

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE
MINUTES FOR JUNE 15, 2004**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by County Commissioner Glen Huntingford at 10:05 a.m. in the Jefferson County Courthouse BOCC Chambers.

ROLL CALL

Committee members present:

Jefferson County: Commissioners Glen Huntingford, Dan Titterness, and Pat Rodgers.

City of Port Townsend: Council members Freida Fenn and Laurie Medlicott.

Port of Port Townsend: Commissioner Bob Sokol.

Staff present: Al Scalf, Josh Peters, Kyle Alm, and Cheryl Halvorson, County Department of Community Development. City Manager David Timmons; Jeff Randall and Judy Surber, City Building and Community Development. Larry Crockett, Port of Port Townsend.

Guests: There were about four members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were Jim Hagen and Nancy Dorgan.

The committee reviewed the agenda. Bob Sokol suggested that, at some time in the future, the committee should discuss how and when to add a representative or representatives from the UGA to the committee. Questions that should be considered were how many representatives and how they would be appointed. Glen Huntingford suggested that representation from the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort should also be discussed. He thought the County-wide Planning Policies [CWPP] might need to be amended in order to allow for that. It was agreed that those should be topics for a future meeting.

IRONDALE & PORT HADLOCK URBAN GROWTH AREA (UGA)

Josh Peters provided information on the UGA planning process. He noted that the goals, policies, land use districts, development regulations and general sewer plan proposals had been developed by a UGA Citizens Task Force, a UGA Committee of the Planning Commission, and consultants and staff. He stated that the Planning Commission had already held two public hearings, one on the sewer plan and another on the Comp Plan amendments, and would be holding another on the development regulations on June 16. The Planning Commission's objective was to provide a recommendation to the BOCC on the entire package by July 1. Following the Planning Commission's recommendation, the BOCC may decide to hold a public hearing, with adoption following sometime in July. Mr. Peters stated that the UGA planning process was required under a Hearings Board order on an appeal. The Hearings Board basically ordered the county to finish its UGA planning, including a sewer plan and capital facilities plan.

Dan Titterness asked whether any amendments needed to be made to the CWPP relating to the UGA. Josh Peters replied that there were already policies addressing UGA planning in the county. Therefore, he did not think the CWPP required amendment now.

Freida Fenn stated that she thought there was a gap in the CWPP concerning the siting of Essential Public Facilities [EPFs]. She thought it was supposed to be a joint process for how they were sited. Also, with a new UGA

being planned, she thought the siting of the UGA's essential public facilities [the sewer] may be an issue. She wondered whether that kind of process was covered in the CWPP, commenting that it may be a gap that the GMSC should take up at a future meeting. She acknowledged that it would not likely affect the city. Bob Sokol commented that the Comprehensive Plan addressed EPFs. Glen Huntingford responded that, while the Comp Plan did address EPFs, the question was whether the CWPP addressed the issue. He thought the GMSC should review the CWPP to see if they were still consistent with the direction the government entities were taking.

Bob Sokol stated that a related issue was whether the GMA required the CWPP to be incorporated into the respective comp plans in some way. Glen Huntingford thought it was an interesting question, stating that, while the CWPP were a requirement of the GMA, he was not clear about how they were to be used in the amendment process of the jurisdictions. Pat Rodgers stated the belief that the findings for a legislative action should reference the consistency with the CWPP. Mr. Huntingford asked for staff's opinion. Jeff Randall replied that he thought the staff presentations on the 2004 mandatory updates would answer some of those questions.

**STATUTORILY-MANDATED 2004 UPDATES TO THE COUNTY AND CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLANS
AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS**

Jeff Randall handed out a list of the city's 2004 proposed Comp Plan and Code amendments. He also handed out a timeline for the city's updates.

Jeff Randall provided information on the population update that was done in 2003 using a three UGA scenario.

Jeff Randall reviewed the docketed items for the city's Comp Plan and Code amendments.

Concerning EPFs, Jeff Randall stated the understanding that the county adopted a process for siting EPFs in its UDC. He stated that the CWPP and state law required that our procedures be consistent. Because the city adopted its Comp Plan in 1996, it had a more generic process. He thought the policies were fine in terms of siting EPFs, but the Code language was not "fleshed out" very completely. Therefore, the city needed to review its Code language to make sure it was addressing all EPFs and make sure they were doing it in a manner that was consistent with how the county dealt with the issue.

Jeff Randall stated that he would not review the city's adoption schedule, stating that it was delineated in their Code.

Bob Sokol asked about the ability to do Code amendments separately from the Comp Plan amendments. Jeff Randall replied that, if they were found to be consistent with the Comp Plan, they [Code amendments] could be done outside of the Comp Plan amendment process. He stated that they tried to do the Code amendments at the same time as the Comp Plan amendments if they were related. He stated that there was a requirement under state law to assess cumulative impacts, so it was easier to do that if they were both done at the same time. He agreed that there were situations where Code amendments could be done outside of the Comp Plan amendment cycle, particularly if the Code amendment was consistent with the existing Comp Plan. He cited a Fort Worden Code amendment as an example.

Judy Surber provided information on the city's update of its Shoreline Master Program [SMP]. It included goals, policies, and regulations that applied to shoreline areas. She stated that they were under a state mandate to update their SMP by December, 2005. She reviewed the process the city had followed to date. It included a shoreline inventory and a Shorelines Advisory Group, which was developing the goals and policies. Ms. Surber described the makeup of that group. She handed out a chart depicting the timeline for adopting their SMP amendments. She noted that the city was one of the first in the state to update its SMP. She noted that the county's update was not required until 2011. Because the city was one of the first, they were working with the DOE to address the new DOE guidelines appropriately.

Glen Huntingford stated that it was interesting that the DOE guidelines were to be "guidelines", but the city had the agency there to tell it how to implement them. He stated that had been a real concern of the state counties association. There were interpretations for the guidelines, yet the state agency was interpreting them for the jurisdictions. Judy Surber agreed that it was a challenge from both directions. She noted that, ultimately, DOE had to approve the SMP and what they were going to use as their measurement was the guidelines. Therefore, the city had been talking with DOE about what the guidelines meant, and depending upon who they talked to, they could get different answers. She stated that the city had had a difficult time and had told DOE that, if they were going to give the city advice, the city needed to know it was something DOE would stand behind. Mr. Huntingford commented that it sounded like best available science. Ms. Surber agreed, stating that it was hard to get someone at DOE to commit to an interpretation. She stated that the direction they got from DOE was to do something and turn it in and see what DOE thought. She stated that was neither time efficient nor cost efficient for the local jurisdiction.

Josh Peters provided information on the county's schedule for the county's Comp Plan update. He stated that the county currently planned to have a proposal available to the public in September. It would be determined by the update of the Capital Facilities and Transportation Plans.

Josh Peters stated that Jefferson and Clallam Counties were two of the most rural counties in the first group required to update their Comp Plans. The other counties were more urban and had seen much higher population growth. He reported that Jefferson County and Port Townsend were almost moved to 2005 in the last two legislative sessions, but the proposal did not get out of committee. He stated that the larger counties had more resources to do their updates. He noted that King County had their proposal available on their web site already. He stated that the smaller counties had less resources, which made meeting the mandated timeline more difficult.

Josh Peters stated that there was an opportunity for the public to be involved in the update process through the Planning Commission Comp Plan Review Committee. The objective was to have a complete package of amendments to address the mandated update topics. With regard to best available science, he stated that there were some things the county was going to look at, although the county had already had a chance to implement that rule in the UDC.

Dan Titterness asked if the county was doing any preliminary work on the county's SMP. Josh Peters responded that, before the DOE rule was adopted, the county had received a state grant and started a process to update its SMP. Later that year, the DOE rule was appealed. That appeal process took

over a year and it took some time to get a rule that was not appealed. In the meantime, Jefferson County's legislatively required update was moved to 2011. The direction from the BOCC was to proceed closely behind other jurisdictions rather than waiting until 2011, possibly 2006 or 2008, given that the county's SMP was adopted in 1989. He thought the city's was a good example for the county to follow in terms of process. He stated that staff was also looking at Snohomish County and Whatcom County. Mr. Peters stated that we had a draft SMP from that earlier process although it was not done under the new rule. Therefore, the county would have some catching up to do. He reported that the county received a grant last year to start an inventory but the grant was not renewed this year. However, DOE found some extra money for the county and we were under budget on the grant, so the county was continuing the inventory work with the expectation to finish the inventory by next year or 2006.

REMOVING BARRIERS TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Dan Titterness stated that the BOCC had discussed what we could do to remove barriers to economic development. He stated that the first issue was to identify what the barriers were. He thought the first step was to do some analysis in order to do that identification. He thought there was, at least, a perception that there were legislative barriers. He thought that was the issue the BOCC wanted to discuss.

Pat Rodgers stated that issues the BOCC had discussed as barriers were a large enough space to allow for a campus setting and also the bulk and dimensional regulations. He thought they could possibly be addressed in the MID provisions, but was concerned about the legislative intent. Of course, infrastructure that was outside of a UGA may be an issue. The question was whether we should increase the UGA to include the infrastructure. He thought those kinds of things needed to be considered.

Pat Rodgers stated that the county was looking at what Snohomish County had done. That county had addressed the needs of potential new businesses. He thought we should look at it from the point of view of someone who wanted to come to this county, or someone who wanted to expand their existing business, and see what specific things they needed in terms of infrastructure to accommodate them.

Dan Titterness offered the thought that many businesses that wanted to come here had different needs. Pat Rodgers responded that they would fall into certain categories, however; businesses were not that unique.

Dan Titterness stated that the county was already working on the permit process in that the county had entered into negotiations with the same contractor who did Snohomish County. He stated that what the GMSC needed to be concerned with was what the CWPP said on the issue and whether they contained restrictions that could be modified. Freida Fenn suggested that was a topic for another GMSC meeting.

Glen Huntingford stated that the UGA Citizen Task Force had looked at some of those issues, although the UGA may not have enough area. He thought bulk and dimension was one issue, stating that the UGA provisions were expanded from the county's rural provisions. He thought another issue may be to look at the MID provisions to see if there were revisions that could be made to allow for other tools. He stated that another issue was to review the legislation again to see if there were other tools we could use.

Pat Rodgers commented that the MID ordinance was kind of like a promise because it was so general. He cited an example of a business that wanted to site a campus facility in the county. He wondered whether the legislation would allow something other than a manufacturing facility, whether we could allow some kind of software campus. He stated that intellectual content was the development thing of the future. He questioned whether we had a place for such a business or could site such a business under the current ordinance.

Bob Sokol stated that the MID ordinance was designed for one specific business with a specific property requirement and where there was not enough land inside a UGA. You had to get through that process before you could site such a business outside the UGA. Mr. Sokol agreed that a software company was now the state of the art manufacturing company, as opposed to a steel plant. Dan Titterness thought the current MID ordinance allowed for that now. Mr. Sokol stated that he was thinking about Port-owned land around the airport that was currently zoned Rural Residential. He did not think that appropriate or the most practical zoning. He cited the legislative action that allowed for an industrial land bank in rural counties. However, again the question became "What was manufacturing?" He thought software manufacturing and shipping, while not a traditional manufacturing business, was a manufacturing process none the less. Pat Rodgers had a question about whether the current definition of "manufacturing" would include software, however.

Freida Fenn stated the belief we acted quickly with the MID legislation in order to respond to a particular circumstance. She thought it was ironic to hear the discussion about software companies, citing cities where such businesses were locating. They were all larger cities around the country. She thought we needed some reality about what was likely to come to this county. We did not have a large university campus, which was typically what software companies wanted. They wanted a pool of educated people to recruit right there. They wanted top secondary education and, consequently, went to large urban areas. While she was not saying it was impossible, she thought those industries were struggling in those cities, as was most manufacturing in this country. Ms. Fenn cited the report of Mr. Summers on economic development. That report seemed to be more on track about what we could expect here. Her point was the reality check of what we could actually attract.

Pat Rodgers stated that we had two companies that showed interest that were intellectually based. They were businesses that did not depend on the traditional manufacturing base. He stated that we had an environment that was very attractive to such companies. He stated that there was one company that badly wanted to come here because of the beauty of the area. This area was close enough to the urbanized area of the state for their purposes. Because we could not provide a place for them, they had gone to California. He stated that the big attraction here was our quality of life. He stated that such businesses did not depend on the typical industrial needs, such as a deep water port or railroad for transportation.

Bob Sokol stated that we already had a local company (Mobilisa) that may outgrow their offices in downtown Port Townsend. It was reported that they were working on moving to Glen Cove. Mr. Sokol thought they had the potential to outgrow that space as well. He stated that we should not close the door on a second Mobilisa that may want to come here. He stated that in

other discussions about economic development, it always seemed to boil down to attitude. He stated that we talked about zoning, legislation, etc. However, he thought that zoning and legislation were created for an attitude or a desire to do something or not to do something. He thought the bigger question was "Do we want it?" He stated that when he thought about economic development, he thought about people in business doing things. There were a lot of things in an economy that did not rely on manufacturing raw materials into something. He stated that there was nothing like people making a paycheck, with benefits such as medical, and their children in school. That was quality of life. He stated that when you thought about creating an opportunity for people to go into business and be successful, or someone who was successful and needed to expand, you did not want them going somewhere else because they could not expand or could not start their business.

Bob Sokol advocated for allowing campuses to be developed, citing an example in Iowa City. He stated that they had almost a planned unit development section in their code. He stated that something like the example cited would have been an ideal situation for 21st Century. Other than a sign and a road, you would not have known they were there. He thought the attitude about allowing economic events to happen was the most important issue. He stated that manufacturing businesses paid the best wages and benefits. He pointed out that the largest single group that could not afford health benefits were small business owners, even though they may provide medical benefits for their employees.

Laurie Medlicott referred to the revitalization that was going on in Sequim. They had formed a coalition in order to do that. She stated that they did it with the attitude that "If they build it, they will come". She stated that the fear had been that their businesses would see a downturn with the highway bypass, but the opposite had been true. In fact, they had added twelve new businesses with a total of 68 new jobs. Ms. Medlicott stated that her point was that it was the attitude and the cooperation between the county, the city, and the economic development group that made it happen. Glen Huntingford stated that what had impressed him was not only the attitude and the direction they were going, but also so much buy-in from the community; they had created a whole new atmosphere in downtown Sequim. Mr. Huntingford stated that they used many different grants (revitalization and transportation being two) to accomplish it. Ms. Medlicott thought it was such a reversal of the poor attitude she had always felt in Sequim. She stated that attitude really was a key issue and the willingness to work together between the various agencies and entities.

Pat Rodgers stated that there were some other models, citing Coeur d'Alene, Idaho as an example that used their natural beauty. Mr. Rodgers stated that we also had natural beauty in our area to use in attracting businesses. He stated that some Ports had prepared places with installed infrastructure so that they were ready when a business wanted to come. He thought the county could do, or allow for, something similar.

Glen Huntingford stated that we had the MID provisions in place. He asked if there was something that needed to be revised. Dan Titterness invited a response from Larry Crockett. Larry Crockett stated the opinion that the legislature did not do a good job at the state level for MIDs. He thought that, while the intent was honorable and good, by the time it went through the political process, it was changed from the original intent. Mr. Crockett stated that the legislation was very clear that an MID could not have office complexes; it was for light industrial. He thought it was a case where the

legislation had not caught up with the reality of what today's manufacturing was. He stated that software development was today's manufacturing. He offered the opinion that we would have trouble permitting such a business. He stated that software businesses wanted a true campus with the extra acreage. He thought that even a local MID was too restrictive because it was only concerned about building sizes and footprints. He thought it would be worth some effort to have the legislature clarify the provisions. He questioned why office campuses could not be included. He thought that most typical software companies would look like an office campus. Concerning the transportation issue, he stated that companies that were not bound to a transportation system were starting to migrate out of the urbanized areas. He thought there were opportunities for this county to attract wonderful jobs. However, he thought it would take help from Olympia.

Freida Fenn thought that if any entity, such as the Port, had issues with the MID, they should be specifically identified. She stated that one of the things that bothered her when the issue was put on an agenda was that it was such a huge topic. She stated that the question for the Port was to identify what portions of the MID the Port thought were not operating. She did not think there had been a company approach the county that had come close to falling within what the state was trying to create as an opportunity. She stated that it was not supposed to address everything; it was not supposed to allow a complex of offices outside a UGA. She stated that the MID provisions were to address one entity that was the maker of something. She stated that she did not have the sense that it was intended to be limited to manufacturing of widgets; there could be other intellectual endeavors that could be included under it. She thought perhaps there needed to be some clarifications made. Pat Rodgers stated his agreement with Ms. Fenn on that issue. Ms. Fenn stated the belief that the Committee was acting like the provisions were more narrow than she recalled the discussions being about. She stated that it was never the intention to allow a mall of offices where you could sublet to a bunch of entities.

Bob Sokol stated that sometimes you needed a critical mass to make it work. He cited Boeing as an example of a large business that subcontracted out a lot of its work. The example was that Boeing would be the anchor tenant, but the subcontractors would have space for their businesses, some of which may be manufacturing while others may be design and engineering. He thought the MID was kind of restrictive in the way the MID could be laid out.

Dan Titterness stated that he thought the MID discussion included allowing a processing center, such as an insurance company claims adjuster center. He did not believe the current ordinance was prohibitive of such a use. However, it appeared that Mr. Crockett thought it was. Mr. Titterness thought the only thing that was prohibitive was on retail.

Freida Fenn thought the county was happy that there was a new UGA going in where all kinds of economic activity could occur. It seemed like there was a whole host of new opportunities in the county's jurisdiction for commercial activity. The gap she thought she heard Mr. Sokol and Mr. Rodgers articulating was a desire for options for siting very large firms and campuses. She wondered whether there was a missing element to the MID provisions or if it was an ambition of the Port to see something on Port land adjacent to the airport. She thought that was an idea that had been discussed for some time. She stated that the MID provisions were not supposed to address everything. She stated that the new UGA would create new commercial areas. She stated that most economic development was supposed to

happen inside the UGAs under the efficiency of utilizing infrastructure. The reason UGAs existed was to make it affordable to provide the infrastructure necessary for commercial activity.

Pat Rodgers stated that the county was happy about the UGA. However, he saw a gap that could prevent us from attracting a large company. He stated that there was a potential that we could not seize an opportunity because there were barriers that would prevent it. That was his interest.

Josh Peters stated that there were two specific pieces in the GMA. One concerned MIDs (36.70A.365). He stated that the GMSC went through an exercise to develop the MID ordinance to allow a specific company to site in the county. He stated that the legislature also changed the GMA at 36.70A.367 to allow designation of industrial land banks. He stated that this county was one of the rural counties the legislation was aimed at. Mr. Peters stated that the GMSC would be the appropriate committee to discuss the issue. Concerning the UGA, Mr. Peters referred to the county web page that contained all the current information on the UGA process. He also introduced Kyle Alm, a contract planner hired to work on the UGA planning. He asked if the Committee would like to hear information on the zoning proposed in the UGA. The Committee deferred a presentation until later.

Glen Huntingford suggested that, since it had been some time since the GMSC had last met, the Committee review the CWPP and MID ordinance and the pertinent state statutes and discuss them at the next meeting. He also suggested that the Committee discuss expanding the membership to include representation from the UGA and/or from the Port Ludlow MPR. He asked the Committee to consider when it would want to meet again. Dan Titterness supported holding another meeting reasonably soon, possibly in September.

The Committee discussed whether to include the agenda topics in the four-government meeting that would occur in September as well. It was agreed to not include the fourth government entity, but to hold the meeting as the GMSC entity instead. Dan Titterness asked staff to prepare new copies of the CWPP, MID, and state statutes regarding MIDs for the Committee members. It was agreed that staff would send out an e-mail with links to the specific documents. Al Scalf asked if the Committee wanted an analysis of the CWPP. He stated that, as an example, the CWPP talked about Rural Centers but were silent on the topic of LAMIRDS. Mr. Titterness thought the CWPP probably needed to be updated and a staff report on them may be helpful in starting that process. Pat Rodgers stated that one of the things on the agenda for 2005 may be an update of the CWPP. Josh Peters pointed out that the county's deadline for Comp Plan amendments was February 1, so having the conversation earlier rather than later would be appropriate.

Concerning Mr. Scalf's question about an analysis of the CWPP, Bob Sokol suggested that it should be each entities responsibility to review them and refer specific questions back to staff.

As a point of clarification, Bob Sokol stated that Ms. Fenn had talked about very large businesses [in relation to an MID]. He stated that he and Mr. Rodgers were talking about businesses that could not be located within the UGAs, which did not necessarily mean they would be very large. Concerning the UGA, he stated that he thought it was a "no brainer" years ago when it was first designated. He referred to Ms. Fenn's comments about commercial opportunities in the new UGA. He stated that commercial and MIDs did not go together. While there was a light industrial area in the UGA, it was very

limited. He thought it was interesting that Ms. Fenn characterized the land around the airport as being a "battle". He stated that it was too bad that economic development, when there was space in particularly large parcels in single ownership, had to be a battle. He thought it made sense for a company that needed a significant amount of space to be able to go to a single owner with a design, and perhaps we would not have to battle.

Glen Huntingford stated that was some of the discussion that had occurred at the inter-governmental meetings. He advocated supporting each other in providing commercial and industrial zoning and infrastructure. He thought that if it was zoned and we had the right things in place, a company could be attracted.

Glen Huntingford asked staff to provide a presentation on the UGA zoning.

Kyle Alm stated that the county was engaged in finishing the UGA planning process with capital facilities planning to meet a Hearings Board order. He stated that most of the discussion in the GMA about rural areas talked about current buildout and limited infill. He stated that the UGA would create more opportunities because it would have infrastructure and would no longer have to meet septic requirements. We would gain more buildable land just because septic systems would no longer be required. He stated that the Citizen Task Force had also changed the bulk and dimension requirements, the type of uses that could occur in the commercial zones, and had expanded the zones for commercial and industrial. He referred to a map on the wall depicting the zoning. He stated that there was a fair amount of vacant land in the commercial zones that was in larger parcels.

Glen Huntingford stated that there were some concerns on the Citizen Task Force about whether there was enough commercial land zoned and whether it was available in order to allow growth to happen. The emphasis had been on the capital facilities planning and on getting the basic boundaries established. The thought was that they could revisit the commercial zoning later. Kyle Alm stated that there were also some opportunities for increased density in the residential zoning. In answer to Dan Titterness' question, Mr. Alm pointed out the UGA light industrial zone on the map. Mr. Huntingford stated that there was concern in the citizen group about the Hadlock core and how it would expand and grow. The BOCC had also received some public comment about the "dog bone" along Rhody Drive. He stated that there had been lots of different discussions about different areas but they had been holding off on doing anything with those other areas until the UGA was fully established.

In other economic development news, Glen Huntingford stated that the PUD had been working on a water system in Quilcene, which would allow for some additional commercial opportunities in that rural area. Also, there was some discussion about allowing more opportunities in the Brinnon area. Concerning the UGA, he thought that when the infrastructure was in place, we would see some real changes there. He thought there were some opportunities for expansion and to bring in new businesses, such as medical service providers.

Glen Huntingford referred to the changes that had occurred in Port Hadlock since the 1960's.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Glen Huntingford opened the meeting to public comments.

Nancy Dorgan asked about the Port's Comp Plan amendment proposal from 2003 for a light industrial park at the airport. Larry Crockett replied that it had been pulled from their proposal, although he thought the land bank issue was the way to go. Josh Peters stated that there was a Comp Plan/UDC amendment before the county this year concerning the airport, but there was nothing in it concerning light industrial. Bob Sokol stated that the amendment was to address a Hearings Board appeal. Mr. Peters stated that there were some proposals in the Comp Plan amendment addressing incompatible land uses around the airport. He stated that there was another Comp Plan amendment from another entity that also addressed the airport issue. So there were two amendments going forward in the amendment cycle.

Bob Sokol stated that, in referring to attitudes, one thing that got into the UDC was "runway reliant" at the airport as opposed to the FAA definition of "airport related", which were enormously different things as far as land use was concerned.

Larry Crockett stated that he had some information about I-864 which he would provide to the city and county administrators. He stated that Kitsap County had developed an information sheet about what I-864 would do to the budgets for the county and its junior taxing districts. He thought this county developing such an information sheet would help the public to understand the impacts of the initiative.

Concerning the MID campus idea, Jim Hagen stated that we lived near one of the world's premier software centers and we were very accessible. Some of what was under discussion was access to opportunity. He stated that there were people living in the Seattle proper area who may have to go just as far to their opportunity as someone from Jefferson County. He did not think it was like we were a rural area that was miles from nowhere. He thought the campus idea was something that was very realistic. He thought we were more urbanely located and he thought that could be an advantage.

ADJOURNMENT

Glen Huntingford stated that staff had been asked to provide information via e-mail with the links to the pertinent documents. Josh Peters stated that he would send the e-mail, along with some draft agenda items, so that each entity could respond with questions.

It was agreed that the county would host the next meeting which will be held in September.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.