** - Can someone read the number off on the agenda for people that want to  
454 testify that aren't able to speak yet? Mike and Tiffany in particular.  
455  
456 **Kyle Curtis** - Yes, I'll go ahead and read the numbers. So the number is 1 (571) 317-3122.  
457 And you'll need to input an access code which is 379825941.  
458  
459 **Doug Mayo** - You'll probably have to go through that again.  
460  
461 **Kyle Curtis** - Should I go through it one more time?  
462  
463 **Noelle Madera** - I don't think so.  
464  
465 **Phil Hoge** - Yes.  
466  
467 **Noelle Madera** - Oh go ahead. Yes, that's fine.  
468  
469 **Kyle Curtis** - Go ahead?  
470  
471 **Doug Mayo** - Sure.  
472  
473 **Kyle Curtis** - Sure really quick. The number again is 1 (571) 317-3122. The access code is  
474 379825941.  
475  
476 **Phil Hoge** - Thank you. So let us try to go onto the next person. Roxanne Thompson is  
477 another one that cannot be unmuted so that's three people that maybe having audio  
478 problems.  
479  
480 **Noelle Madera** - She's unmuted now.  
481  
482 **Roxanne Thompson** - Hello?  
483  
484 **Phil Hoge** - Oh there you go. Okay.  
485

486 **Roxanne Thompson** - Hello?

487

488 **Phil Hoge** - Yes, we hear you Ms. Thompson.

489

490 **Roxanne Thompson** - Sorry. Okay.

491

492 **Phil Hoge** - Go ahead.

493

494 **Roxanne Thompson** - It's myself and my mother here. We live at 9131 Old Naches  
495 Highway. So we are across from Mr. Dunn. And it sounded like earlier you had said that  
496 there are lots within town limits that you're not sure why you didn't have a reason why  
497 they were not being developed which is a little concerning to me. But my, we've been  
498 here for five generations. I brought my children out here to raise them because I didn't  
499 feel that I didn't feel that I didn't want them in town. I lived in Seattle. I brought them  
500 back out to Naches to grow up here. This is where I grew up, my brother grew up. We  
501 were used to running around outside. We didn't have to worry about neighbors that  
502 might come take something that's not theirs. We didn't have to worry about drive-bys. I  
503 have noticed that since I have returned it sounds like I hear about more break-ins and  
504 vehicle problems in Naches than there were when I was growing up. And I feel that some  
505 of that is related to there are more people here. People are coming in from Yakima that  
506 don't necessarily have the best goals but I understand the need to develop but you're  
507 looking at properties that have been in families for generations and the plan was to pass  
508 those properties onto their children. I think that there's a better way to develop the town  
509 rather than taking property from families that have been here for a very long time. That's  
510 all I got.

511

512 **Doug Mayo** - Thank you.

513

514 **Phil Hoge** - Alright thank you, Ms. Thompson. We'll go on next to Sue Dunn.

515

516 **Kailan Dunn** - Hi. I'm Kailan and Sue's husband. And Sue and I moved here and bought  
517 our farm in Naches in about 1973 and we raised our families and I was an agriculture  
518 teacher for many years but I farmed on the side and now I'm able to farm full-time but I  
519 hate to see good farm ground taken up in housing. One of the properties that adjoins  
520 me on two sides has probably the best water rights in the valley and that as most of you  
521 know is probably worth more than the land and it's good agricultural ground. I don't think  
522 that a housing development should be put in a piece of ground that could be used for  
523 prime agricultural ground. Again, there's, as been stated by many of the other people  
524 here, there's a, all of us like to live in a nice area and I can understand why they might  
525 want to develop the area and try to have more people out here but as I've notice,  
526 people bring problems and whether it be dogs or water or whatever, I think we've got a  
527 wonderful place to live and I think right now that there's some ground that can be  
528 developed in town. There's ground to the south by the railroad tracks around the  
529 treatment plant that would make a fine area. I know it's already in the agricultural zone,  
530 not in housing maybe but to me that's where housing should be adjoining the McDowell  
531 addition, not taking up a good piece of farm ground. I hope you'll consider this. Thank  
532 you.

533

534 **Doug Mayo** - Thank you Kailan.

535  
536 **Phil Hoge** – Thank you.  
537  
538 **Sue Dunn** – Can I say something? May I say something please?  
539  
540 **Doug Mayo** – Certainly Sue.  
541  
542 **Phil Hoge** – Yes.  
543  
544 **Sue Dunn** – Sue Dunn. And I'm Kailan Dunn's wife and Kailan Jr. Dunn's mother. But I'm  
545 just asking a question. I know that there's a growth plan right now, management plan, to  
546 the west of town and I'm just wondering why that can't be finished. There seems to be  
547 land over there. Is it still available from what I've heard?  
548  
549 **Kailan Dunn** – That's part of it. It's in this plan Sue. They're trying to annex ground over  
550 there too.  
551  
552 **Sue Dunn** – Can you hear me?  
553  
554 **Phil Hoge** – Yes, we can.  
555  
556 **Sue Dunn** – Alright, anyway I just wondered why that isn't being finished or annexed  
557 there? My question.  
558  
559 **Tua Vang** – Mr. Chairman, can I kind of answer that question? Basically I think that would  
560 be a better question for Jeff Ranger. And I mean I don't know why he would not look at  
561 those options too or why he's looking at options outside, but I mean ultimately that's a  
562 question that I think only Jeff could answer. Even when you're making these proposals,  
563 there's a lot of things that you have to take into consideration like, he, part of this I mean  
564 the town makes its own decision. They don't even have to actually talk to the property  
565 owner's to even propose to bring their properties into the Urban Growth Area and so I  
566 don't know if you guys reached out to Jeff and ask him why they don't consider some of  
567 those and then, if there's lands that can't be developed, we can look at removing some  
568 of those in the future too. But I think it's kind of a conflict where we have to look at resizing  
569 Urban Growth Areas and then we have to look at preserving agriculture too. And so it  
570 makes it difficult for us to make those decisions without those types of considerations  
571 because if we have to look at removing people out of the Urban Growth Area, those  
572 people probably have wanted their lands in, to be annexed someday, so that they could  
573 look at selling them off and retiring also. And maybe they're just not ready to sell those  
574 properties either but yes, I don't have a really good answer for you, but I think that when  
575 it comes to the town and how they want to develop, that's a question that you would  
576 have to ask them. We just have to work with the towns and try to figure out whether these  
577 lands are good to be brought into the Urban Growth Area or not. So hopefully that kind  
578 of helps.  
579  
580 **Sue Dunn** – Okay. Thank you. Thanks.  
581  
582 **Phil Hoge** – This is Phil Hoge with staff. I'm sharing my screen. I hope that you can see it so  
583 you can get the call-in number so people can get the call-in numbers if you're trying to

584 reach us and are unable. So the phone number, there is 1 (571) 317-3122. It's in blue and  
585 then the access code follows it if that can help anybody. Noelle, can you call on the next  
586 person because while screen sharing and I cannot see who's on anymore?

587  
588 **Noelle Madera** - Yes, it looks like maybe Jeffrey Davis is next.

589  
590 **Phil Hoge** - Thank you.

591  
592 **Jeffrey Davis** - Alright. Can you hear me?

593  
594 **Phil Hoge** - Yes.

595  
596 **Noelle Madera** - Yes. Go ahead.

597  
598 **Jeffrey Davis** - Okay, so yes, I'm an adjacent property owner, 9140 Old Naches Highway.  
599 I'm not in favor of the R1 designation and that change doesn't seem to fit in with the  
600 nature of all the adjacent properties which are either farmland, active farmland, recently  
601 inactive farmland or larger parcels with say single residents or sometimes a couple houses  
602 but really, I have to agree and concur with all the comments that have been expressed  
603 so far against this proposal. And I guess I find it surprising that the town I mean I know Jeff  
604 Ranger's, not, couldn't be here but I'm surprised that the town couldn't have anybody  
605 here to respond to any questions. And it does seem a little disconcerting that the town  
606 didn't go into any details with the Yakima County Planning Commission. And then you  
607 guys don't seem like you're required to kind of ask for those details and yet you could, the  
608 staff recommendation that was on the screen earlier was that you recommend that all  
609 eight parcels be added or amended or whatever the right terminology is so. That just  
610 seems to be like there's a little bit of a disconnect or the perception from a citizen is that  
611 it doesn't feel like you really have much say in the process that you can speak out here  
612 but is it really going to make a difference

613 I guess, so it's hard not to have that perception, just knowing that there's not really  
614 anybody here that could respond to those questions that should be directed to the Town  
615 of Naches. And I guess I did have a question. I don't know how this works, if I can ask a  
616 question of the Planning Commission but can these changes actually be made without  
617 the concurrence or without agreement from our parcel owner. So that's a question I  
618 haven't heard the answer to yet. It is it is disconcerting here there's lots or areas within  
619 the town limits that aren't being developed and yet the town wants to go outside of the,  
620 into the unincorporated area to look for Urban Growth Area. I guess the other the second  
621 question I would ask is why is this an off cycle change? Why does it have to happen now?  
622 What's driving that? So that's all the comments I had but I did have the two questions I  
623 don't know if that's something that you can answer here?

624  
625 **Tua Vang** - Hi this is Tua again. So can you repeat your first question?

626  
627 **Jeffrey Davis** - Okay so can these changes be made, can this amendment to the Urban  
628 Growth Area actually add parcels where the owner of that parcel is in disagreement and  
629 does not want their property added to the Urban Growth Area because it was already  
630 shared earlier I think when you were kind of going over the proposal that the Mills property  
631 I believe they're not in favor but their parcel is one I know that in a at least one of the  
632 other neighbors of mine I think didn't even realize what was going on and so is he not in

633 favor or does he even understand what the process is that's going on right now so I can't  
634 speak for him but I do know that the comment that I heard was that what's this all about.  
635 So can this kind of change happen if the parcel owner is not in agreement or doesn't  
636 even, is not aware I guess?

637

638 **Tua Vang** – Yes, and I think that's a great question. I really appreciate you sharing that  
639 with us and. Yes, that's why we have this public process. Whether the Town of Naches  
640 proposes all those parcels would be brought into the Urban Growth Area or not. Whether  
641 staff makes a recommendation to approve, not approve, the recommendation it's really  
642 this process that you guys have an opportunity to come and talk and testify in front of  
643 the Planning Commission, to help them. Ultimately it comes down to the Board of County  
644 Commissioners to make that decision. And so everything is taken into consideration. And  
645 that's the thing, I know that the Mills they're mostly concerned about just they just  
646 purchased that property. They just divided their house off onto a one to three-acre lot  
647 and they plan to farm the other lot and once you do that with an AG small lot you can  
648 build another home and then wait another 15 years and divide it. So whether it gets  
649 divided now or later it's up to them and it's going to take some time to do that. However  
650 even if it's brought into the Urban Growth Area whether they end up selling it down the  
651 road 10, 20 years from now it's in the R1 zoning district, it's in the County's jurisdiction, you  
652 can farm on that land for as long as you want. It's just that it would just be an urban  
653 zoning. It would be brought into the Urban Growth Area and it doesn't mean that it's  
654 automatically going to get developed, and so. But there's a lot of things to consider and  
655 so this is an opportunity and that's why we notice people so that they're not blindsided  
656 that the town is proposing to bring their property into the Urban Growth Area. And not  
657 only do we notice people within 300 feet of the properties, that are going to be subject  
658 to consideration, we also post the legal ad for this hearing. And so this is an opportunity,  
659 and then you'll have another opportunity depending on what the Planning Commission  
660 does whether they decide to approve, deny, modify staff's recommendation and the  
661 town's proposal you'll have another opportunity at the Board's hearing to testify again  
662 and make your case to them as to why these shouldn't be brought into the Urban Growth  
663 Area. And so, I understand where you're coming from. I feel like this should be something  
664 taken into consideration where the neighbors that are actually property owners of these  
665 properties should be notified, should be discussed, but it kind of makes it a little difficult  
666 too because Jeff is a town administrator and he is also a developer. So there would be  
667 a conflict of interest for him to work with these property owners whether he buys these  
668 properties or not. And so beyond that, I'm not sure why these properties but like I said he  
669 proposed them and we looked at them and I felt, staff felt, that basically the land within  
670 town, the lots are too small. If you're going to actually do a lot of homes, and then the  
671 lands that are too big are basically still being farmed and who knows when they'll sell  
672 them, or if they'll sell them. And so that's kind of where Commerce comes in and the  
673 primary Commerce wants us to work with the cities and towns but then we can't force  
674 them to reduce their years of growth to remove people who are speculating their R1  
675 properties to be sold for retirement. So, who none of them want their lands out they want  
676 to continue to farm make money in hops, make money in orchards, but they're not ready  
677 to sell yet. So it's difficult. It's kind of a balance act that I think the town faces most of the  
678 cities do. Town of Tieton, they have 400 years of growth. They still wanted more land last  
679 time we talked to them and basically, they wouldn't even swap 10 acres for 10 acres to  
680 be put in, to be taken out. And so, I understand your frustration but those are just kind of  
681 things that we have to work with. And then what was your second question?

682  
683 **Jeffrey Davis** - Oh why is this an off-cycle? So is there some reason why that the town is  
684 doing it now cause you, that's, you kind of clarified which was helpful. I know when I saw  
685 the notice of that, well what's the emergency? Is it, why is this called an emergency? So  
686 I understand that now but what's the reason that it's an off-cycle change that the town  
687 is wanting?

688  
689 **Tua Vang** - There's no secret to it. Basically like I said, GMA allows cities and towns and  
690 counties to basically update their comp plans once every year but no more than once  
691 per year and so this stuff besides that what we have in our code under the county-wide  
692 planning policies with the cities and towns is that we have a two-year cycle a five-year  
693 cycle and then the eight-year cycle with the GMA update every year for the comp plan  
694 update and that's the time when people can do map and text amendments. And so  
695 beyond that we don't have a one-year cycle for that stuff. And so in a situation where a  
696 town or city wants to come and propose to us, not during those cycles, then they make  
697 a recommendation, they make their requests to us, we forward it to the Board of County  
698 Commissioners, the Board of County Commissioners review it, and they look at it and say  
699 yes this would be, go ahead Planning Division you guys can go ahead and do a review  
700 of their proposal and take it through the public process, and, but yes there's no  
701 emergency. It's just an off-cycle amendment because we don't have the one year. We  
702 don't have we didn't, we basically didn't adopt GMA's guidelines into our county policies  
703 and so we still can use GMA, their provision that allows us to basically look at updating  
704 our comp plan once a year, and this is this is the one this year that was made to us in  
705 March. And so, okay? Alright I hope that answers your question.

706  
707 **Jeffrey Davis** - Yes that helps.

708  
709 **Doug Mayo** - I just wanted to emphasize to everyone that regardless of what this Board  
710 does this evening or in the near future, that whatever we do, that action will go to the  
711 County Commissioners, whether we voted up, vote it down, split the vote whatever, that  
712 goes to the County Commissioners, they make the final decision on what happens. And  
713 that's, so they just look to us as kind of a sounding board and then we move it forward.

714  
715 **Jeffrey Davis** - So this Board just pretty much gives a recommendation based off of  
716 feedback you receive at this meeting to the County Commissioners, all the County  
717 Commissioners?

718  
719 **Doug Mayo** - Well I'm assuming they get the whole packet, right?

720  
721 **Tua Vang** - They do. They will basically, what will happen is once after the hearing is done  
722 and closed and you guys go through deliberations, make your recommendation, then  
723 we'll do a draft findings and then we'll set up a study session with the Board of County  
724 Commissioners, all three of them, if they're all there and then we'll make your, we'll  
725 forward your recommendation to them, and then we'll have another open public record  
726 hearing, and there'll be more opportunity for the public to testify, and raise some issues  
727 or concerns or support or whatever they want to do to that, and then the Board will  
728 eventually make a decision based off of all the information. But yes, they are the final  
729 decision-makers.

730

731 **Jeffrey Davis** – And we will be getting mailed documentation on when the next hearing,  
732 is that correct?

733  
734 **Tua Vang** – Yes, I will forward everything to you, everybody that sent in a comment letter,  
735 everybody within 300 feet of those properties. You're all parties of record now and so if  
736 even if you're one of the neighbors that got mailed something and I got your email and  
737 said hey Tua you I just want to make this comment. I don't live near this area but I want  
738 to provide this. You're a party record, you'll get notified of the open public record hearing  
739 with the Board of County Commissioners.

740  
741 **Noelle Madera** – Okay, so I think we can move on to the next person. Mya looks like. Mya  
742 you are muted still. I don't know if you muted yourself? Phil, I don't really have access to  
743 the back end so I'm not sure if you want to stop sharing the thing so that you can check  
744 to see if you can unmute people?

745  
746 **Phil Hoge** – Yes, well I can't, I cannot unmute her. I tried.

747  
748 **Noelle Madera** – Okay.

749  
750 **Tua Vang** – We have too, Noelle. We actually have administrative changes...

751  
752 **Phil Hoge** – Oh, she's here.

753  
754 **Noelle Madera** – Okay Tua.

755  
756 **Phil Hoge** – Mya's here.

757  
758 **Mya Stivner** – Hi. My name is Mya Stivner and I live on the Walker's property. My boyfriend  
759 Connor Phelps is their grandson and we are currently living on their property. We are  
760 planning to buy this property from them so this is kind of our future we're looking at here.  
761 And it's concerning as well to us that there's not really a say for why they're not  
762 developing in the Town of Naches. It brings some questions forward on if they're really  
763 looking. I also have a concern with the condition of Old Naches Highway. Is there  
764 anything in this that goes to the road conditions? So I don't know about anyone else but  
765 I get in a car wreck almost every time at the intersection of Allen Road and adding some  
766 more to that kind of brings some concern. I don't think I have any specific questions but  
767 we were in attendance in the fact that this affects our children, our future children, and  
768 the property we own.

769  
770 **Noelle Madera** – Great. Thank you. Mike, can we try you this time? Tua and Aman can  
771 you, have you guys tried unmuting Mike?

772  
773 **Phil Hoge** – Cannot be done.

774  
775 **Tua Vang** – We have been trying everybody.

776  
777 **Noelle Madera** – Okay.

778  
779 **Tua Vang** – I think they'll have to do it themselves.

780  
781 **Noelle Madera** - I'll move on to Tiffany then. Tiffany?  
782  
783 **Tiffany** - Yes, so I'm here. I'm sorry you have to allow the app to use your mic. So I got  
784 that figured.  
785  
786 **Noelle Madera** - Oh okay.  
787  
788 **Tiffany** - So it is something on our end that we're not doing. So I live at 9480 Old Naches  
789 Highway, which is actually the last house in the city limits, but I also have vacant property  
790 up on Old Naches Highway. One of my concerns is I'm hearing, excuse me, I'm hearing  
791 that you don't know why Jeff Ranger wants to develop this. He's a developer. He's a town  
792 administrator. I'm going to say what everybody else is thinking. He's going to (inaudible).  
793 I know that you guys can disagree with that but it's going to happen and that's why this  
794 is happening. That aside, my concern is the condition of Old Naches Highway. I used to  
795 jog that road all the time. The road condition is terrible. You can barely get two cars  
796 passing each other and then you're going to put more traffic on that road. You guys have  
797 said we have cops out there, we have one deputy that has to be assigned to the Naches  
798 area four hours a day. So bring more people to that four hour a day deputy and we're  
799 just going to get more crime. I live out there, I am in the city limits, but I live out there because  
800 I want the country living. There's other land that Jeff can develop. He doesn't need to  
801 take it away from these farmers and that's about all I have to say.  
802  
803 **Noelle Madera** - Thank you. And then Stacy and Ryan Mills.  
804  
805 **Stacy and Ryan Mills** - Can you hear me?  
806  
807 **Phil Hoge** - Yes, we can.  
808  
809 **Stacy and Ryan Mills** - Okay. We don't need to take up a lot of time but I think it's probably  
810 clear we don't want to be part of this. We didn't buy our property to be changed from  
811 AG to residential and there is other property that can be developed, but it doesn't need  
812 to be ours. We didn't know that this was happening and we were surprised when we got  
813 the paperwork for it, so we just want to make sure that it's on record we don't want to be  
814 part of this.  
815  
816 **Noelle Madera** - Thank you. And then I think Mike is the last one so we'll try Mike one last  
817 time and see if he can get unmuted.  
818  
819 **Phil Hoge** - We understand Mike that you have to somehow and allow your application  
820 to use your mic.  
821  
822 **Noelle Madera** - It looks like he might have dropped and is maybe we'll see if he tries  
823 again. But I think that's everybody Doug and I guess we can just monitor to see if Mike  
824 tries to get back on, but that's everybody that is, that I'm seeing.  
825  
826 **Kailan Dunn Jr.** - I don't know if it's property quorum but I, this is Kayla Dunn again and I  
827 totally agreed, Jeff Davis brought up some really good points and I guess one of the  
828 points that he brought up, I have the same question. Does it make any difference what

829 we think or is this something that is going to be probably railroaded through by our city  
830 administrator?

831  
832 **Noelle Madera** - Doug do you want to answer that or do you want me to take that?  
833

834 **Doug Mayo** - It's up to the Board of Commissioners.  
835

836 **Noelle Madera** - Yes.  
837

838 **Doug Mayo** - We'll do what we do but the final vote is with them.  
839

840 **Noelle Madera** - So I would make sure that you show up to the Board hearing also and  
841 so that once we're done with all of the public testimony, the Planning Commission will  
842 make their recommendation, and then that will be forwarded, kind of like what Tua said,  
843 and so I would also make sure that you show up to the Board hearing just so that you can  
844 have your public comment again. And then Mike did you want to?  
845

846 **Kailan Dunn** - This is the Board of Commissioners?  
847

848 **Noelle Madera** - Board of Yakima County Commissioners correct. And like Tua said he'll  
849 provide, just similar to the way that you got this information for this hearing, you'll have  
850 something similar sent to you.  
851

852 **Kailan Dunn** - Thank you.  
853

854 **Noelle Madera** - Mike do you want to try one more time to unmute? I don't think that he's  
855 able to unmute so I think it's back to you guys.  
856

857 **Tua Vang** - And I just want to share one more thing, is that we accept comments even  
858 though I've sent out a request for comments earlier with the first 14 days for SEPA and  
859 then I sent out another comment 14-day period for the open record hearing today and  
860 the actual SEPA threshold. There's, we accept comments all the way up to the Board of  
861 County Commissioners hearing and they'll accept comments, your additional testimony  
862 then also. And so, if you've got any new information, any new concerns stuff like.  
863

864 **Noelle Madera** - That'll be part of the notice. Yes, that'll be part of Tua's notice.  
865

866 **Tua Vang** - (Inaudible) your comments to me. If it's anything new than what you've  
867 already submitted okay.  
868

869 **Jeff Davis** - And can you maybe share a time, approximate timeline are we for the, when  
870 would the Board of County Commissioners meeting be for this, is it six months, is it three  
871 months, is it just so that we kind of know what the timeline is?  
872

873 **Tua Vang** - It's going to be kind of hard to make that determination because after the  
874 hearing, basically either the Planning Commission deliberates today, and makes a  
875 decision today. Or they can wait and take some time to think about it and deliberate at  
876 the next meeting. And then that next meeting is if Planning Commission regular meeting  
877 deliberations is every second Wednesday of every month. And so it's going to take some

878 time to possibly do that but if they deliberate today, we potentially could have something  
879 to the Board. They the Board usually likes; we like to work backwards from them. It's usually  
880 like a, Noelle correct me if I'm wrong but it's like, what, we work backwards about two  
881 months out from them?

882  
883 **Noelle Madera** – Well I would say yes that's correct but at the earliest the hearing would  
884 be late October. But that's just a rough estimate, a complete rough estimate. So just  
885 make sure that you're paying attention to the notice that you received for this hearing.  
886 I'm assuming most of you got it through the mail so just kind of keep paying attention to  
887 that, but I would say the earliest would be late October.

888  
889 **Jeff Davis** – And then Tua will we hear what the Board, your Board, decides and  
890 recommends to the County Commission, when will that, when will we hear kind of their  
891 decision and recommendation?

892  
893 **Tua Vang** – That is that is up to them. What they want to do. So it's up to the Planning  
894 Commission as to when they want to make that decision.

895  
896 **Doug Mayo** – I'm thinking in about 20 minutes. If not sooner. We'll kick it around here in  
897 front of you and take a vote.

898  
899 **Tua Vang** – Yes, you can deliberate today if you'd like and make a decision.

900  
901 **Doug Mayo** – And I think it's time to do that. On the deliberations, I want to split the two  
902 parcels, that are the two areas, and all of the people here are with the what's listed as  
903 the Kel-Lowry Road, which is I don't know where the name came from, but anyways  
904 which is the area that I think is a concern of everybody here.

905  
906 **Tua Vang** – Mr. Chairman are you deliberating now?

907  
908 **Doug Mayo** – Yes.

909  
910 **Tua Vang** – So you need to close the public hearing.

911  
912 **Doug Mayo** – Close the public hearing and we'll move on to deliberations. It's the public  
913 hearing only on the Naches.

914  
915 **Mike Shuttleworth** – Mr. Chairman?

916  
917 **Doug Mayo** – Yes?

918  
919 **Mike Shuttleworth** – I, I'm just concerned that we had a lot of requests for questions to be  
920 answered and Mr. Ranger was not at the meeting and I have some additional questions  
921 too related that probably he's the only one that can answer and also, I've always been  
922 a stickler on having their capital facility plan for us to review before we make a decision.  
923 I wonder if I can make a recommendation that we continue to the next regular hearing  
924 date and that request Mr. Ranger to be there to answer questions.

925  
926 **Doug Mayo** – Well we've got the capital facility plan in front of us.

927  
928 **Mike Shuttleworth** – Okay I'm sorry but I haven't had a chance to look at it. I know it may  
929 be in front of you but it wasn't emailed or anything to me, so I would like to review it before  
930 I make a recommendation.

931  
932 **Doug Mayo** – Well, would you like to make a, well okay. I'm again I'm going to close the  
933 public hearing on Naches issue. And would you like to make a motion?

934  
935 **Mike Shuttleworth** – Well that's kind of my concern because if we close the public hearing,  
936 we can't take additional testimony and I'd like to have additional testimony.

937  
938 **Doug Mayo** – I think that we should vote on whether we want to extend this or deal with  
939 it now. I'll just throw it out there.

940  
941 **Mike Shuttleworth** – Well if it's appropriate I'd like to make a motion that we continue the  
942 public hearing until the next meeting which would be in October and request that Mr.  
943 Ranger be there or at least answer those questions that were proposed by the about  
944 (inaudible) or why not the other areas and that kind of stuff and then give us a chance,  
945 at least me a chance to look at the additional data that's come in recently since I'm not  
946 actually at the meeting and I believe some stuff was given to you at the meeting.

947  
948 **Doug Mayo** – There's been a motion on the table that we table this to the following  
949 meeting, so further information can possibly be presented, Mike has an opportunity. All in  
950 favor of tabling this say aye.

951  
952 **Jerry Mellen & Kyle Curtis** – Aye

953  
954 **Doug Mayo** – All opposed.

955  
956 **Jerry Craig & Doug Mayo** – Aye.

957  
958 **Mike Shuttleworth** – Aye.

959  
960 **Tua Vang** – So.

961  
962 **Doug Mayo** – So who said aye on the phone?

963  
964 **Tua Vang** – Yes, we need to make sure we get that clear.

965  
966 **Doug May** – Well it was two to two.

967  
968 **Noelle Madera** – Can we?

969  
970 **Doug May** – Here.

971  
972 **Noelle Madera** – So the vote was two to two?

973  
974 **Doug May** – Of the four people in this room.

975

976 **Tua Vang** - So which two said aye, which two said table, which two said no?  
977  
978 **Doug May** - Okay Kyle and Jerry.  
979  
980 **Noelle Madera** - We could just. Go ahead Doug I'm sorry.  
981  
982 **Mike Shuttleworth** - Can we do a?  
983  
984 **Jerry Mellen** - I would support tabling this.  
985  
986 **Doug May** - Okay.  
987  
988 **Kyle Curtis** - Same.  
989  
990 **Doug May** - So Kyle and Jerry, which Jerry are you?  
991  
992 **Jerry Mellen** - Mellen.  
993  
994 **Doug May** - Mellen. They voted yes for tabling. The other Jerry and Doug voted no. And  
995 then I guess Mike gets to vote. I'm assuming.  
996  
997 **Mike Shuttleworth** - I vote yes.  
998  
999 **Doug May** - I'm going to assume.  
1000  
1001 **Mike Shuttleworth** - On tabling it.  
1002  
1003 **Doug May** - I guess it's three to two.  
1004  
1005 **Mike Shuttleworth** - Can you hear me?  
1006  
1007 **Doug May** - To table.  
1008  
1009 **Phil Hoge** - Yes. We can hear you, Mike. I heard the motion as the hearing would be  
1010 continued.  
1011  
1012 **Noelle Madera** - To October.  
1013  
1014 **Doug May** - You're right the motion will be, there's three to two to continue the public  
1015 hearing to such time hopefully the next meeting that the City can be represented and  
1016 that Mike has an opportunity to see all of the material.  
1017  
1018 **Phil Hoge** - That would be October 13<sup>th</sup>, normally.  
1019  
1020 **Doug May** - Normally.  
1021  
1022 **Phil Hoge** - Second Tuesday, Wednesday.  
1023  
1024 **Doug May** - I have to apologize it's not going to be 20 minutes.

1025

1026 **Tua Vang** - It's how these things go.

1027

1028 **Doug May** - With that being said it's continued; guess we're going to move on to the  
1029 other item on the agenda.

1030

1031 **Noelle Madera** - Can I just make it, just one statement is that the location likely might,  
1032 won't be the same for the people that are in person. We won't know if it will be virtual  
1033 only or try to do the hybrid like we're doing now. So just make sure you're paying attention  
1034 to the agenda that goes out that will give you the location and if it's virtual and in-person  
1035 or if it's just virtual. Just to make sure everybody knows. Thanks everybody for attending  
1036 that attended for the Naches portion.

1037

1038 **Kailan Dunn Jr.** - Tua just a quick question so are we all going to sometime in October  
1039 have to come back and test give our testimony again to the group or?

1040

1041 **Tua Vang** - If you don't have any new information and you already testified and I've got  
1042 your comment letter, the Planning Commission has already got those comments and  
1043 then all five Planning Commission members are here and Mike I'm not sure when you got  
1044 in and did you get in when they testified or not, but we record these meetings and so if  
1045 Planning Commission member came in a little late, they had the opportunity to go back  
1046 and listen to it. But yes, you are more than welcome to come back and listen to the  
1047 testimony that's being requested of Jeff Ranger, if you can make it, and then for them to  
1048 make their consideration and deliberation for this. And so, you can come back and listen  
1049 and because it is another hearing we will have to notice, and so. Actually, is that right or  
1050 do we...

1051

1052 **Noelle Madera** - Actually, I don't think that's true Tua. I don't think.

1053

1054 **Tua Vang** - Is it just everyone here is just made aware, Noelle, that the hearing is  
1055 continued? I believe right now is just your notice, is that correct?

1056

1057 **Noelle Madera** - I think that we'll have to double-check but I don't think that we have to  
1058 re-notice the hearing because it was continued, during this hearing, and the date of the  
1059 next hearing was already discussed at this hearing so I don't think that we have to do a  
1060 legal notice for it, but we will probably send out an updated agenda since the location  
1061 will likely be different.

1062

1063 **Kailan Dunn Jr.** - Okay. Yes, one thing, I guess just thinking, I appreciate trying to get Jeff  
1064 involved and that's a good idea. What I fear is a month goes by, you've all heard that  
1065 landowners that are adjoining talk and then we've already spoke our peace. And then  
1066 a month goes by and we hear from Jeff. I'm just worried that without the testimony that  
1067 day, that could persuade one way or the other which I don't know scares me, but  
1068 understanding we do need more answers from him so.

1069

1070 **Doug May** - Excuse me do we know who's talking right now?

1071

1072 **Tua Vang** - Yes, it's Mr. Kailan Dunn Jr.

1073

1074 **Doug May** - Oh okay.  
1075  
1076 **Tua Vang** - Yes.  
1077  
1078 **Doug May** - Well.  
1079  
1080 **Johnathan Thompson** - May I speak?  
1081  
1082 **Doug May** - Certainly.  
1083  
1084 **Johnathan Thompson** - Is it my understanding that the reason this is going to be delayed  
1085 is because Jeff Ranger is not able to be here today? Is that correct?  
1086  
1087 **Doug May** - That's one reason.  
1088  
1089 **Tua Vang** - Actually.  
1090  
1091 **Johnathan Thompson** - Jeff Ranger could not be here to answer the questions so  
1092 therefore this is tabled for now? Correct?  
1093  
1094 **Doug May** - Well not tabled but continued.  
1095  
1096 **Johnathan Thompson** - But continued. Okay, I understand now. Very convenient.  
1097  
1098 **Jerry Craig** - I agree with the previous speaker. If those people oppose to this annexation  
1099 are not here, would we postpone it until they got here? I don't see the reason for  
1100 postponing it because the Town of Naches did not come here to support this move.  
1101 That's why I voted not to continue this on. Let's make a decision and go about it.  
1102  
1103 **Doug May** - The engineer isn't here. The City didn't show up.  
1104  
1105 **Jerry Craig** - I think we have done an adequate job of notifying them that this was to be.  
1106 How many times are you going to ask them? I'm done.  
1107  
1108 **Doug May** - Well we voted.  
1109  
1110 **Mike Shuttleworth** - Mr. Chairman this issue has been continued we probably should not  
1111 be discussing it still until the next public hearing.  
1112  
1113 **Jonathan Thompson** - Alright, fine f\*\*\* this. Obviously, this is a God d\*mn kangaroo court.  
1114 F\*\*\* it.  
1115  
1116 **Doug May** - Okay. You're all welcome to stay for the next issue.  
1117  
1118 **Jeffrey Davis** - Can you repeat the date on when that next hearing is? I didn't get that  
1119 written down.  
1120  
1121 **Phil Hoge** - October 13<sup>th</sup>.  
1122

1123 **Doug May** – Well the tentative schedule, that's.  
1124  
1125 **Jeffrey Davis** – October 13<sup>th</sup> and you'll send out an agenda to everybody that was  
1126 notified through paper mail for this meeting I mean, so I'll get something in the mail?  
1127  
1128 **Noelle Madera** – We can do that.  
1129  
1130 **Jeffrey Davis** – Okay. Thank you.  
1131  
1132 **Noelle Madera** – Thanks everybody for attending.  
1133  
1134 **Everyone** – Thank you.  
1135  
1136 **Noelle Madera** – For those that aren't staying for the next topic thank you for attending.  
1137  
1138 **Eugene Thompson** – Can you give us a brief synopsis of what the next thing is about?  
1139  
1140 **Doug May** – Short-terms rentals have to do with Airbnb's.  
1141  
1142 **Tua Vang** – Thanks, everybody.  
1143  
1144 **Jerry Mellen** – Can't we talk off-record for a minute?  
1145  
1146 **Doug May** – Right now we're still in the public, well I guess I haven't opened the second  
1147 public hearing yet.  
1148  
1149 **Olivia Story** – No.  
1150  
1151 **Doug May** – You're saying no.  
1152  
1153 **Olivia Story** – You haven't opened it yet so you'll have to open up the next hearing.  
1154  
1155 **Doug May** – Right. So right now every everything's, the first public hearing is closed. We  
1156 have not opened the second public hearing, so, but I guess we can't talk about the issue  
1157 that just went before us because we've continued it so we can't talk about it again until  
1158 we open it back up again. We can talk about something else. Okay. Alright, it is 7:27  
1159 open public hearing on LRN2021-00003 Short-Term Rentals. We all should have gotten  
1160 them. Did you have a revised draft?  
1161  
1162 **Olivia Story** – It was posted online after you corrected that one that we posted online  
1163 and we (inaudible) the changes from the last session.  
1164  
1165 **Doug May** – So you should have a copy of the proposed, that's mine, the proposed  
1166 language, the blue line draft that you got, they did, they failed to put the corrected part  
1167 having to do with signage that we discussed at our last meeting. So what you were given  
1168 a couple days ago is not completely accurate. Do you have something to hand out to  
1169 us?  
1170  
1171 **Kyle Curtis** – That's the email version that's not the one sent in the packet so.

1172  
1173 **Doug May** - Here it is.  
1174  
1175 **Olivia Story** - So in the updated version, we're talking about the signage, that was  
1176 changed to read, to comply with the Yakima County Code sign language, not  
1177 necessarily prohibiting signs on the properties. That's the change there and also in the  
1178 updated language near the top or the definition include within the underlines there and  
1179 Kyle that was your recommendation to include that in the following as well, not just the  
1180 definition section.  
1181  
1182 **Doug May** - As we're in the second public hearing, I suppose we should quickly repeat  
1183 the rules of order. Do we have anybody online?  
1184  
1185 **Noelle Madera** - I think just staff just. Mike and staff. I don't see anybody else and it is hard  
1186 to hear Olivia so I'm not really sure where she's sitting in relation to any of the  
1187 microphones.  
1188  
1189 **Tua Vang** - Do you just want to come over here?  
1190  
1191 **Olivia Story** - Yes.  
1192  
1193 **Doug May** - This isn't the best setup in the world.  
1194  
1195 **Olivia Story** - That's fine just leave it. Alright this is Olivia and I'm sitting next to the  
1196 microphone. Can people hear me now?  
1197  
1198 **Phil Hoge** - Yes.  
1199  
1200 **Noelle Madera** - Yes.  
1201  
1202 **Olivia Story** - Okay great. So for the past couple months we had some work sessions on  
1203 the short-term rentals. And this is a background. Can you show me again? I don't see it.  
1204 Okay so as a reminder a short-term rental is a residential unit where the whole house or  
1205 portions within that house are rented on a temporary basis, less than 30 days, to overnight  
1206 guests. So currently our code addresses traditional bed and breakfast, not the Airbnb  
1207 that we're talking about tonight or the short-term rentals. And the difference between a  
1208 traditional bed and breakfast and these short-term rentals is the short-term rentals can  
1209 rent the whole entire house to a renter rather than just one room that's a traditional bed  
1210 and breakfast. The property owners do not have to stay on the site for these short-term  
1211 rentals, and then also because there's no code associated with these there's no  
1212 requirement for lodging tax, there, or sales tax associated with these short-term rentals.  
1213 So the lack of the regulation right now can lead to a lack of the life safety standards that  
1214 are associated with other bed and breakfasts.  
1215  
1216 **Doug May** - Could you slow down and be a little louder please?  
1217  
1218 **Olivia Story** - Is this better can you hear me now?  
1219  
1220 **Doug May** - Slow down. We're having trouble. I'm having trouble here.

1221  
1222 **Olivia Story** - Okay, I'm sorry about that. Another thing that has been brought up is the  
1223 lack of parking when there's increased traffic to the property. There's more of a need for  
1224 parking, and then also like I said the loss of lodging and sales tax associated with these.  
1225 So there's a list of criteria to change anything with the Yakima County Code. It has to be  
1226 consistent with 16B.10.095, and within there is the GMA and the SMA, other  
1227 comprehensive plan goals and policies, so any changes have to be compliant with  
1228 those. So after a thorough review, staff has determined that these underlying criteria do  
1229 meet that criteria. It meets it for approval. So staff is recommending approval of the draft  
1230 text change. So subject to any public testimony or questions for you, that is the end of  
1231 my presentation. We also did not receive any exhibits or letters of recommendation for  
1232 or against on this. So there's no recommendation letters here. So that's the conclusion of  
1233 my presentation. Are there any questions associated with this?

1234  
1235 **Doug May** - So I suspect that you have no idea how many there might be because  
1236 they're not registered?

1237  
1238 **Olivia Story** - There's no way to register or count them. I spent some time and I did a quick  
1239 research and I think I found about 225 that are in the county, but again that was just a  
1240 rudimentary search. There's no process to actually count these like an official count. It  
1241 was just me looking to see what was available online.

1242  
1243 **Doug May** - And this deals partially with the wineries, I think that's one of the things that  
1244 kind of brought this to the table?

1245  
1246 **Olivia Story** - It could have been part of what was brought up in part of it but these are  
1247 specifically for residential uses, whereas the wineries would be a winery or an ATO use,  
1248 and then I have separate criteria for that.

1249  
1250 **Doug May** - So we haven't, we're not dealing with that yet?

1251  
1252 **Olivia Story** - We're not dealing with the wineries yet, no.

1253  
1254 **Doug May** - But you had you've had a meeting or two with groups to speak to that.

1255  
1256 **Olivia Story** - We've had several meetings with the winery owners and we're drafting that  
1257 recommendation and proposal right now and so that will come to you soon but that  
1258 would be outside of what these are regulating. These are regulating just more of an  
1259 individual owner not a winery owner.

1260  
1261 **Doug May** - Has any one of these people been identified and are they aware that this is  
1262 on the table?

1263  
1264 **Olivia Story** - Besides the public notice, it through, the hearing public notice that was the  
1265 notification and we did not notify individual ones. There's no way to contact them. If you  
1266 go onto Airbnb's website, there's no addresses or owners listed until you actually go  
1267 through the process of booking a room. So there's no way for us to know who these  
1268 people are. We can't contact them in other words. So the notice and the Herald for the  
1269 public hearing was the most that we could do, I think.

1270  
1271 **Noelle Madera** - Hi Doug this is Noelle. One of the reasons that we added this on  
1272 something to work on was because people are coming into the County asking how to  
1273 get permitted and the closest thing that we have in our code is the bed and breakfast  
1274 and it doesn't really meet that, and that's what triggered us to work on this. If that helps  
1275 at all it.

1276  
1277 **Kyle Curtis** - It does for me, I think. For some reason I thought that we were having folks in  
1278 the county or city complaining about Airbnb's but that doesn't seem to be the case it's  
1279 rather folks are coming in trying to figure out how do I comply with the County because  
1280 other counties are trying to regulate this type of rentals.

1281  
1282 **Noelle Madera** - Correct and so we have had one issue with a code violation but it was  
1283 more, not just that they were operating an Airbnb, but they were also living in structures  
1284 that weren't habitable. They didn't have building permits for residential use. So that was  
1285 kind of more than just the issue with the Airbnb but we do have for years we've had  
1286 people coming in asking how what kind of permitting do they need and we just don't  
1287 really have a good answer for them. But then also there's a ton of articles around the  
1288 state and other jurisdictions that are having issues with them, and with the what Olivia  
1289 talked about with the noise, and so I don't know that we have a noise or the parking  
1290 issues yet in Yakima County, but if we had something in our code and somebody was  
1291 having a neighbor that was maybe using an Airbnb, it would be easier for us to say well  
1292 this is what you would need to apply for and then you would have to meet these criteria  
1293 to operate legally in the county. So it would give us something for us to tell them. But right  
1294 now, if your neighbor, you called a noise complaint on your neighbor there's really not  
1295 anything we could tell them to apply for that makes sense. So that's what kind of spurred  
1296 us to work on it.

1297  
1298 **Doug May** - Any questions from the Jerry's? Comments?

1299  
1300 **Kyle Curtis** - No I think I've got my, well there's just the comment is I think it would be  
1301 extremely hard to enforce this, right? And I don't think that's the intent. I don't think we're  
1302 expecting the County to all of a sudden contact individually the 225 folks that are doing  
1303 Airbnb and or reach out to Airbnb and instruct them that anyone with a certain zip code  
1304 unless they show proof of a Yakima County business license that they're not going to be  
1305 allowed to operate on their on their platform or their source. So I don't personally have  
1306 an issue with this just because I think it satisfies some of the needs and the wants from the  
1307 community there. And then it also sets us up, sets up the County, if there is an incident  
1308 where an Airbnb becomes an issue, at least it's spelled out here to allow further discussion.

1309  
1310 **Doug May** - Well and a guy might not like his neighbor and the neighbor having one and  
1311 call up the County and said hey, then they find out he doesn't have a permit for that.

1312  
1313 **Kyle Curtis** - Yes.

1314  
1315 **Doug May** - Even though he's been doing it for the last five years because I'm sure they're  
1316 not going to grandfather people in and then they have to go through the hoops to find  
1317 out whether they can qualify. But one thing that comes up also is the tax, where it is in a  
1318 way, you could argue unfair competition against an established hotel motel in town that

1319 is taking away someone that may have rented a room from them, go out to an Airbnb,  
1320 and so whomever loses a little bit of tax money plus the motel loses a customer.

1321  
1322 **Jerry Mellen** - What was the basis for not taxing these facilities and taxing the others?

1323  
1324 **Olivia Story** - I'm sorry I couldn't quite hear your question.

1325  
1326 **Jerry Mellen** - My question is what was the basis for not taxing these facilities and yet  
1327 taxing others?

1328  
1329 **Olivia Story** - These the way the draft text is written is these would be taxed. The plan is to  
1330 have them have a business license and be taxed just like an Airbnb or a regular bnb.  
1331 Right now there is no regulation so there is no tax but this would implement the tax.

1332  
1333 **Doug May** - I think it's just kind of stuck up on them where they've been taxing the motels  
1334 and bnbs all along and then all of a sudden, they got a new industry out here the Airbnb's  
1335 the last couple years that kind of evolved and they just, the County and the taxman are  
1336 behind the curve on.

1337  
1338 **Olivia Story** - So this would put them on the same playing field as a bed and breakfast.  
1339 Like a traditional bed and breakfast. Where they would have the same business license  
1340 and the tax requirements as they do.

1341  
1342 **Jerry Mellen** - Are we saying that both of these facilities will be taxed?

1343  
1344 **Olivia Story** - Yes.

1345  
1346 **Jerry Mellen** - They will?

1347  
1348 **Olivia Story** - Yes.

1349  
1350 **Jerry Mellen** - Ok.

1351  
1352 **Doug May** - Under this.

1353  
1354 **Jerry Mellen** - Under this. Alright, that's correct.

1355  
1356 **Olivia Story** - Yes.

1357  
1358 **Jerry Mellen** - Thank you.

1359  
1360 **Doug May** - Anyone one want to, any other testimony, comments, questions? I guess  
1361 we're still going to close the public hearing on this issue.

1362  
1363 **Deliberations**

1364 **Doug May** - We'll move on to deliberations. Somebody want to throw a motion out there?  
1365 To either I guess accept it or reject it as presented.

1366  
1367 **Jerry Mellen** - I make a motion that we accept this.

1368  
1369     **Kyle Curtis** – Kyle Curtis. I'll second.  
1370  
1371     **Doug May** – It's been moved and seconded that we accept the proposed language for  
1372     Chapter 19.18 Special Uses and Standards on 19.18.420 Short Term Rentals. Comments?  
1373     Jerry?  
1374  
1375     **Jerry Mellen** – No I think it's fair. I think this is a good start. Alright and it may be a start as  
1376     these things develop but I'm willing to say that we need this on record.  
1377  
1378     **Doug May** – Kyle any comments?  
1379  
1380     **Kyle Curtis** – No I've already made my comments.  
1381  
1382     **Doug May** – So it's been moved and seconded. All in favor of adopting this, signify by  
1383     aye?  
1384  
1385     **Doug, Kyle, Jerry Craig, and Jerry Mellen** – Aye.  
1386  
1387     **Doug May** – All oppose?  
1388  
1389     **Mike Shuttleworth** – Aye.  
1390  
1391     **Doug May** – Okay was the aye for, was the aye yes or a no? Mike?  
1392  
1393     **Mike Shuttleworth** – Aye, yes.  
1394  
1395     **Doug May** – Okay. So it's 5-0 yes. There's a delay Mike. So I guess I'm too fast cause you  
1396     always come in with an aye after I've asked for the no's.  
1397  
1398     **Mike Shuttleworth** – Sorry about that there was a little bit of extra noise on the call for  
1399     some reason.  
1400  
1401     **Doug May** – Yes. Okay. We did the deliberations are in here again.  
1402  
1403  
1404     **IV. New Business:** None.  
1405  
1406  
1407     **V. Old Business:**  
1408         A. Vice Chair-Elections. The Chair made a motion to nominate Kyle Curtis as the Vice-  
1409         Chair. Jerry Mellen and Mike Shuttleworth seconded the motion. All five Planning  
1410         Commission members voted in favor of the motion and zero opposed.  
1411  
1412  
1413     **VI. Communications:**  
1414         A. **Reports of subcommittees and study groups.** None.  
1415

1416 **B. Status report of cases before the BOCC.** The CAO Flood Chapters text amendments  
1417 is scheduled for a hybrid public hearing with the Board on September 28, 2021,  
1418 10:00 a.m. or shortly thereafter.

1419  
1420 **C. Secretary's report.** None.

1421  
1422  
1423 **VII. Adjournment or continuance to a date, place, and time:** The next meeting to be held  
1424 on October 13, 2021, 6:00 pm due to the continuance of the Naches UGA  
1425 Amendment public hearing. In-person and virtual attendance will be determined. The  
1426 September 8, 2021 meeting was adjourned at 7:48 pm.

1427  
1428 Minutes approved by the Planning Commission on Oct 13, 2021.

1429  
1430  
1431 Signed: Dan May  
1432 Planning Commission, Chair  
1433 \\Int2\Planning\Planning Commission\2021 - 2030\2021\Minutes Draft\Sep 8 Hearing Minutes Draft.docx