

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR MAY 21, 2003

- A. OPENING BUSINESS
- B. COMPLETE RECOMMENDATION TO BOCC ON MLA03-202, UDC AMENDMENTS AND GENERAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO SEAWATER INTRUSION
- C. DISCUSSION ON 2003 COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS AND PROCESS
- D. ADJOURNMENT

**A. OPENING BUSINESS**

The regular meeting was called to order at the WSU Learning Center at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Tom McNerney. Planning Commission members present were Phil Flynn, Eileen Rogers, Robert Morgan, Dennis Schultz, Edel Sokol, and Jenny Davis. David Whipple and Pat Rodgers were excused.

DCD staff present were Josh Peters, Randy Kline, and Cheryl Halvorson, secretary.

There were about four members of the public present. The only person who signed the guest list was Lauri Chambers.

The minutes for April 30 and May 7, 2003, were approved as submitted.

The Chair invited staff updates.

Randy Kline reported on the workshop meeting between the Port of Port Townsend and the BOCC on the Airport Master Plan. The meeting was scheduled for June 18 at Point Hudson at 11:00 a.m. He stated that the Planning Commissioners were invited to attend. He stated that staff would arrange for the advertising.

Randy Kline handed out copies of the zoning maps for the Tri Area to the committee members. He requested that the committee read the section on the UGA in the Comp Plan (beginning at Page 3-35a).

Randy Kline reported that DCD was in the process of hiring an Associate Planner. He explained the duties of the position. It would be half time on the Fred Hill Materials project. The other half time would be devoted to other Long Range Planning projects or possibly other current planning projects. Josh Peters reported that the county and Fred Hill Materials were negotiating how to pay for the EIS for their project. The new Associate Planner would be the contact person and coordinator for that project. Mr. Kline reported on the number of applicants for the position, stating that they were all well qualified. Mr. Kline stated that the position opening had closed and the interview process would begin soon, with the objective of filling the position as soon as possible.

There were no members of the public present at this point in the meeting. Consequently, there were no public comments received during the first comment period.

**B. COMPLETE RECOMMENDATION TO BOCC ON MLA03-202, UDC AMENDMENTS  
AND GENERAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS  
RELATED TO SEAWATER INTRUSION**

Tom McNerney reported on the questions raised by the BOCC at their last meeting concerning the Planning Commission's recommendations for addressing seawater intrusion. The questions had to do with how we would know whether seawater intrusion was getting worse or better and, if it was getting worse, what the county would do about it. Mr. McNerney handed out a 2-page document addressing the three pronged approach the Planning Commission had recommended. Its intent was to clarify the commission's recommendations. Some typos and grammatical errors were pointed out.

Edel Sokol asked about the newspaper report about the county hiring an expert to interpret the well monitoring data. Josh Peters explained that Commissioner Titterness had asked how we would determine whether degradation was occurring. He reported that Dave Christensen had basically said that kind of determination required an expert. Mr. Peters reported that Commissioner Titterness, similar to the Hearings Board, was asking for a number. He reported that Mr. Christensen had said he did not know the answer. Mr. Peters stated that the staff recommendation was to hire a hydro-geologist as a consultant to interpret the data that would be gathered during the 2-year testing program. It did not mean the county would hire a hydro-geologist on staff. Phil Flynn reported on the context of the conversation at the BOCC meeting. It had to do with how many tests it would take to establish a baseline, whether it would be one, which may be skewed for some reason, or an average of four tests (a year's worth of tests).

Josh Peters stated that to look at an individual well and interpret a series of tests, you could use a computer model to reach a conclusion, and you would not have to be a hydro-geologist. However, if you were going to look at several wells, say on Marrowstone Island, the computer program was not sophisticated enough to be able to say an area was experiencing seawater intrusion degradation. That was where you needed to have a hydro-geologist because you needed to bring another dimension to the groundwater characteristics.

Dennis Schultz asked if we knew the geology of the water bearing strata on Marrowstone. He wondered whether anyone really knew the shape. Mr. Schultz stated that his background was in petroleum engineering and reservoir engineering, but it was very similar to salt water intrusion into oil. He stated that until you had a baseline and history, you could not do anything. He pointed out that the original tests on the wells could be skewed because the well drillers dumped a lot of water down the wells while drilling. We had no idea whether those initial tests were accurate, whether the driller flushed the well sufficiently or whether it was contaminated from the drilling. Mr. Schultz stated that the only ones we could consider valid were wells where the owners had done regular tests. Josh Peters stated that it had been brought up that well drilling practices prior to 1990 were such that, in general, the test results were more questionable than they were post-1990. Mr. Peters stated that we generally knew about the geology of Marrowstone from the DOE study. He stated that it was expensive to characterize groundwater formations.

Edel Sokol stated that the Planning Commission had included a recommendation about using the "best available science" which could be interpreted to mean hiring a hydro-geologist to interpret the data.

Tom McNerney discussed testing over time, stating that if you did not have at least five years worth of data, you essentially did not have anything. Yet the Hearings Board was saying we had to come up with something. He stated that we were requesting that they give us two years to come up with something that might be definitive.

Josh Peters stated that one document the county intended to introduce into the case record was a hydro-geologic assessment turned in for a well, not on Marrowstone Island but in a different part of the county, because the proposed well was within a circle created by a High Risk SIPZ well. He stated that we had originally proposed in our policy that a well showing a history of chloride analyses over 200 ppm be designated. The Hearings Board

had ordered the county to clarify that because the code seemed to indicate that a High Risk SIPZ was created simply by one test. Mr. Peters stated that this hydro-geologist said that one single water quality sample did not form enough of a historic data base to establish a High Risk SIPZ. He thought that would be an interesting document to submit to the Hearings Board. Phil Flynn stated that report would be typical for a well drilled within the 1,000 feet of a High Risk SIPZ well, which was a requirement for a building permit.

Jenny Davis noted an inconsistency between the Planning Commission's first recommendation concerning the map update, which said six months, and the paragraph in the McNerney memo saying the first year's tests would establish a baseline. Josh Peters stated the belief that the six months was in reference to the map. The commission was essentially suggesting strongly that the county administration direct staff or resources towards working on the map, which may involve re-testing wells or characterizing pre- and post-1990 tests, etc., in order to make the map more useful. On the other hand, the first year's tests were a baseline for a water quality monitoring program on Marrowstone Island. They were two different things, although related. He admitted that the monitoring program may influence a future version of the map, but the map was a tool for the entire county that basically showed what wells had been tested, when, and at what level. Also, the Planning Commission had suggested adding information to the map on the areas served by public water districts. Ms. Davis thought the two statements may be confusing to someone who had not been working with the issue.

Eileen Rogers suggested that perhaps the terminology was not well served in that place. She stated that what the commission meant was to get the process of the revised map started sooner, within six months. Jenny Davis stated that she did not disagree with what the commission was doing. Her point was that it was confusing.

Dennis Schultz asked if there was anything about updating the map with the actual locations of the wells as opposed to using the circles, which represented parcels. Some commissioners stated the belief that it should be the actual well locations, or GPSing the wells. Josh Peters stated that related to his question at the last meeting concerning the level of detail the Planning Commission wanted on the update. Mr. Peters stated that the county had GPS'd some wells, but it would take much more work to GPS all of the wells. Mr. Peters clarified that the map was advisory, similar to all of the maps the county used (like the wetland map). All of those things were field verified, so we would find the actual well location. The regulatory influence of that well was 1,000 feet from the actual well, not from some imaginary point on a map. Mr. Schultz stated that if we were going to hire a hydro-geologist, he would want to prepare intrusion contour maps, and to do that he would have to have accurate locations. Randy Kline offered the opinion that DOE should be requiring that information with their start cards, stating that in this technological age, it would be simple enough to do.

Tom McNerney and staff discussed transmitting the clarifying document to the BOCC at their public hearing.

Edel Sokol asked about the red dots on the map, stating that the DOE representatives had indicated that if a new well request was within a certain number of feet of a dot, there would be a moratorium. Josh Peters replied that it was 100 feet. Ms. Sokol stated that someone may have a well within 100 feet that was fine. Mr. Peters stated that it was a complicated point that deserved further clarification. He stated that the original ordinance

equated the whole 1,000-foot radius High Risk SIPZ with a sea salt water intrusion area per the WAC for the Water Well Construction Act. The county thought that doing that would mean that DOE would essentially be forced to consider variances before you could drill a well within that circle, because the DOE was clearly better equipped to review a variance application. Randy Kline added that was their responsibility under the law. Mr. Peters stated that they did that for other areas of known or potential sources of contamination. He explained that DOE's standard regarding sea salt water intrusion areas was strictly the marine coastlines; they had not gone through any rule making process that would make any other area, besides the marine coastlines, a sea salt water intrusion area. He stated that DOE had said that if the county did that, they would not even entertain a variance application in that area because they would consider it to be the known or potential source of contamination. The BOCC then made a change to the ordinance, at DOE's suggestion, that really it should be the point itself. That meant that the DOE would be forced to review a variance application for any well proposed to be within 100 feet of a well that the county had designated a High Risk SIPZ, or a well that was responsible for creating a High Risk SIPZ. The remaining 900 feet in the circle area would kick into the county's High Risk SIPZ regulation that said, at the building permit level, if you were going to use that well, a hydro-geologic assessment must be prepared.

Jenny Davis stated that was the reason for the map being accurate to the exact location of the wells. Edel Sokol stated that it should be made clear on the map, because people did not know the purpose of the map. Phil Flynn stated that the map was just a reference, but the computer should show the pinpoint location of the well on the property.

Josh Peters continued to ask for clarification about what information should be on the map. Jenny Davis responded that accurate well locations was one thing. The other was accurate chloride readings. Mr. Peters stated that what the commission meant was that, for every well that had a reading over 200 ppm, the county should re-test, after getting permission from the land owner.

Eileen Rogers asked about making a wording change to a policy. Tom McNerney stated that the BOCC would hold a public hearing on the issue and would likely accept a wording change through that process from the Planning Commission.

Eileen Rogers moved to make a wording change in Recommendation #1: "... six months to provide an accurate base map." Robert Morgan seconded the motion.

Jenny Davis asked if it would be helpful to add something to the effect that it represent exact GPS well locations and current chloride readings. Josh Peters was not sure the commission needed to modify the first recommendation document. He thought that it should be re-submitted if the commission wanted to change the wording. However, it would be useful to provide some further direction about Recommendation #1. Mr. Peters stated that the clarification he had was GPS sites for all existing wells in the county. Tom McNerney stated that if the Planning Commission suggested GPSing all the wells in the county, it would be very expensive. He thought it should be limited to the High Risk wells.

Josh Peters explained how he could clarify the recommendation without having to re-submit the recommendations themselves. The new transmittal from the

commission could be used to clarify the original recommendations, with some further information from staff added.

Josh Peters asked if the Planning Commission would want the At Risk wells to be GPS'd and re-tested as well. Phil Flynn responded that twelve to fifteen wells should be done. He thought there were about fifteen to eighteen At Risk wells in the county. Mr. Flynn stated that all of the At Risk wells were within the shadow of the High Risk wells.

Tom McNerney expressed concern about re-wording the Planning Commission's recommendations when they had already been submitted to the BOCC. Mr. Peters stated that the question from the BOCC related to Recommendation #3 and concerned how we would determine, after the eight tests over two years, whether there was degradation or not.

After further discussion about the appropriateness of re-wording the commission's original recommendations, the motion was withdrawn. It was agreed that the clarification should be made in the communication to the BOCC.

Concerning the map, Josh Peters stated that what he was hearing from the Planning Commission was that the commissioners wanted the High Risk and At Risk wells to be GPS'd and re-tested, as much as possible. The commissioners agreed that was their intent. Another point was to add public water regions to the map because chances were that affected wells within those service areas were not being used any longer.

Josh Peters asked if the commission wanted something on the map about year of well construction, or pre- or post-1990 construction, or decade of construction. Phil Flynn replied that the commission had not asked for that. He stated that the question was about a disparity between a new test and a test that was fifteen years old. It was agreed that the new map should show the new tests. Mr. Peters asked if one test could make a circle and one test could un-make a circle, or whether there should be a series of tests. Mr. Flynn stated that was what had been done in the past. He stated that therein lay the problem and question the Seawater Committee had struggled with and whether there was a process that could be put in place to take a well off the map. Mr. Flynn stated that the committee had decided to archive the first map so we would have that data, but the new map may not show all of those wells, but we would know that it was an impacted well at one time. Jenny Davis stated that the map should be updated with every test period. Mr. Peters stated that a problem with updating the map with every test was what happened if a well had a good test and was taken off the map. Then the restrictions would be lifted and someone else could drill a well and then the seawater intrusion came right back. Dennis Schultz offered the opinion that you should not take any wells off the map. Mr. Peters stated that was different from what he was hearing. Mr. Peters stated that the map was also different than the information we had on a parcel basis, which was actually more important. He thought that regardless of whether the circle was on the map, when staff reviewed a parcel, all the information was there and the fact that it had a high chloride level would remain in the record.

Eileen Rogers asked who used the map and what it was used for. Randy Kline stated that the county had the information digitally, so we constantly had it in an updated format. He stated that Ms. Rogers' question was whether we even needed a map that was publicly available, especially since it was creating a tremendous amount of anxiety. Josh Peters stated that the county

had been accused of not knowing what was going on. So the county created the map to depict graphically what we knew, but now everyone's attention was on the map because now it had regulatory connotations. Mr. Kline stated that always happened with maps.

Robert Morgan stated that he was a proponent of the map simply because it was a graphic representation of the data. He thought it was a good picture of what we had at any given time in history. He acknowledged that there would be fluctuations in the underground movement of the water. As the picture changed, the map should change. He thought we would not necessarily drop a well from the map because we would want to know that, at a given time, it had a certain condition. Even though the condition may improve, because of seasonal fluctuations or whatever, we would know that the condition may return. The map would show the condition on a given date at that location. If the condition improved, it could mean that the permitting process would allow whatever could be allowed in the region of that well. Then if the condition worsened, the restrictions would kick in and affect the permitting process for that region. If a problem persisted in that region, then you would re-test the well so that you would always have the location and the picture for the well. Tom McNerney stated that the problem was that the original testing for many of the wells was inaccurate and the locations were not accurate. He stated that people had looked at that, noting that the red circles were not to scale.

Tom McNerney stated that the Planning Commission had agreed not to do anything that would change the original map, but the new map would be prepared showing the new data. Randy Kline stated that staff could add a general explanation about the map which may relieve some of the public's anxiety about it.

Phil Flynn referred to the paragraph about the testing program. He asked how that would be folded into a regulation. Josh Peters stated that it was part of the policy; it was not in the line-in/line-out regulations. Mr. Peters stated that staff had prepared a place holder Comp Plan amendment application for this year's cycle to address further changes to our seawater intrusion policy in the Comp Plan. He did not know that we would want to put details about a two-year well monitoring program in the Comp Plan.

Josh Peters stated that a question remained about what created a circle or how a circle might be taken off the map. He recognized that in the past we had used one test to create a circle. Phil Flynn suggested that if an original test came in too high, the well should be re-tested in six months, for instance, before it would be put on the map. Mr. Peters stated that something like that may be possible, although he thought it was a question for a hydro-geologist. Tom McNerney questioned whether we were being inconsistent by saying one test in one place and saying eight tests over two years in another place.

Dennis Schultz thought each map after each period would be a snapshot in time of the conditions at that time. You would not look at just that one map but at the history of a well, whether it was getting better, worse, or yo-yoing back and forth, and whether the seawater intrusion was creeping across the map. That should be the whole purpose of the testing. Josh Peters stated that was essentially the foundation of the original adaptive management program adopted in 2002 through the resolution. It was left vague because we were still in the process of communicating with the USGS and other partner agencies to decide how best to answer those questions. Mr. Peters stated

that, unfortunately, we got caught in a situation where we were trying to determine something over the long stretch, and determine a pattern and a trend, and react accordingly with a regulatory situation based on a specific well at any given point in time. He stated that the danger of making a new map and deleting a circle was that someone would not be faced with the restrictions they would normally be faced with, and then next year the problem could come back. He reminded the commission that the whole concept of the circles on the map came from the SWIG group. The SWIG group had agreed unanimously that the circles around problem wells should be created and they should be 1,000 feet in radius. Mr. Peters stated that the commission had heard testimony that the SWIG group's recommendations had been ignored. He stated that, contrary to that testimony, all of the nine unanimous recommendations of the SWIG group were incorporated into a policy in 2002.

Dennis Schultz offered the opinion that the map should not show 1,000-foot circles; it should show chloride concentrations. Josh Peters stated that the circles did graphically represent incremental chloride concentrations. He explained that the circles came from the SWIG focus group that was assembled with the BOCC's blessing and direction in Spring 2002. He stated that the group met four times. He stated that Phil Flynn was the Planning Commission representative on the group, and the petitioner was represented as well. That effort resulted in staff preparing material, including the nine unanimous recommendations and other more general information where there was not unanimity, which the BOCC adopted and subsequently modified as a result of the DOE's input. Then the brief came back from the petitioner saying the county was still off base.

Phil Flynn referred to the second paragraph under #4 on Page 4. He asked the members of the Seawater Committee to read the section and see if they thought it was really what was intended. The section addressed designating the whole of Marrowstone Island as a High Risk SIPZ if public water was brought to the island. Josh Peters stated that the public water reference came about from the interim ordinance adopted on March 3. He explained the intent of the two years referenced in the original sentence (concerning bringing public water to the island), which was separate from the two-year monitoring program. Mr. Peters stated that if public water came to Marrowstone, then we wanted to discourage any well drilling even more strongly than we normally did, noting that our current policy was to require hook up to public water if available. Mr. Peters explained that the Planning Commission did not want the provision to take effect if the monitoring program showed that seawater intrusion was not further degrading or was improving. He thought it was a hybrid of two different policy ideas in the one section. Robert Morgan summarized that the section said that if the monitoring program showed that the groundwater quality was degrading, Marrowstone would be declared a High Risk SIPZ and there would be no further well drilling once public water was available.

Tom McNerney stated that if you brought water onto the island, it would still not identify whether seawater intrusion was still present. We could assume that it was still present, but we would not know that people who still had wells would be pumping them to the extent that the problem continued to worsen. He thought we would still have to keep up a monitoring program to see that seawater intrusion was not going away. Mr. McNerney stated that he understood Mr. Flynn's issue about why we would tie a High Risk SIPZ designation for the whole island to providing a water system. Josh Peters stated that the BOCC added the section. He stated that there may be some well users who would want to hook up to public water. However, you would be

principally addressing new development on legal lots of record. It did not address the current well users and especially the wells where there was a problem. Mr. McNerney asked what would happen if the whole island was designated a High Risk SIPZ. Mr. Peters responded that all of the mandatory actions would go into effect. He stated that the only action that would affect existing wells was the water use limitation; all of the other actions applied to wells for new building permits.

Robert Morgan asked what would happen related to these regulations if someone wanted to drill their well deeper. Dennis Schultz stated that most of the wells on Marrowstone would be at or below sea level and trying to go deeper would just make the seawater intrusion worse. Josh Peters stated that the county typically saw people wanting to reconstruct their wells to a shallower depth. He stated that (reconstruction) had even been suggested as a regulatory or incentive tool to improve the seawater intrusion problem, especially in older wells.

Phil Flynn stated that, while he did not have other wording to offer, he did not think it was really what the commission meant to put into play. Tom McNerney stated that if the whole of Marrowstone Island was declared a High Risk SIPZ, it meant that all of the existing wells would be restricted to 400 gallons per day per well. He stated that the commission had recommended 400 gallons per day anyway, so he did not see where it would have any effect. Josh Peters stated that the only way it would have an effect was if some of the commission's other ideas with regard to water meters, etc., were implemented. Mr. McNerney stated that those provisions would be triggered by increased seawater intrusion. He stated that just because there was a public water system, it did not mean that if seawater intrusion increased that the people who were still using wells and not hooked up to a water system would not have to put in meters and be monitored. He noted that was already in the commission's recommendations.

Phil Flynn continued to have a problem with the wording of the section. At issue was the phraseology about "when public water is available, whichever is sooner". Dennis Schultz asked what would happen if we did not find increased salt water intrusion and a public water system came to the island. Josh Peters stated that, according to the statement, it would still be designated a High Risk SIPZ. Mr. Schultz stated that it would penalize the people for no reason. Jenny Davis stated that Marrowstone would be designated no matter what if public water was developed. Mr. Flynn stated that was not what the commission meant at all. Mr. Schultz suggested removing the language.

Tom McNerney moved that the Planning Commission send a recommendation to the BOCC to take that wording out ("... when public water is available, whichever is sooner"). Edel Sokol seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Josh Peters asked if the next statement, which talked about public water, made sense given the motion. The commissioners agreed that there was no effect since it assumed that there was salt water degradation and it was a long term solution.

Tom McNerney asked about the per day gallon limitation as it related to a building permit for a accessory dwelling unit [ADU] and whether it would go to 800 gallons per day from the 400 gallons per day allowed. Josh Peters stated that the issue had been discussed the previous year and an administrative policy had been developed about proof of potable water. He stated that the GMA nexus of proof of potable water only occurred one time.

He stated that the BOCC had adopted a policy that ADU's fell under the proof of potable water requirement for the main residence. Dennis Schultz stated that he had experience with the issue. He related how his property was affected, stating that he had a water meter that was at maximum capacity. In order to add a bathroom, he had to increase the capacity or put in another meter. He would have to pay an additional hookup fee for another meter or to put in a bigger meter. Mr. Schultz stated that he had to show that he had the capacity for the additional water taps. Mr. Peters stated that was two separate but related things. One was proof of potable water, a GMA provision. The other was dealing with building and plumbing codes. Mr. Peters stated that the commission could make a recommendation about the ADU issue. He stated that the well would be limited to 400 gallons per day regardless of the number of buildings on that property under the commission's recommendation. Mr. McNerney stated that there would be no exemptions for an ADU; the restriction would be on the well.

### **C. DISCUSSION ON 2003 COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS AND PROCESS**

Randy Kline handed out notebooks to the commissioners with the eight applications on the preliminary docket for the 2003 amendment cycle. Mr. Kline stated that the June 4 meeting would be a joint meeting with the BOCC to hear presentations by the proponents of the amendments, except for the Port of Port Townsend. That presentation would occur in detail at the joint meeting on June 18.

Randy Kline stated that People for a Rural Quimper [PRQ] had proposed a suggested amendment that was related to the Port's airport amendment. The commissioners and staff discussed the airport noise overlay issue. Mr. Kline pointed out that there was nothing in federal or state law, anything beyond local policy, requiring us to have an airport noise overlay district. He stated that we were required to protect the airport from incompatible land uses, but that did not necessitate notice to title through a noise overlay district.

Josh Peters stated that the two county suggested amendments were basically place holder applications. One had to do with seawater intrusion and would be developed as the BOCC took action on the issue. The other was the agriculture issue.

Concerning the agriculture issue, Josh Peters stated that we had handled Step 1. Step 2 involved taking a fresh, comprehensive look at the agriculture lands policy and regulations as a whole and to complete some of the unfinished work upon adoption of the Comp Plan and UDC. He reported that the county had acquired some grant funding for that purpose. He stated that the county would be hiring a temporary staff member to work through the summer on the issue. He reported that the new staff person would be Karen Driscoll. She had testified on the issue before the Planning Commission and had a planning background and also owned a farm. He stated that Ms. Driscoll would conduct the outreach program. Mr. Peters stated that he would be coordinating the project but Ms. Driscoll would be doing a lot of the leg work.

Randy Kline outlined the time frame and the process for the Comp Plan amendment cycle.

Tom McNerney asked when staff would have its recommendation for the docket to the Planning Commission. Randy Kline stated that staff would have it to the

commission prior to the public hearing on the docket. The commissioners agreed to hold the public hearing on June 18. Mr. McNerney suggested that the commission could make its recommendation to the BOCC for the final docket on that date as well.

Randy Kline noted that there should be a correction on the Northwest School of Wooden Boat Building's application. It was for a 5-acre parcel. He stated that half of the parcel was already designated commercial and the other half rural residential. Therefore, the application was for the 2.5-acre residential portion of the parcel.

The commissioners moved on to discuss the committee work.

It was agreed that the By-Law Committee would meet on Thursday at 1:30 p.m. in the DCD conference room beginning on May 29. Tom McNerney suggested that any suggestions for By-Law amendments be forwarded to the committee chair (Edel Sokol).

Tom McNerney thanked the Seawater Committee for the work it had done, stating that the BOCC recognized that work as well. He noted that there was a seawater Comp Plan amendment proposed so the committee would have further work to do.

Tom McNerney stated that a complete Tri Area UGA amendment would come forward during the 2004 amendment cycle. He stated that if the Hearings Board should find the 2002 UGA designation noncompliant, the whole issue could be reprocessed during the 2004 cycle. Mr. McNerney reported that consultants were being hired. He suggested that the Tri Area UGA Committee focus first on the zoning within the UGA boundary in order to facilitate the capital facilities planning. The work on the UGA could be done in steps or phases with public hearings before the Planning Commission as appropriate. Randy Kline stated that the county would be doing a mailing to all residents in the Tri Area as notification that the process was going on. Mr. McNerney stated that the mailing would probably generate interest in the committee's work.

Concerning the Airport Master Plan Committee, Tom McNerney suggested that the committee take the application in pieces. He thought the commission and the committee would know more after the Port's presentation on June 18.

There being no members of the public present, no public comments were received at the second comment period.

The secretary suggested that the committees select a regularly scheduled time and day of the week to meet to facilitate advertising and site scheduling.

#### **D. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

#### **E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

These minutes were approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of June, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas McNerney, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary