



## JEFFERSON COUNTY

### PLANNING COMMISSION

621 Sheridan Street

Port Townsend, WA 98368

(360) 379-4450

Minutes of the Critical Areas Committee Meeting  
February 1, 2007  
WSU Learning Center  
Shold Business Park, Spruce Room  
Port Hadlock, WA

Planning Commission members: Jim Hagen, Peter Downey, Henry Werch and Dennis Schultz (Bud Schindler, alternate)

Advisory Group members: Al Latham, Amy Hiatt, Bill Wheeler, Cathie Baker, Dennis Holman, Diane Johnson, Dianne Bonnavier-Holman, Dr. Kenneth Brooks, Dr. Robert Crittenden, George Yount, Jill Silver, Jim Tracy, John Richmond, John Boulton, Julie Jaman, Kathy Dickson, L. Katherine Baril, Nancy Stelow, Norman MacLeod, Roger Short, Ron Sikes, and Sandy Hershelman.

Staff: Brent Butler, Barbara Nightingale, and Cheryl Halvorson

---

The Planning Commission Critical Areas Committee meeting was called to order at the WSU Learning Center, Spruce Room, at 7:00 pm by Chair Jim Hagen. Planning Commission members present were Dennis Schultz, Jim Hagen and Henry Werch. Advisory Group members present were Al Latham, Amy Hiatt, Bill Wheeler, Diane Johnson, Dr. Kenneth Brooks, Dr. Robert Crittenden, George Yount, Jill Silver, Jim Tracy, John Richmond, Nancy Stelow, Norman MacLeod, Roger Short, and Sandy Hershelman.

DCD staff present were Brent Butler, Barbara Nightingale, and Cheryl Halvorson.

There were about 30 members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were: Ron Sikes, Pookie Reed, Bill Pflueger Jr., Lois Richmond, and Teren MacLeod.

Norm MacLeod reported that he and Roger Short had gone to Olympia to testify on SB 5248, an ag bill proposing to codify agricultural exemptions. They testified in support of the bill along with several others. He reported that Future Wise representatives, also representing WEC, had testified against the bill. They thought it was curious that WEC did not support ag exemptions on the state level when the Settlement Agreement with this county did support exemptions. Jill Silver explained why she thought WEC wanted to make concessions in Jefferson County for ag exemptions. It had to do with the smaller amount of agriculture of long term commercial significance in this county as it related to the April, 2002 date.

#### Public Comment:

Jim Morgan, Forks, said that he had seventeen acres on the Hoh River. They had stopped paying taxes on the property because they could not use it. There was a 450-foot buffer to protect the fish, but they were being over-fished and other things were happening to pollute the oceans and rivers which contributed to the decline more than what we did on the rivers. He spoke about the paper mill going into bankruptcy and the economic impact that would have on the county. We needed the tax base that our rural lands provided to the county. We should not be taking those properties out of their usefulness for development.

Teren MacLeod suggested that the focus on majority versus minority was not a very helpful focus for the committee. There were a lot of areas where there was consensus. That should be the focus. She suggested that there be an opportunity to look for those similarities. The committee members should ask themselves how their individual beliefs were playing into the decisions on these regulations. One was whether or not land owners were given the opportunity to be good stewards of their land without over-regulation. When there were necessary environmental protections that were for the common good, then the common good should pay for them.

Denver Shoop was worried about the land that they could not use but they were still paying taxes on it. People in this county were having a hard time paying their taxes because people did not make good wages. He said that Dr. Brooks' suggestions were something he could live with and were fair. He was opposed to the apparent mentality of the environmentalists.

Jim Hagen hoped that some of the land value and tax questions would be answered by the Assessor.

#### Discussion on Administrative Issues:

Jim Hagen said that, at the Quilcene meeting, Jim Tracy gave a presentation on administrative issues, but the group did not have a chance to get into a discussion on it. Also, at the last meeting, it had been suggested that we have a discussion on the impact of critical areas buffers on available land use in respect to taxation of the land. Therefore, he had invited the County Assessor to make a presentation.

Jack Westerman said that anytime you lower the value of a piece of property, it just resulted in a shift to other properties. It just meant that the levy rate increased.

Jack Westerman said that, concerning buffers, the effect on property value, and thus taxes, was site specific. If you took the ability to build away from a property, then you have diminished the value of that property substantially. He provided an example of a 10-acre farm property in Beaver Valley, with Highway 19 on one side and Chimacum Creek on the other. He drew an example on the board. He said that the real value of property was in the buildable site, which in the example would be close to the road. If the property was in the Open Space Ag program, they took out the 1-acre homesite and the rest of the acreage was valued at \$75 increments ranging from \$75 per acre to \$300 per acre. So the assessment was not very high on the remainder of the property. He said that farmers had asked him in the past about buffers that were taken out of production and set aside. They wanted to know if the Assessor would take it out of the Ag program and make them pay compensating tax. He said that the answer was "No"; they had never done it and did not plan to.

Jack Westerman provided another example of the same 10-acre parcel with one building site that was not in the Open Space Ag program. He described how property was being marketed and sold now. The real value is in the building site. So if you had a 10-acre parcel selling for \$100,000, they would consider \$75,000 of that value to be with the 1-acre homesite and the residual 9 acres at maybe \$5,000 per acre with an 80% reduction because it was wet, resulting in about \$25,000 on the 9 acres. So they get to 100% of the fair market value, but more and more they were finding that the vast majority of the value was on the 1-acre building site.

Jack Westerman provided an example using the same 10-acre parcel but putting a 150-foot buffer on a Type S stream, a 1.5 acre reduction. The question was how the county would assess that. He said that the 1-acre building site was still \$75,000. The 7.5 acres might have \$22,500 valuation. And the 1.5-acre buffer might be only \$2,500. It must be remembered that when it sells in the marketplace, they were required to come up with 100% of fair market value. If it sells for \$100,000, they were required to figure out how to get there.

Jack Westerman said that, for the 1.5-acre buffer, they would not assume to take it out of Open Space Ag and put it into Open Space Open Space. They would have to have a request from the property owner to do something. He said that the Open Space Ag assessment, from \$75/acre to \$300/acre, was determined by the soil capabilities and the best producing soils were the wet soils in the bottomlands.

Jack Westerman said that the example cited would not result in a great reduction in the assessment because the whole 10-acre parcel could only serve as one building site. If you were talking about pre-

GMA, it would be a whole different story because that 10-acre parcel could have been developed into eight parcels. But under the GMA, that could no longer happen.

Jack Westerman said that it was a funny thing that when you sold these properties, the critical area many times actually became an attribute that potential buyers really wanted. He cited the examples of a property with an eagle's nest on it or a pond. The negative to the property before it was developed actually became an attribute later on. While that did not hold for every situation, it did apply in some situations.

Jack Westerman gave an example of a narrow parcel running parallel to the creek with an easement road for access, but there was a buildable site. If the buffer took up the whole property, you have limited that property and it was a situation that was quite serious. He did not think the county should ever do something where it ended up in a taking. He did not know how you would write regulations to address such exceptions, but we should try to do so. He urged the group to try to never reach a point with the regulations where it became a taking.

Concerning agricultural exemptions, Jack Westerman said that all 39 Assessors would agree that it should be codified into the state statutes, because it was easier to administer.

Jill Silver asked if there were mechanisms where someone in Rural Residential zoning had a stream or wetland buffer where the land could not be used that the value could be reduced even further for the buffer area, or taken out of the tax base altogether. Jack Westerman replied that it could not be taken out altogether. But there were mechanisms to limit them even more significantly. If you did a conservation easement through the Land Trust, it would significantly reduce the valuation. Or, in the 10-acre parcel example with RR zoning instead of Ag, the 1.5-acre buffer area could be put into Open Space Open Space. You should keep in mind that the valuation is already pretty low, but the question was whether you could lower it even more. He wondered whether you could amend the Open Space Open Space public benefit rating system so that when it was set aside due to buffers adopted under the CAO, it would automatically qualify for a 90% reduction of the assessed value. He said that it would not make a huge difference because the 1.5 acres is already assessed at a pretty low value, but it might go from \$2500 to \$250 for the 1.5 acres. He emphasized that the \$75,000 for the 1-acre building site would not change.

Bill Wheeler said that the problem was that the fee of \$1,300 for the Open Space Open Space designation would take much too long to amortize in the savings in taxes. Jack Westerman agreed that was a problem. He emphasized that Open Space Open Space was about the property owner choosing to do it; it would not be possible under a blanket county designation. However, the county could decide to make those affected properties eligible. He said that the county could also choose to waive the fee for a certain period of time to allow people to opt in for free.

Jim Tracy thought the Open Space Open Space required public access. Jack Westerman responded that was absolutely not true. It required the commissioners to determine that there was some public benefit. Now the commissioners could say, under the public benefit rating system, that public access had to be allowed. In certain specific cases where the only public benefit they could foresee was to allow public access, they had done that. But, in general, they did not require public access. Mr. Westerman said that, in fact, you would not want public access in these buffer areas because you want to protect the feature.

Nancy Stelow asked if there was a minimum parcel size for Open Space Open Space. Jack Westerman replied that there was not.

Amy Hiatt asked if Mr. Westerman knew how many parcels in the county were unbuildable because of critical areas. Jack Westerman replied that he could not say. The critical areas maps were inaccurate, so it only came up when a permit application was received. Then a site visit was needed to determine the extent of the critical area.

Roger Short asked about an example where nine of the ten acres was taken in a no touch buffer, leaving the 1-acre building site, and the owner could no longer do ag uses. Jack Westerman replied that he would have to take the nine acres out of the Open Space Ag program and charge seven years of back compensation, which could get very expensive. His opinion was that it would be smart for the county to

allow ag practices in the wetland buffers. If the property owner could continue to do that, he thought you'd be okay. Mr. Short said that you would still have to generate the \$200 per acre to stay qualified for the program.

An audience member asked about how much tax had been transferred from Open Space programs to the other properties in the county. Jack Westerman answered that he could provide that information through reports they did for the Department of Revenue.

Denver Shoop provided an example of a wetland in the valley where the buffer on the wetland took in the rest of the property, essentially making it unbuildable. Jack Westerman answered that, if that was the case and it was made unusable, then he thought the county would have to buy it. Mr. Shoop said that the county had told him he could put a house on a small corner of the property but he could not build any other buildings to support the farming activity. That depreciated the value.

Richard Hild asked if conservation easements increased the value, decreased the value, or had no effect on the value. Jack Westerman answered that, under the public benefit rating system in Open Space Open Space, you got extra points for having a conservation easement. That would help lower the assessment. However, there were scenarios where there would be no negative or positive effect. Mr. Hild said that the Assessor saw the real value of the property in the building site. Mr. Westerman agreed that the vast majority of the value was in the building site. He said that if you had 20 acres in a RR 1:10 zone, you had quite a bit of value. They would not assess you for two building sites until you split that property up. Mr. Westerman clarified that the effect of a conservation easement was minimal.

In answer to Kenn Brooks' question, Jack Westerman said that the majority of the value of a property was in the buildable site and not necessarily in the rest of the property. He did not want people to think the Open Space programs would save them a lot of money because the acreage that would be affected was already assessed at a pretty low value. It could save them some money, but not huge amounts.

Bill Wheeler said that what bothered him was that two properties, one with a buffer and one without, would actually pay the same amount. The one without buffers could use all of his properties while the one with buffers could not, but the taxes would be the same unless the one could put the buffer into Open Space Open Space. Jack Westerman replied that it was possible because the fair market value would not be significantly different. Mr. Wheeler said that the difference was in the amount of usable land.

Robert Crittenden wondered how the Land Trust lands were taxed. Jack Westerman replied that the law required him to value the property as fee simple ownership. The bundle of rights evolved to the property owner. They had to assume that they were assessing at the full bundle of rights, but with restrictions so that it may not have the same value as a property that did not have the same restrictions. But they did not go into outside restrictions, whether it was the Land Trust or an easement to a neighboring property owner.

Roger Short asked about an example where one 10-acre parcel had nine acres of buffer and another 10-acre parcel with no restrictions. He wondered whether the valuations would be the same or whether the parcel with no restrictions would be much higher. Jack Westerman replied that the one with no restrictions would have more value but not significantly more. He explained the reasoning.

Jim Tracy asked about an example where a 10-acre parcel was completely constrained by critical areas or buffers. The owner could seek a reasonable economic use variance. There was no existing standard, guideline or definition for determining a reasonable economic use variance and his experience indicated a wide variety of results. He asked what the Assessor did under such a scenario where the owner was allowed only a building envelope of 10,000 square feet on that ten acres. Jack Westerman replied that it depended on what other similar properties were selling for; at first it was a guess.

George Yount said that it appeared that the Assessor would take sales figures to determine property values for properties that may be affected by these regulations. Jack Westerman responded that they would need several sales to start with.

Roger Short asked about an example where a parcel was entirely mapped wetland. In his opinion there was a buildable site on one corner of the property. His question was, if someone bought the parcel for

\$50,000 and spent \$20,000 on a wetland delineation in order to get an approved building site, whether the Assessor would deduct the \$20,000 from the value. Jack Westerman responded that the value would actually become \$70,000 because he had gone through the expense of doing the delineation, which would be attractive to another buyer.

The group moved on to other administrative issues.

Jim Tracy referred to a memo dated August 17, 2006, that outlined a series of identified questions and comments on the administrative section. He solicited input from the group on them. As an example he referred to 18.15.205 of the draft ordinance. That section granted the Administrator the ability to grant an exception to the requirements and provided a standard. The next sentence seemed to be inconsistent. That was the kind of thing that needed to be clarified in the ordinance. If the ordinance was going to grant the Administrator discretion to make decisions, which generally was a good thing, the standards by which those decisions were made should be clear and the appeal remedy should also be clear. He hoped that the committee would address the issues raised at some point.

Brent Butler reported that staff was expecting a bumper year for Comp Plan amendments. He said that staff had looked at the Public Works small works roster which showed one consultant planner who might be available to do the drafting of the Critical Areas Ordinance. Jim Hagen said that assumed that funds were made available. He thought that might be an agenda topic for the next meeting.

Bill Wheeler moved that the committee recommend to the Planning Commission that they recommend further to the BOCC that they amend the current Open Space public benefit rating scale to give a maximum of eleven (11) points (which would give a 90% reduction) to all buffers imposed by the CAO and further the BOCC waive the application fee for Open Space Open Space applications based on CAO buffers. Nancy Stelow seconded the motion.

George Yount asked if Mr. Wheeler would put a timeframe on waiving the application fee. Bill Wheeler replied that he did not have a timeframe.

Roger Short suggested amending the motion to include waiving the fee for Open Space Ag as well. Bill Wheeler responded that he opposed it because Open Space Ag and Open Space Timber included uplands. This motion would only apply to the buffers. Mr. Short withdrew the amendment.

Henry Werch said that the committee had talked about changing the approval process to an administrative procedure as a way of bringing down the fees. He asked about the reasoning for keeping the process the way it is and waiving the fee as opposed to making it administrative and lowering the fee. Bill Wheeler replied that he did not care how it was done. His calculations showed that it would take 24 to 44 years to amortize the fee in the savings on taxes. That was not acceptable. Jim Tracy thought the fee should be waived in any case, whether done the way it is currently done or whether it is done administratively.

The motion carried unanimously (17-0-0).

#### Discussion on Timeline for Producing Line-in/Line-out Recommendations:

Jim Hagen reported that he had sent a letter to the BOCC requesting that funds be made available to hire a consultant to do the code drafting. He thought it was apparent that staff, in its present capacity, was stretched pretty thin. He hoped we will have some word about the result of the letter at the next meeting.

Brent Butler explained how the Public Works roster was compiled. There are currently two planning consultants on the roster. One had indicated that he would be interested in doing the code drafting work. He explained how someone could apply for the roster.

Jim Hagen said that under one scenario, if the budget was made available for a consultant, there would not be a large delay.

Brent Butler reported that he had been contacted by Rick Mraz of DOE who had some questions about what was happening with the committee. He wanted to visit with the committee. Jim Hagen said that the

committee had talked about inviting DOE and the tribes to a presentation. Norm MacLeod said that, under the Settlement Agreement, we were required to consult with DOE if we wanted to depart from the DOE Guidance. He thought DOE would be open to discussing a variation.

Kenn Brooks reported that he had made some contacts and he now had seventeen senior academics and government officials around the western U.S. who had agreed to peer review his report to the committee. Unfortunately, it may take six weeks to receive their reports back, although that was not unusual. Dr. Brooks reported that he had also provided copies of the report to the Port Gamble S'Klallam and the Jamestown S'Klallam tribes.

Robert Crittenden asked that Mr. Hagen write a letter of invitation to DOE and the tribes for set up a meeting. Jim Hagen thought staff could set up a meeting. Jim Tracy suggested that DOE and the tribes should have a copy of the Brooks report so they could review it before attending a meeting. Mr. Hagen suggested that we should get the DOE and tribes as soon as possible, because their input would have an effect on the potential contents of any revisions.

Kenn Brooks thought the committee should have a contingency plan. We should have a draft ordinance for consideration by the committee no later than the second or third week in March. If hiring a consultant was not going to work, then he thought the committee should consider forming a sub-group to do the drafting.

Kenn Brooks moved that, if we did not get the funding required from the BOCC, that the committee form a code writing sub-committee at the next meeting to do the code drafting and also set a deadline of no later than the committee's next to last meeting for a draft code review. Robert Crittenden seconded the motion.

Kenn Brooks thought some committee members had the necessary skills to do the work. Jim Tracy thought the product that should come out of this committee should be a report on what the committee thought the code should include or not include; the product did not have to be a codified version of the CAO.

Diane Johnson asked if it would hold more weight with the BOCC if more committee members were present during their discussion about the funding request. Jim Hagen replied that it never hurt to have committee members present.

The group discussed the pros and cons of hiring a consultant to do the code writing versus doing it in-house. They also discussed the product the committee should forward to the Planning Commission, whether it should be line-in, line-out code or whether it should be a clear report about what the committee recommended. They discussed having the committee provide guidance to a code writer because the committee had been very close to the issue for awhile now and had more knowledge about the topic than the code writer would have.

Jim Hagen asked what the committee could expect from staff if the consultant money was denied. Brent Butler explained the staffing tasks for the Long Range Planning division. It would depend on the number of Comp Plan amendments. Bill Wheeler asked if the committee took on the task of writing a draft code whether they would have staff support. Mr. Butler replied that staff could provide support.

By agreement, the motion was tabled until the next meeting.

Jim Hagen related a conversation he had with Commissioner Sullivan about the committee's work. Commissioner Sullivan indicated that the more agreement you had, the more weight the recommendation carried. Mr. Hagen said that in order to reach consensus, the two sides needed definitive starting points. He said that the majority had provided their specific recommendations. The minority had been saying that they would provide their specific reports, but they had yet to be received. He considered that important because it provided the opportunity to see what areas could reach some commonality. From reading the memo from the four minority members received tonight, it seemed to indicate that they would do a separate comprehensive alternate report to the Planning Commission.

A conversation ensued about how the minority should proceed. There was a concern expressed that if we simply could not agree on some fundamental strategies for each of the critical areas sections, the question was how the minority opinion could be expressed to the Planning Commission. Jill Silver said that they were doing their best to provide specific minority recommendations but it took time. There was a concern expressed that the majority reports had been discussed and adopted in the committee's public meetings, but it appeared that the minority's reports would not have the same public scrutiny. Ms. Silver said that was not the intent of the minority members.

Henry Werch addressed the minority's memo, which he wrote on their behalf. What it suggested was that it could take more time, effort and drain on our resources to try to reach a compromise than it would for each group to advance its proposals. The public would have an opportunity to consider it once it got to the Planning Commission. There was no effort to push anything anywhere without public input. If there were clear alternatives presented to the Planning Commission and the public, then the Planning Commission would be able to review them and make choices. He read the memo from the minority.

Norm MacLeod provided an impassioned rebuttal to several points in the memo. He did not believe it served the public purpose of the committee for the minority to produce a separate report to the Planning Commission that the committee would not be privy to and would have no input on.

Jill Silver said that the committee would see the minority's product, but there were only four of them to share the work compared to the rest of the committee that had shared the work on the majority reports.

The committee discussed identifying the fundamental issues of conflict between the majority and minority. They also discussed holding a field trip, which had been suggested earlier in the committee's process, to see depicted on the ground both the DOE guidance and the proposal in terms of buffers.

Some minority members expressed frustration and discouragement with the committee's process, expressing the feeling that their input on the issues was discounted and ignored by the majority. Jill Silver stated that, for herself, she had fundamental differences of opinion with what the majority proposed in terms of buffers and she had made her opinions abundantly clear. She was not trying to take peoples' property; she was trying to protect water quality. She said they were not trying to do anything behind the scenes.

Henry Werch said that the frustration for them was not that they were in the minority, because that was part of the democratic process. Their concern was that the materials they believed should have been given more attention and review by the group were rejected. He described other frustrations they had experienced. He discussed the comments about the DOE guidance not being peer reviewed and evaluated and, therefore, did not constitute sufficient science to justify the conclusions that were drawn. Dr. Brooks had taken that work and built on it. If his work was submitted for peer review and was supported by other scientists, then he was obligated to reconsider his opinion and change his mind, as all of the committee was when presented with new information. He said that the minority, of course, wanted the public and the committee to be able to review anything they would propose. All they could hope for was to have their ideas considered and voted on at some point. There was nothing going on behind closed doors.

Jim Hagen thought everyone had been given a chance to voice their viewpoints. The most significant idea that had driven the whole group was breaking up into the sub-groups to tackle the individual topics. That had been suggested early in the committee's process and it had been rejected then. As often happens in a process like this, it was not that you were rejecting things out of hand, it was just part of the process. Things happened in their time. His concern was that some members were giving up on any attempt to try to find common ground. He thought there was still time and opportunity.

Roger Short expressed the frustration he had felt before and during this process, stating the opinion that he would not want any buffers. He felt what was being proposed was a compromise that was the best thing we could do for the community. He thought the minority should be willing to give up some of their stubborn positions and move forward with an overall plan that we could all support. He said he had talked to people in the community who were more frustrated than himself and who talked about coming to a meeting with a gun.

Roger Short moved that the committee have a field trip on wetlands. Jill Silver seconded the motion which carried unanimously (17-0-0).

Kenn Brooks said that everything was done in its time. His document was presented in January, so there was nothing to compare with the DOE guidance until then for field trip purposes. He addressed the DOE guidance and the information he included in his report. He pointed out that he had never said that the DOE guidance was flawed science. What he had said was that it was a one dimensional document written by people whose whole lives were focused on wetlands and that there were other dimensions that needed to be considered by decision makers. To back that up, he had specifically noted what those other pieces of literature were that were not listed in the DOE documents, what their conclusions were, and how those lead to very different buffers. All of that information needed to be presented to the decision makers so they could make their decisions. He wanted to be clear that there was no rejection of DOE's science. It was one dimensional in its nature, which was what one could expect if you go to a regulatory agency with no interest or responsibility to use resources but only to protect resources.

Jill Silver responded that she had some basic disagreements about who the people were that put the DOE guidance together, the dimensionality of it, and the fact that the peer reviewers actually covered a wide range of disciplines. She thought we had a fundamental difference about whether you could go down to a minimum and protect species. She thought the DOE guidance was a compromise in that its recommendations took the median.

Jim Tracy spoke about the task before the committee. We had seven weeks to produce the deliverable product. If we had a consultant to do the code writing, the committee had to give them more than the sub-group reports. We had to give them a bigger vision and consensus of what the committee saw as foundational principles. That was included in his document that was handed out tonight. We needed to give specific direction so that we could meet this task. He suggested that the committee should consider the issues he raised in his fundamental and foundational principles memo dated January 22. Robert Crittenden suggested that the committee take up Mr. Tracy's suggestions at the next meeting.

#### Public Comment:

Pookie Reed said she had attended two committee meetings and had read the majority and minority reports on wetlands. They said that the trees would last forever in Wisconsin, but there were very few trees left there now. Change would come; it was inevitable. She said that animals lived with us. It seemed that you were taking away the fact that we are animals and they are animals and we could all live together. She said that the public had not seen the minority report nor the science behind the minority report. She thought the Brooks report compromised a lot and took everyone and everything into account. She did not think someone getting their own way was what a committee was about. Everyone had to compromise.

Denver Shoop said that the committee had a responsibility to the people in the community. Even what Dr. Brooks was proposing was more than he thought there should be. He thought the environmentalists wanted to take everything from the property owners. He reiterated that he had said that if you could show him that something, environmentally, should have a regulation on it, he may be able to support it. But no one had showed him anything like that. He said that the regulations we had now destroyed his plans for his property. He said that when the May, 2006, draft was written, there were attorneys who could not understand it. When this ordinance was written, he wanted it to be in plain language that anyone could read and understand.

Moe Rogers said that he had attended most of the meetings and he was surprised at what was going on here tonight. Most of the issues had been brought up to the group and voted on. Most of the time, there were some people who were against everything. That was the democratic process; majority rules.

#### Adjournment:

Al Latham asked the committee to set a day and time for the field trip. The committee agreed on Saturday, February 17, at 12:30 p.m. starting from the WSU Learning Center. They will car pool to Tibbals Lake and the Roger Short farm.

The agenda for the next meeting will be an update on the consultant recruitment and discussion of the Jim Tracy fundamental/foundational principles letter.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.