

APPENDIX M

2022 DEIS Consultation Notes

7/1/22 Mission Ridge EIS USFS / County Coordination Meeting

7/25/22 Mission Ridge EIS: Chelan PUD / County Coordination Meeting

8/1/22 Mission Ridge EIS: Chelan County Fire District No. 1 / County Coordination Meeting

9/22/22 Mission Ridge EIS: Washington State Department of Transportation, City of Wenatchee, City of East Wenatchee / County Coordination Meeting

11/1/22 Mission Ridge EIS WDFW / County Coordination Meeting

Meeting Notes

July 1, 2022

Mission Ridge EIS USFS / County Coordination Meeting

Confluence Technology Center – 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Meeting Facilitators:

Aspect Consulting: Dan Haller

Anchor QEA: Heather Page

WIFI: Riversjoin

Purpose: *Coordinate County SEPA EIS with USFS NEPA EA (scope and schedule)*

Agenda Items

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dan

Attendees: USFS (Erica Taeker, Kristin Bail, T.J. Broom, Rita Bennett), County Team (Mike Kaputa, Camie Anderson), Mission Ridge Team (Larry Scrivanich, Sam Scrivanich, Josh Jorgensen, Clay White), Aspect Team (Dan Haller, Heather Page, Tina Loucks-Jaret, Molly Corbin (intern)).

2. Developer Opening Remarks

Larry, Josh, Clay

- a. New information since February 2020 Draft Environmental Assessment

The primary concern expressed was over schedule delays and lack of communication. This needs to improve moving forward. The developer was originally advocating for County/USFS integration of environmental review. While a return to this effort is likely the right choice, the perception of lost time was concerning.

3. County Coordination Goals

Mike, Camie

- a. Potential to rely on and augment USFS findings
- b. Potential to adopt USFS Environmental Assessment (EA)
- c. Coordination of schedule

The County supports greater coordination and integration with the USFS. There is likely lower litigation risk overall if environmental review is aligned. The County is on a path to resolve data gaps in 2022, start the EIS drafting process by year-end, and complete the Final EIS by end of 2023, subject to the required public processes.

4. USFS EA Status

Kristin, Erica, Rita

- a. What is current work schedule on EA

- b. Discussion of key issues in affected environment (habitat, access, etc.)
- c. Are there significant issues of concern Chelan County should be aware of?
- d. Are there barriers to its completion?

The EA has been near complete for a year now, with updates to the draft EA following public comment.

The USFS has been waiting a year for a response from USFWS on their draft Biological Assessment to support the EA. They are hoping for a determination of concurrence. They believe the backlog is staff related, not something substantive but will not know for certain until consultation is completed. USFS will again reach out to USFWS for updated timeline and will provide an update.

The USFS has advice from its Solicitor's Office that the conflicting threshold determinations at the local and Federal level produces litigation risk that is likely unacceptable to the USFS and inadvisable to the County and proponent. We discussed several options in the meeting, including:

1. Issuing the EA as planned.
2. USFS starting over with an EIS instead of an EA.
3. USFS tiering their EA off of a County EIS.

We spent the majority of the discussion on the third option. It has some merit because:

1. There are precedential cases of this being successful and surviving litigation challenges.
2. It does not force the USFS to redo work. Their EA in its near-finished form could be shared (via an MOU perhaps) with the County/Developer/Aspect Teams for use in the County EIS where appropriate.
3. It does not modify the overall environmental review timeline. The EA could be essentially co-issued at the same time as the County Final EIS in late 2023 provided no surprises come out of that public process.

The USFS is willing to coordinate on Option 3. The County and Developer Teams were going to reflect on this wrinkle this week with their respective legal councils and we are going to discuss by email. We can follow up with a meeting if necessary. If Option 3 is pursued, the County and USFS will circulate an example MOU that we can modify for this purpose.

5. Open Discussion and Next Steps

All

Dan will check in with the parties in the coming week to resolve the path forward.

In-Person Conference Room and Zoom Meeting Information

9:00 AM - 11:00 AM (PT) Chelan County Mission Ridge (Confirmed) Executive Board Room

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83528280057?pwd=YkIHM0F1KzRyUFdxdnNlV0NUZGhoZz09>

Dial by Telephone: 253 215 8782

Meeting ID: 835 2828 0057

Passcode: 920475

Meeting Agenda

July 25, 2022

Mission Ridge EIS: Chelan PUD / County Coordination Meeting

Confluence Technology Center – 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Meeting Facilitators:

Aspect Consulting: Dan Haller

Anchor QEA: Heather Page

WIFI: Riversjoin

Purpose: *Coordinate County SEPA EIS with Chelan PUD Scoping Comments*

Agenda Items

1. Welcome and Introductions, Aspect Team Role

Dan

Mission Ridge: Larry Scrivanich, Sam Scrivanich, Josh Jorgensen, Clay White

KPG: Josh Fedora

Anchor QEA: Heather Page

Aspect: Dan Haller, Daniel Chang

Chelan County: Mike Kaputa, Camie Anderson

Chelan PUD: Ron Slabaugh, Chad Rissman, Celia Slatta, Vicki Griffin, Andy Wendell

2. County Opening Remarks

- a. Overview and update of Chelan County SEPA process
- b. How clarity on Chelan PUD comments will inform EIS
- c. Coordination of schedule

Mike and Camie

The County supports coordination efforts to support the PUD and developer collaboration. The County is on a path to resolve data gaps in 2022, start the EIS drafting process by year-end, and complete the Final EIS by end of 2023, subject to the required public processes.

3. Developer Opening Remarks

Larry, Josh, Clay

- a. Goals in EIS process
- b. Historic coordination with Chelan PUD

Developer team supports collaboration with PUD and will work to address comments and requests necessary to move actions forward.

4. Chelan PUD Comment Letter Discussion

Chelan PUD and All

- a. Framing for affected environment and alternatives in the EIS
 - i. Power and Distribution (Comment Letter, McKinstry Report, Checklist)

The McKinstry report and the PUD Comment Letter had opposing conclusions on need for a new substation for power demands. McKinstry report needs clarity on basis for calculations to provide the PUD with a better understanding (i.e. peak versus average demands, phasing, energy demand per area). The PUD recognizes some information is still draft and ranges are acceptable.

The PUD's existing substation at Squilchuck has limited available capacity and likely does not have enough to support the full 7 MW demand that was projected in the McKinstry report, particularly when considering peak demands and availability with organic growth. Options discussed for reducing high energy demands include alternative heating, new substation locations, and phasing of the project concurrent with new substation site development.

The timeline to develop a new substation without the Mission Ridge project based solely on organic growth is likely 15+ years out. With Mission Ridge, significant improvements will likely be required to accommodate full buildout of the development. Substation siting and development usually takes the PUD on the order of 3 to 5 years and the PUD has their own public and environmental review process it conducts for these.

A Capacity Reservation Agreement is a potential option to determine power demands and availability with greater certainty than the normal Line Extension process which is only good for 60 days. Capacity Reservation Agreements have an annual review process and can allow for various scenarios over a longer time period.

Next steps include:

- Coordinate a call between PUD and McKinstry to discuss updates to the draft report needed for the PUD to run its model (Aspect)
- Resubmit an application through the PUD to develop a model for a Capacity Reservation Agreement to understand availability of power for the development. The new model will include clarified values from McKinstry (Developer Team)
- Include Chelan County Community Development on McKinstry revised report to ensure assumptions are consistent with County Code (County)

We will aim to reconvene to discuss the results of the power capacity model in early October. Depending on the results, the need for a new substation may need to be included in the draft EIS to understand the disturbed environment. The level of detail of review for that could be programmatic or project level depending on what phase it falls in, the risks and opportunities associated with coordination of County and PUD separate environmental review processes, and what can be reasonably known at this time.

ii. Water Services (Comment Letter, RH2 Report, Developer Reports)

The perspectives from the reports produced by RH2 and American Land and Water were discussed. For the purposes of the EIS, the necessary action item is to develop a map of the disturbed environment that the water system will affect. Costs and water system capacities were also discussed, but no action items are immediately necessary for the EIS unless capacity issues directly affect the footprint of disturbed area (e.g. difference in pipe sizes for example is not a critical path issue).

There is some potential for water lines to cross USFS property if it aligns with the power corridor, which we want to ensure is covered in their EA and any required Special Use permitting.

Next steps include:

- **Obtain GIS files of water system infrastructure from PUD and work with Developer Team to produce disturbed area map for review by all parties (Aspect)**
- **Determine whether additional USFS engagement on the water line (and telecommunications below) is needed in the EA.**

iii. Telecommunications (Comment Letter, SEPA Checklist)

Similar to the water services discussion, a map of the disturbed environment is needed. The PUD will provide information to Aspect for the map.

iv. Wastewater (Developer Reports, SEPA Checklist)

No alternative for wastewater involving Chelan PUD will be evaluated in the EIS.

5. Open Discussion and Next Steps

All

Next steps are outlined in each sub section of the meeting notes. Dan and Daniel will coordinate with the parties in the next week to follow up on necessary actions.

Meeting Agenda

August 1, 2022

Mission Ridge EIS: Chelan County Fire District No. 1 / County Coordination Meeting

Confluence Technology Center – 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Meeting Facilitators:

Aspect Consulting: Dan Haller

Anchor QEA: Heather Page

WIFI: Riversjoin

Purpose: *Determine approach to alternatives for fire safety and road access for the upcoming County SEPA EIS*

Agenda Items

1. Welcome and Introductions

All

Chelan County Natural Resources: Mika Kaputa, Camie Anderson (Shockey Planning Group), Kenneth Harper, Marcus Foster

Chelan County Public Works: Eric Pierson

Chelan County Fire Marshal: Stephen Rinaldi

Aspect: Dan Haller, Daniel Chang, Trevor Stephens, Josh Fedora (KPG), Brian Vrablick (AFM)

Mission Ridge: Duana Kolouskova, Josh Jorgensen, Larry Scrivanich, Samuel Scrivanich, Clay White

Chelan County Fire District No. 1: Brian Brett, Tim Schermetzler

2. Aspect Team Role

Dan

a. EIS Approach

b. Questions of the Day

- i. Is the Developer's Single 28-Foot Wide Access with Fire Protection approach appropriate?
- ii. Are the "burden of proof" criteria met (e.g. "logical", "unusual circumstances", "impractical")?
- iii. Should a secondary access be an "Alternative Not Considered" or an "Alternative" in the EIS?

Aspect continues to host series of consultation meetings to inform county process and determine data gaps. Aspect will work with the Mission Ridge and County team to synthesize data by the end of 2022 with the goal of a draft EIS by summer 2023 and final by end of 2023.

3. County Opening Remarks

Mike and Camie

a. Overview and update of Chelan County SEPA process

The County aims to collect consultation support and necessary data to improve efficiency in the draft process. Goal of this meeting is to clarify comments submitted to-date on the issue of secondary access to the proposed resort.

4. Developer Opening Remarks

Larry, Josh, Clay

a. Approach to access and fire protection in proposal

Mission Ridge recognizes the fire risk in the area and wants to ensure that all alternatives are explored to achieve the most practical and reasonable solution. The team has evaluated secondary access issues at length and believe its proposal for a primary access with additional fire protection mitigation is consistent with county code. Although the issue of a single access for a mountain-top resort may be unique to Chelan County, it is not unique nationally, and is commonly permitted.

5. Open Discussion

All

The County Marshal expressed the need to examine this problem as an “All Hazard” (i.e. hazardous materials, avalanche, mudslide) response that includes evacuation scenarios and shelter-in-place scenarios. The Mission Ridge team has a Crisis Management Plan that addresses those hazards, but the team needs to make sure the plan is up-to-date and accounts for full buildout scenarios (i.e. full buildout, maximum population). Mission ridge team to send current Crisis Management Plan to Dan to distribute. Additionally, the level of service provided by a secondary access is envisioned to be the same as for the primary access, and is to be fully functional when the primary access is unavailable due to fire, smoke, falling debris, or other factors. The level of service provided overall was also discussed with the Fire Marshal indicating that annexation into the Fire District would be required as opposed to just a service agreement.

The District concurred with the Fire Marshal. Fire hazards and access should be considered for fires origination above, below, and within the resort area and each of those events should provide safe evacuation or shelter-in-place options. Other concerns raised by the District include annexing into the District, road access specifically relating to traffic concerns, financial considerations to provide the required level of service, and safety zones during fire scenarios that require a shelter-in-place.

The group spent some time evaluating the process around which such a decision should be made. This included evaluation of key sections of County Code, including:

- **Chapter 15.30.230(4) which includes an “impractical” standard that allows for additional fire protection mitigation if a secondary access is not proposed.**
- **Chapter 15.40.020 which describes additional mitigation may be necessary when fire apparatus access roads cannot be installed due to location on property, topography, waterways, nonnegotiable grades or other similar conditions.**
- **Chapter 3.04.080(5) which identifies that geographic and topographic considerations may prevent a secondary access and trigger additional fire protection mitigation associated with a single primary access.**

There was discussion on how the “practical” standard embodied in County Code compared to the standard in SEPA for selecting “reasonable” alternatives for a secondary access road. Generally these appear synonymous. If a secondary access is not “practical” then it is not a reasonable alternative. In either case, the issue of a secondary access and its practicality as a stand alone alternative will be discussed in the EIS so the public has a full accounting of the issue.

Specific secondary access routes were discussed by the group relative to issues of land ownership, topography, geography, and other factors, including the following five potential secondary access alternatives: Upper Wheeler, Orr Creek Road, State Parks, Mission Ridge, and the Hair Pin Turn on Squilchuck.

The Developer’s Team has studied all of these previously. These alternatives all face various challenges such as property ownership, steep slopes, rugged roads, crossing water bodies, and difficulties for year-round maintenance. Although these issues present challenges, it appears that documentation of those challenges is a data gap necessary to make an informed decision.

6. Next Steps

All

The group agreed to the following next steps:

1. The Mission Ridge team will develop a scope of work for Aegis to develop an addendum to the 12/17/22 Fire Protection Plan to specifically address issues of secondary access.
2. The County, Fire Marshal, and Fire District will review the scope of work to ensure that it covers the work necessary to make an informed judgment on the issue.
3. Aegis will update the Fire Protection Plan and circulate for review.
4. The County, Fire Marshal, and Fire District will comment on that plan.
5. Aspect will prepare a scope of work based on that review that either:
 - a. Includes a secondary access as a discrete alternative that is part of the disturbed environment, or
 - b. Documents the reasons that a secondary access is not a reasonable alternative that triggers independent review as an alternative in the EIS.
6. Clay will coordinate a meeting with the Fire Marshal and Fire District to discuss mitigation measures (other than secondary access) that were included in the comment letters but not the focus of this meeting.

Meeting Agenda

September 22, 2022

Mission Ridge EIS: Washington State Department of Transportation, City of Wenatchee, City of East Wenatchee / County Coordination Meeting

Confluence Technology Center – 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

Meeting Facilitators:

Aspect Consulting: Dan Haller
WIFI: Riversjoin

Virtual Meeting Connection Info (if in person not possible)

1

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86978999727?pwd=dFXenlZcWpPSEtFOTBQeDJOUdJvdz09>

Dial by Telephone: 1 253 215 8782

Meeting ID: 869 7899 9727

Passcode: 463432

Purpose: *Clarify data gaps regarding traffic and environmental impacts due to full development of Mission Ridge Expansion MPR.*

Agenda Items

1. Welcome and Introductions

All

Aspect Team: Dan Haller, Daniel Chang, Josh Fedora, John Davies

Developer Team: Larry Scrivanich Samuel Scrivanich, Josh Jorgensen, Clay White, Kimley & Horn Brad Lincoln, Edward Koltonowski

Chelan County: Camie Anderson, Andrew Brunner, Mike Kaputa

WSDOT: Kathy Murray, Kate Tollefson, David Kieninger, Mosstafa Sadia

City of Wenatchee: Rob Jammerman, Daniel Dye (Fehr & Peers), Gary Owen, Emma Honeycutt

City of East Wenatchee: Garren Melton

Chelan Douglas Transportation Council: Riley Shewak

2. Aspect Team Role

Dan

a. EIS Approach

Aspect continues to host series of consultation meetings to inform county process and determine data gaps. Aspect will work with the Mission Ridge and County team to synthesize data by the end of 2022 with the goal of a draft EIS by summer 2023 and final by end of 2023.

3. County Opening Remarks

Mike and Camie

- a. Overview and update of Chelan County SEPA process

The County aims to collect consultation support and necessary data to improve efficiency in the draft process. Goal of this meeting is to clarify data gaps in the traffic analysis and continue conversations with relevant parties.

4. Developer Opening Remarks

Larry, Josh, Clay

- a. Goals in EIS process

Mission Ridge wants to ensure that the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) incorporates all comments and addresses any data gaps going into the 2023 EIS draft process. The team has brought in their engineering team from Kimley & Horn to discuss the TIA and next steps to address data gaps. The goal is to reduce data gaps from the agencies' feedback to reduce comment review potential during the draft stage in 2023.

5. Standard of Review / Compliance Discussion by Each Agency

General consensus that the TIA should include discussion on intersections, road design relative to county standards, proportionate impacts, and mitigation tied to each phase of the project.

- County
- WSDOT
- City of Wenatchee
- City of East Wenatchee
- Input from Developer Traffic Expert
- Input from Aspect Team Traffic Expert (Josh and John)

6. Open Discussion on Potential Data Gaps

All

- Phasing of analysis versus SEPA standard of closing reasonable data gaps

Reasonable data gaps should be addressed in the TIA.

- Proposal for phased updates to TIA concurrent with Mission buildout

Phased updates to a TIA are possible, but should be forecasted where possible with proportionate impacts. There is flexibility in analysis for moving components between phases. If there are unknown impacts in the future, the EIS can include a condition that a new TIA will be conducted at a certain future phase. If this future TIA concludes that findings are substantive, then a supplemental EIS will be necessary. If the proportionality of impacts can be reasonably predicted now, along with mitigation measures and appropriate development agreements, then that would obviate the need for an additional environmental review later in the project.

- Were pre-2021 comments fully addressed in 10/2021 TIA Addendum

The 2021 TIA Addendum, which responded to comments on the 2019 TIA, has not been fully reviewed by the agencies. The main comments for the 2019 TIA were concerned

with the lack of clarity on full development analysis in 2040, the intersections evaluated, and the time periods reviewed.

- Remaining data gaps noted in the record
 - Discussion of impacted intersections and roadway segments:
 - SR 285 to downtown
 - Wenatchee City Streets
 - SR 28 in East Wenatchee
 - East Wenatchee City Streets
 - Squilchuck Road / County Roads
 - Secondary Access Road Update (status of discussions with fire authority)

There were several data gaps and assumptions that were raised during the discussion that should be resolved in an updated TIA.

1. The conservative assumption of residential homes being full at all times, versus a realistic part-time scenario.
2. The TIA focused on an afternoon peak scenario and did not document weekend traffic conditions.
3. A concrete threshold was not determined for the TIA since there were many jurisdictions in play. Documentation of selection criteria for intersections analyzed will be beneficial.
4. Quantify impacts to East Wenatchee intersections
5. Address summer and winter public transportation

- Proposed Mitigation Measures

All agencies require a discussion of the traffic impacts and associated intersections to manage mitigation with proportionate impacts quantified. The County requires an additional agreement in the form of a Development Agreement or Voluntary Mitigation Agreement to manage risk. Other jurisdictions have similar agreements. The developer is interested in having mitigation tied to trip targets or other similar method, so that there can be flexibility in phasing the project.

7. Next Steps

All

The following next steps were identified to target data gaps in the TIA for the EIS:

1. Developer team to meet with EIS consultant team to develop a scope of work for a supplemental TIA to account for the data gaps discussed above (i.e. residential home assumptions, trip counts, intersection selection and impacts, expected development, phasing).
2. Developer team to send scope of work for review among the working group to confirm the proper data gaps will be addressed.
3. All agencies (WSDOT, City of Wenatchee, City of East Wenatchee, Chelan County) will share relevant data to ensure efficiency and accuracy for the Developer team efforts.
4. Developer team to develop a supplemental TIA to be used in the draft EIS.

Meeting Agenda

November 1, 2022

Mission Ridge EIS WDFW / County Coordination Meeting

Confluence Technology Center – 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Meeting Facilitators:

Aspect Consulting: Dan Haller, Daniel Chang

Anchor QEA: Heather Page, Matt Kuziinsky, Chris Moelter

WIFI: Riversjoin

Purpose: *Coordinate County SEPA EIS with WDFW*

Agenda Items

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dan

Aspect Team: Dan Haller, Daniel Chang

Developer Team: Josh Jorgensen, Larry Scrivanich

Chelan County: Camie Anderson, Mike Kaputa

WDFW: Ken Muir, Amanda Barg, Lisa Wood, Carmen Andonaegui, Brock Hoenes

Anchor QEA: Heather Page, Matt Kuziinsky, Chris Moelter

2. Overview and update of Chelan County SEPA process

Mike, Camie

This is the final planned consultation meeting to inform county process and determine data gaps. Aspect, Mission Ridge, and County team plan to synthesize data by the end of 2022 with the goal of a draft EIS by summer 2023 and final by end of 2023.

3. Developer Opening Remarks

Larry, Josh, Clay

4. WDFW Opening Remarks

Brock, Carmen, All

5. Summary of Discussion Issues

a. Integrated USFS EA / County EIS Approach

Goal is to conclude the EA and EIS at the same time with an interlocal agreement. An MOU has been drafted between USFS and the County and is expected to sign in the next few weeks.

b. Discussion of disturbed environment and pending studies

For all subsections, refer to the disturbed environment table at the end of the notes for a full summary.

i. Expansion area

Studies in the Expansion Area:

- **Botany Study:** field work complete, report in progress
- **Stream Study:** Updating currently
- **Elk Movement Study:** Complete and shared with group
- **DNR Landscape Analysis and Forest Management Study:** WDFW will identify relevant maps and data for EIS purposes, Aspect will contact DNR for data

WDFW Comments for Project Expansion Area

- **Section 25 land (high priority)**
 - 25+ year old agreement for land that may not be reliable anymore. If agreement is no longer valid, acquisition will cause a land use change and likely require full mitigation.
 - Action Item: Discuss internally how to engage with DFW, address asap to avoid future conflict.
- **Updated Riparian Management rules**
 - Zones are determined variably based on 200 year tree height rather than a concrete distance buffer zone.
 - Action Item: reevaluate new riparian buffer metrics relative to the County code riparian buffer requirements to implement in EIS. See references below.
- **Management, Maintenance, Monitoring plan is recommended**
- **Address human-wildlife conflict prevention**
- **Address noise pollution (may overlap with Adaptive Management Plan)**
- **Address climate change and climate resiliency of development**
- **Adaptive Management Plan is recommended.**
 - Existing plan is on hand, can be updated to account for new development.
- **Adaptive management, Monitoring, and Rehabilitation plan (AMMRP) is recommended**

ii. Water (discussion of meetings with PUD and Ecology)

Pipe improvements, although disturbing an existing footprint, could create a disturbed environment if within a riparian buffer zone or if there is disturbance to the Squilchuck creek corridor.

iii. Wastewater (discussion of meeting with Ecology)

No concerns were raised by WDFW with discussions of wastewater for the phased plan of LOSS and/or treatment plant with discharge into Squilchuck creek.

iv. Power/fiber (discussion of meeting with PUD)

Similar to water, buffer zones and Squilchuck creek are the main areas of concern. WDFW expressed specific awareness to Squilchuck creek.

v. Traffic (discussion of meeting with WSDOT/Wenatchee/East Wenatchee & Fire Authorities)

#1 Canyon and #2 Canyon are natural drainages into the Columbia River that may be impacted by traffic improvements. This needs to be addressed in the TIA/traffic sections of the EIS.

Secondary access road analysis is ongoing. If reasonable and practical option(s) are determined through the analysis, the selection(s) will be presented and reviewed with WDFW to determine any critical flaws relating to habitat management.

Open Discussion and Next Steps

Next steps are discussed in each of the sections above. The most critical items involve conversations concerning the Section 25 land and reengaging with WDFW following the secondary access road analysis results.

References

WDFW Riparian Ecosystems, Volume 2: Management Recommendations Site-Potential Tree Height Map

- **From Amanda:** In this area, 200-year-old Ponderosa Pine tree height is approximately 120 ft. Based on our published guidance, WDFW recommends a minimum distance of 100 feet for the riparian management zone to protect water quality from pollutants, and ideally in the forested environment, the minimum distance recommended is equivalent to SPTH, which in this case is approximately 120 feet. This distance is less than the County's requirement for type F waters (150 ft.), and only ~20 feet greater than the County's requirement for non-fish bearing perennial waters (100 ft.). The biggest difference would be ~70 ft. greater than the County's requirement for non-fish bearing seasonal waters (50 ft.).
Chapter 11.78 FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT CONSERVATION AREAS OVERLAY DISTRICT (FWOD) (codepublishing.com)

20-Year Forest Health Strategic Plan: Central and Eastern Washington | WA DNR Washington DNR Forest Health Tracker

In-Person Conference Room and Zoom Meeting Information

2:00 PM – 5:00 PM (PT) Chelan County Mission Ridge (Confirmed) Executive Board Room

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83528280057?pwd=YkIHM0F1KzRyUFdxdnNlV0NUZGhoZz09>

Dial by Telephone: 253 215 8782

Meeting ID: 835 2828 0057

Passcode: 920475