

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 25, 2016

The Ephrata Planning Commission, Grant County, Washington met on August 25, 2016. The meeting was called to order in council chambers at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Joe Dennis.

Members present: Chairman Joe Dennis, members, Jo Maedke, Don Guillemette, and Tom Moncrief. David Spencer Excused Absence

Staff present: Ron Sell, Community Development Director; Bill Sangster, Public Works Director; Anna Franz, City Attorney; Stacy Hooper, Secretary

Approval of Commission Minutes: Motion to approve the minutes of August 11, 2016 by **Don Guillemette**, Motion Second **Jo Maedke**, motion carried.

Correspondence: Revised packets are handed out. **Anna Franz** made some formatting changes. No other changes.

Additions and/or revisions to Published Agenda: No additions or revisions to Published agenda.

Ron Sell provided a copy of the Ephrata Area Priority Habitat and Species Map, Ephrata Frequently Flooded Area Map, Ephrata Wetland Designations Map and City of Ephrata Aquifer Recharge Areas Map for Planning Commissioners to look at.

Resolution 16-001: A Resolution adopting Ephrata Municipal Code Chapter 19.17 entitled Marijuana Regulations – **Joe Dennis** asks for comments – **Jo Maedke** asks if there are changes from what Planning Committee last agreed to. **Anna Franz**, no just formatting changes.

Tom Moncrief motion to adopt **16-001 Don Guillemette** Second, Motion to adopt, Approved.

Resolution 16-002: A Resolution recommending approval of amendments to Ephrata Municipal Code, Chapters 18.04, Lot Line Adjustments; 18.29, Design Standards; 18.33, Improvements; 18.36, Reimbursement for Utility Installations; 18.55, Segregation for Conveyance Plats; 20.04, Environmental Policy Act and 21.02, Street and Utility Construction Permits – **Joe Dennis** asks for questions, comments, or changes: **Ron Sell**, there is one change that was made at the last meeting, **18.33.090 Monuments** moved to **18.29.380**.

Jo Maedke motion to adopt **16-002 Tom Moncrief** Second, Motion to adopt, Approved.

Review and discussion Chapter 20.08, Protection and Development Regulations of Critical Areas and Resource Lands ordinance:

Joe Dennis asks **Ron Sell** for a report. **Ron Sell**, the information has been pulled from other jurisdictions to make it more current. There have been no significant changes since the original adoption. There is one section that is optional. *Cultural Resource Areas*. We do not have this in place. **Ron Sell** contacted the Department of Natural Resources and Historical Preservation to obtain current maps, they have not responded to the requests. The recommendation is to remove Cultural Resource Areas. **Joe Dennis** asks what happens if we include or exclude this portion.

Ron Sell explains that this section is somewhat open to interpretation. The *Cultural Resource Areas* section gives us a better understanding of the procedures if there are cultural resources found. We already send projects out for review to the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, Colville Confederates Tribes and in some cases the Yakima Indianation, making this chapter just a second layer of procedures we already follow. They typically don't comment, but can come in at any time and comment. **Discussion Ensues.** **Joe Dennis** asks, what happens if someone is out gardening and finds an arrow head, would removing this section pose a problem. **Ron Sell** explains that this section would be more for burial sites or view areas, like areas on a hill. **Discussion Ensues.** When a Federal Project happens, for instance at the Port with the FAA or the Bureau of Reclamation, they have to follow the NEPA process, so there in the past has been preliminary review. **Joe Dennis** asks if anyone apposes dropping *Cultural Resource Areas*. No Comment, *Cultural Resource Areas* to be dropped.

Ron Sell asks if everyone has had a chance to look over **Chapter 20.08, Protection and Development Regulations of Critical Areas and Resource Lands ordinance.** **Joe Dennis** is surprised that there are not many changes. **Ron Sell** explains it is very similar to what we had already had, the definitions section has expanded.

20.08.010 is where we have modifications, in the past we did not have much in the section of **Non-Conforming uses and structures**, this section has been expanded; more on **Land Segregation**, which was not previously there; general procedures is more layed out, in the past it was left up more to the developer to provide the study if critical areas were found, now has better detail of the procedures, there is more peer review. Other than the frequently flooded areas we are very limited on critical areas. Since we are in the CRS program we have a higher standard than that of some other cities. **Discussion Ensues** regarding Wetland Areas.

Wetland Critical area maps from Fish and Wild life, have sensitive information, therefore the maps have very limited information that can be provided in a public setting. **Discussion Ensues.**

Geological Hazardous Areas, are typically the steeper slopes. If there were to be development on the edge of the ridge, it would possibly require a review and because of the slopes, building code would also trigger additional reviews.

Critical Aquifer Recharge Area essentially is our Urban growth area, anything in the City would have limitations if it is of a nature that could potentially be of hazard to the water supply, for example the siting of hazard waste facilities. **Discussion Ensues.**

Jo Maedke asks if there is a map. **Ron Sell** points out the map and discusses. With this section it would require a critical area check list with each project.

Non-Conforming use, **Ron Sell** explains, if you look at it from a developers view point it makes a lot of sense. **Joe Dennis** asks if this is common. **Ron Sell**, yes, very common and is mandated by the Growth Management act for us to have a Critical Areas Ordinance. We took this information from the Grant County Shoreline Management Program, they are hoping to adopt this for their entire Critical Area Ordinance, it currently is their Shoreline Management Program. **Joe Dennis** asks what kind of latitude do we as a City have to tighten or loosen this. **Ron Sell** and **Anna Franz** discussion ensues. **Joe Dennis** asks if we have any unique situations here in Ephrata that this ordinance would effect. **Ron Sell**, it depends on the project and the project site.

Discussion Ensues regarding Frequently Flooded areas, FEMA, FEMA standards and possible diversions. **Joe Dennis** states it sounds as if there is really not much we as Planning Commission can do or the City could do to address concerns. **Jo Maedke** asks the City to please keep looking for that special project or funding to help with diversion funding to lighten the FEMA regulations for building in the downtown area.

Joe Dennis asks if at this point are there any objections to 20.08. **Tom Moncrief** asks if there is currently a check list in place. **Ron Sell**, no, **Tom Moncrief** asks if developers know about this, if not at what point do they find out. **Discussion ensues** regarding procedures to help developers with the process. **Discussion Ensues.**

Next meeting September 8, 2016. **Anna Franz** with not be in attendance.

Joe Dennis Adjourns meeting at 7:50 pm.



Joe Dennis, Planning Commission Chairman

Attest: 
Stacy Hooper, Secretary