

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR AUGUST 20, 2003

- A. OPENING BUSINESS
- B. PUBLIC HEARING - 2003 COMP PLAN SITE-SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS
- C. STAFF UPDATES
- D. ADJOURNMENT

## A. OPENING BUSINESS

The regular meeting was called to order at the WSU Learning Center at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Tom McNerney. Planning Commission members present were Phil Flynn, Dennis Schultz, Edel Sokol, Eileen Rogers, and Jenny Davis. David Whipple arrived at 6:35 p.m. Robert Morgan arrived at 7:05 p.m.

DCD staff present were Josh Peters, Greg Ballard, and Cheryl Halvorson, secretary.

There were about fourteen members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were Gary Phillips, Kelly Phillips, Kris Maki, Mari Phillips, Skip Urling, Kara Lee Monroe, R. Maki, M. Whittaker, and Ron Nowak.

The minutes for July 30 and August 6, 2003, were approved as submitted.

As it was not yet the appointed time for the public hearing, the Chair invited some brief staff updates.

Josh Peters introduced Greg Ballard, new Associate Planner in DCD, and explained that his duties would be in the Development Review Division with an emphasis on mineral extraction permits, including the Fred Hill Materials projects.

Josh Peters reported that the county had received the Final Decision and Order from the Hearings Board on the Fred Hill Materials mineral resource lands issue. A copy was handed out to the commissioners. He reported that the county was essentially upheld on about ten of the fifteen issues. The other five issues related to the SEPA review. Mr. Peters stated that the Hearings Board had already scheduled in the order a series of compliance events with regard to the 180-day deadline. Tom McNerney asked whether the additional SEPA analysis would need to come before the Planning Commission. Mr. Peters replied that, while he was not sure, he thought it would not; it would go to the BOCC. Edel Sokol asked if the Hearings Board had indicated what constituted enough environmental analysis. Mr. Peters replied that the Hearings Board had not been specific but they had provided enough clues in their FDO to indicate what should be included in the EIS. Mr. Peters stated that if the BOCC wanted to pursue a course in which the county would do more SEPA work, staff would do that work and present it to the Hearings Board. First, it would probably be presented to the BOCC to see if their actual decision would be changed. He stated that it was a bit awkward because the decision was upheld but not the analysis that led to it. Mr. Peters stated that there was a series of SEPA issues presented by the Hearings Board. One of the principle ones was that there was not enough information about alternatives, one being the No Action alternative and another being the original proposal for 6,240 acres. He reported that the Hearings Board had also found that the county was correct in saying that it was impossible to fully analyze a pit-to-pier concept absent an actual permit application. However, the county should have analyzed all transportation alternatives to some degree, essentially to the degree required in a non-project action. Mr. Peters reported that, meanwhile, an application had come into the department for the pit-to-pier project as well as another permit for mineral extraction.

Josh Peters stated that staff had some updates regarding the complexities that had come to light regarding some of the site-specific amendments. Tom McNerney asked that those issues be discussed and presented during the public hearing at the time the pertinent application was being discussed.

**B. PUBLIC HEARING - 2003 COMP PLAN SITE-SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS**

The Chair opened the public hearing by reading the public hearing process into the record.

**MLA03-182, Northwest School of Wooden Boat Building**

The Chair opened the hearing on MLA03-182 by asking the Planning Commissioners the pertinent questions relating to ex parte communication, whether they had an interest in or stood to gain or lose any financial benefit, whether they could hear the matter in a fair and objective manner, and that they agreed that the decision would be based on the established record. The commissioners all answered appropriately. He asked whether any members of the audience objected to the participation of any of the commissioners. There were no objections.

The Chair asked for staff's presentation on the application. Josh Peters summarized that staff had no changes to their initial recommendation for approval of the proposal to rezone approximately half of the subject 5-acre parcel from Rural Residential to the Rural Village Center district.

Tom McNerney announced that the staff recommendation had been available for some time, since August 6. He described the Planning Commission process for deliberation and recommendation to the BOCC. He explained that the written record would still be open after this hearing to the BOCC. If the BOCC decided to hold their own public hearing, the public would be able to testify before them as well. However, if the BOCC agreed with the Planning Commission recommendation, they were not required to hold a public hearing.

In answer to David Whipple's question about the timing of the Planning Commission's decision, Tom McNerney stated that, while the Planning Commission could make a decision after this hearing (tonight), the commission probably would not do so because of the amount of written material the commission had received and needed to review.

The Chair opened the hearing to public testimony. There was none received. The Chair moved the hearing forward to the next site-specific amendment.

**MLA03-189, ANE Forests of Puget Sound**

The Chair asked the pertinent questions of the Planning Commission and audience. The commissioners all indicated that there had been no ex parte communication, none had an interest in the outcome of the hearing, they could be fair and objective, and their decision would be based on the established record. There were no objections from the audience regarding the participation of any commissioner.

At the Chair's request, Josh Peters provided an overview of the proposal and the issue concerning the parcel being split through a process in the Assessor's office. He reported that after discussion with the Director, the property owner, the Assessor's office, and the land owners representative, staff had arrived at the decision to continue with its original recommendation. He explained that it had been found that it would not be very difficult to re-consolidate the two parcels back into one. That would be a condition of the approval to re-designate the property from RR 1:20 to

RR 1:10. The other condition would be that the PRRD process be used in the subdivision.

The Chair opened the hearing to public testimony. There was none received. The Chair moved the hearing on to the next site-specific amendment.

**MLA03-225, Donna Pall**

The Chair asked the pertinent questions of the commissioners and the audience. The commissioners all indicated that there had been no ex parte communication, none had an interest in the outcome of the hearing, they could be fair and objective, and their decision would be based on the established record. There were no objections from the audience regarding the participation of any commissioner.

The Chair opened the hearing to public testimony. There was none received. The Chair moved the hearing forward to the next site-specific amendment.

**MLA03-231, Phillips/Maki**

The Chair stated that the application was for a redesignation of approximately 37 acres from Rural Residential to a Mineral Resource Land Overlay. The Chair asked the pertinent questions of the Planning Commissioners. Tom McNerney stated that he had driven to the quarry to familiarize himself with the proposal and Mari Phillips had introduced herself and pointed out the location of the proposed MRL. He stated that he had nothing to benefit from the proposal. There were no other responses from the other commissioners to the questions regarding ex parte communication, an interest in the outcome, fair and objective, and the decision being based on the established record. There were no objections from the audience regarding the participation of any commissioner.

At the Chair's request, Josh Peters briefly reviewed the proposal, stating that the staff recommendation for approval, with four conditions, had not changed. Mr. Peters stated that the proponent had informally asked for clarification about the hours of operation and noise condition. He explained that UDC Section 4.24.6 set hours of operation for noise producing activities of between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, unless extended hours of operation were authorized for emergencies. The question was about what kinds of activities could or could not occur outside of those hours. Mr. Peters stated that the Director's informal interpretation was that "activities" referred to the definition of "operations" in RCW 78.44.031(8). That reference listed the types of things one would normally expect to do with mineral extraction. Mr. Peters stated that the hours of operation would, therefore, be 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, no holidays, and within those hours, a noise disturbance could occur as long as it did not exceed what was provided for in the WAC. In this case, you could not exceed a threshold of 60 decibels at a receiving property except under temporary exceedances for limited amounts of time. The question became what a noise disturbance was and whether you could do activities outside of the hours of operation if it did not create a noise disturbance. He stated that the answer was "Yes", under certain circumstances. He stated that a noise disturbance would be a noise that exceeded 50 decibels at a receiving property. He stated that 50 decibels could be compared to light traffic. Mr. Peters stated that the only way you could do activities or operations outside of regular hours would be through emergencies, or special circumstances with administrative approval, or a demonstration that the

proposed after hours activity would not cause a noise disturbance. That demonstration would be through a noise report, which would essentially set up decibel meters on receiving properties to study the noise levels of the proposed after hours activities. He stated that only under those circumstances would the administrator say that certain activities could occur during off hours. Tom McNerney asked if staff could provide a written summary of that interpretation before the next meeting. Mr. Peters replied that he would have to ask the Director. Mr. McNerney stated that it was part of the conditions the commission would discuss. Mr. Peters stated that what he had reported was an informal interpretation of an existing condition that referred directly to the code. If the Director was interested in making a formal code interpretation or some kind of written statement, that might happen, but he would have to discuss it with the Director.

The Chair opened the hearing to public testimony on the proposal.

Mari Phillips, Quilcene, read comments into the record and provided a copy for the record. The comments related to the hours of operation question and proposed language for loading trucks outside of the established hours. Several letters in support of their proposal were also attached. Ms. Phillips introduced her children, who were also owners of the proposal property, as well as one of their truck drivers.

Gary Phillips, Quilcene, submitted charts depicting their operation's decibel readings at various times and locations and under varying circumstances. He also submitted graph charts depicting decibel readings taken at the intersection of Highway 101 and Moon Valley Road on August 18 and 20. He explained that one chart was done with the plant operating. He stated that their plant operated at an average of 53.3 decibels. He stated that the spikes on the chart was the traffic noise level on Highway 101. He explained that the plant operating noise level actually represented the floor of that graph. He stated that the next graph was taken after they had ceased operations. He noted that the spikes in the readings were similar but the floor readings dropped lower. Mr. Phillips stated that they had engaged a consultant to help them with the noise issues. He stated that they were implementing changes per his recommendations. Mr. Phillips stated that the operating hours issue was of great importance to them because their primary competition to the north was Shine Quarry and they currently started loading trucks at 6:00 a.m. on weekdays and 6:30 a.m. on weekends. He stated that their primary competition to the south was in Shelton. They also began loading at 6:00 a.m. He stated that they were presently loading trucks at 7:00 a.m. on Saturdays, but thought that changing to 8:00 a.m. to noon would provide their customers with the materials they needed with some compromise to the neighbors. Mr. Phillips stated that staff's recommendation was to loop their existing operation into the current UDC regulations, which made sense in a way as it would put both MRLs operating under the same rules. He stated that their concern was that they would be put at an unfair disadvantage with their main competition. He thought they should have the same hours of operation as their competitors. Mr. Phillips stated that they had no problem with the storm water and other conditions in the UDC.

Skip Urling, consultant for the Phillips/Maki proposal, thanked staff for their guidance and assistance, stating that it was a fairly rigorous application process. He stated that approval of the application would more than double the existing MRL. In doing so, it would allow them to design a mining and reclamation plan that was more effective and efficient and better for the community. It would also be easier to meet the DNR mining

regulations. Mr. Urling stated that although it would be an expansion geographically, there was not any proposed increase in intensity. He stated that the rock crusher and operating equipment would remain where it currently was; there would not be any additional "stuff". He stated that the operation was presently meeting the requirements of the storm water permit. It was also meeting the requirements for air quality regulations. Mr. Urling stated that the criteria for the overlay were spelled out in UDC Section 3.6.3. He thought the application package pretty well demonstrated that the particular operation and properties were consistent with those criteria. Mr. Urling displayed a large map of the subject area. He stated that the expansion included about 37 acres. It included a former county owned surface mine. He stated that properties surrounding the tract were all larger than five acres. Some were DNR forest tracts while others were owned by the Phillips/Maki families. He stated that the residential densities in the area were RR 1:5. There were no rural villages or shoreline in the vicinity. There were no wetlands on the site. There were no wildlife habitat issues. He thought the site met the criteria and thought the staff concurred with that. Mr. Urling stated that the location of the proposed mining expansion area was really appropriate for mining activity. He stated that some mines were in areas that had more residential development surrounding the pit. He stated that in this area there was very little residential development. Also, there was a great deal of other resource based activities with the DNR forest land and other open space lands and the existing county owned pit. It was pretty consistent with other things that were going on in the vicinity. He stated that the state highway would provide good access to the market and did not think the highway would suffer harm from the amount of truck traffic leaving the site. Mr. Urling stated that mining operation would be subject to permitting from both the county and the DNR. He stated that the mining operation sustained seven good paying jobs. Mr. Urling stated that while some of the tracts were smaller than the ten acres combined, he thought the 37 acres total, as well as the other approximately 20 acres, met the intent of the code requirement. He stated that one of the staff conditions was that there be some boundary line adjustments or some other kind of reconfiguration of those properties to meet the 10-acre minimum. While that would meet the letter of the law, he did not know that it served any particular purpose other than meeting only the letter of the law. The reason for that was that the mining plan, the reclamation plan, would be based upon the natural features of the property and the normal sequence of mining and reclamation. He stated that the DNR required that mineral resources be extracted in segments or phases of 6 to 10 acres. It provided some flexibility to deal with the natural features on the particular site. As you started mining in another phase, you would start reclaiming the one just finished. He stated that the interior property boundaries would not have any effect on that mining plan. Mr. Urling stated that the Phillips would like to maintain the property lines as they existed today without any reconfiguration so that, should there be some reason to terminate the operation, the site could be reclaimed and those properties could be used according to the current zoning. He did not think it would do any harm to the public good to maintain the current property lines because the mining plan would be inclusive for the entire 57 acres. Mr. Urling stated that the commission would see by the noise charts and graphs provided by Mr. Phillips that they were in compliance with the state noise regulations. He urged the commissioners to give serious consideration to the additional language they proposed. It would make clear to everyone that they would maintain their ability to load trucks from 6:30 to 7:00 a.m. during the week and from 8:00 a.m. to noon on Saturdays as a continuing operation, as well as to be able to remain competitive with other operations in the county. It should clearly recognize that that aspect would

be limited to loading trucks and that it would have to meet the state noise requirement. He did not know that a noise study would be required, stating the belief that there was enough data on record to demonstrate that the crushing and sorting operations were just barely over 50 decibels. If those machines were turned off, the loading of haul trucks made considerably less noise in his experience. He asked that the commission give serious consideration to the proposed additional language. Mr. Urling submitted the large display map for the record.

Ron Nowak, Quilcene, stated that they lived across the river from the Phillips' operation. He stated that they moved to their present home in 1988. At the time the quarry was just a "Mom and Pop" operation and was no bother at all. However, with the advent of the big slide on Highway 101, it turned into a commercial operation. He stated that the noise level was just unbearable, although it was not so much the operating level as the peak noise level. He stated that they had measured somewhere between 80 and 90 decibels at their house. That, along with the blasting, was just not acceptable as far as they were concerned. He stated that the last blast actually moved their pictures askew on the wall. His wife thought it was an earthquake. Mr. Nowak stated that they felt the Phillips family was entitled to make a living, but they were not entitled to expand their operations for their benefit at the cost of all their neighbors. He thought that was unconscionable.

Mike Whittaker, Quilcene, submitted two letters from other members of the public for the record. He stated that they lived across Highway 101 from the Penny Creek Quarry on Moon Valley Road. He thought the actual distance from the quarry to his house was approximately 700 feet. He stated that it was his intention only to ensure that this process was done within permitted guidelines. He stated that he had grown up and lived in Los Angeles and worked for the municipal fire department for the last three years. He stated that noise, people, activity and traffic were common place. He stated that they purposely chose to live in a secluded, rural residential setting for peacefulness, solitude and privacy which that setting provided. He stated that they wanted an environment where they could enjoy peace of mind and quality of life. They found that place until Penny Creek Quarry began and the serenity was disrupted. He stated that the noise from operations disrupted quality of life, peace of mind, and oppressed property values. He stated that activity had increased since they began in 1997, sometimes starting as early as 6:00 a.m. and occasionally working on Saturday and Sunday. He stated that the MLA stated that the quarry had been in operation for 50 years. While Mrs. Phillips' father probably took rock from the site for his logging operations and Mr. Phillips probably did the same and the county took rock from their pit, it did not create any issues or problems until 1997 when they began primary processing with crushing and sorting, conveyor belts dropping rock into trucks, heavy equipment operating, and back-up alarms. When the primary processing began, their quality of life "went out the window". He stated that while the blasting was infrequent, it created a shock wave that shook their doublewide trailer. He stated that approximately three years ago they built a house and that helped with the noise. He stated that, basically, their only issue was noise. He stated that he knew the Phillips had spent a vast amount of time, energy and effort to bring forward this application and his intention was not to be a thorn in anyone's side. However, this operation had impacted them to a degree that he felt it was time to take issue with it. Mr. Whittaker stated that he noticed a couple small cracks in the sheet rock within a day of a blast and a couple others after the last earthquake. He admitted that he could not honestly say

that the initial cracks were blast related or just happened to show up at that time. Mr. Whittaker stated that he talked with someone at Mine Safety Health Administration [MSHA] in trying to inform himself about what was acceptable for blasting and shock waves. He stated that he remembered the issue with blasting at the Mats Mats Quarry. The Corp of Engineers had gotten involved and said they were doing it wrong, that the most the neighbors should hear was a dull thud. Mr. Whittaker asked the person at MSHA if he would be willing to talk to other neighbors who may be concerned. Upon calling back, the person at MSHA stated that he had the Phillips' records and they looked like they were within specifications. He stated that the MSHA person never called any of the neighbors. He stated that the staff report indicated that the operation was within compliance. Mr. Whittaker stated that his big concern was that no one appeared to be overseeing this operation. He stated that within the last few years, the quarry had been very good about phoning him when they were going to blast. That was helpful and was appreciated. He understood the quarry was using a licensed blaster but he was not aware of anyone overseeing this. He thought that if they were going to be expanding, there should be checks and balances. Mr. Whittaker stated that the 1995 Mineral Lands Ordinance identified mineral lands and allowed people to mine. It said "... allows development to proceed in a manner consistent with the rights of an individual to peacefully use and enjoy their property." There was no reference to anybody else to peacefully enjoy and use their property. He stated that there was nothing peaceful about a quarry, especially when you lived close to it. In Section 8, Uses, it allowed mining and primary processing. Mr. Whittaker stated that there were no permits or checks and balances. He could mine and was still grandfathered under that as he understood it. He needed no permit to continue doing what he was doing. Mr. Whittaker referred to a 1996 Hearings Examiner case for an 18-acre MRL. Initially the staff report said SEPA review was categorically exempt. After much to-do, the county realized it was in error and a SEPA review was done. Mr. Whittaker stated that Section 2.e. said that a portion of the property was in a Critical Aquifer Recharge Area, yet nothing was set out as mitigating measures. Under #3, Analysis, #2, it addressed the utilization of non-renewable resources being done in a manner which did not cause undue adverse influence on neighboring properties, specifically noise, dust, water, water quality degradation, etc. and should be strictly minimized. Mr. Whittaker stated that the staff comment alluded to a Soil Conservation Service soil survey but said nothing about ensuring noise, dust and water quality issues at all. He stated that at an earlier hearing he had testified about his concern with noise at the quarry; that was his only concern and was still his concern. Mr. Whittaker stated that when he and Mr. Phillips were fire commissioners together, Mr. Phillips assured him that he would build a berm which would take care of the noise. While Mr. Whittaker doubted a berm would take care of the noise, there was still no berm in place. Mr. Whittaker stated that the first page of the MLA form said that any falsehood or omission may result in the permit being null and void. He then referred to Exhibit E, Section F, noting that it said that noise from the current operation had not been mentioned by neighbors. He stated that he had personally talked to Mr. Phillips on several occasions about days and hours of operations, and, of course, the issue was noise. He stated that if he could not hear their operation, he would not be concerned. Mr. Whittaker stated that he had spent some time at DCD copying pages from the Penny Creek Quarry file. He stated that there had been more than just a couple incidences of people calling in with complaints. He stated that the hours of operation had always been an issue. He recalled that at one time the beginning hour was to be 8:00 a.m. While he once had a piece of paper saying that, he could not find it now. He stated that Al Scalf stated that he could

not find it either. He stated that he recalled that it was a staff note concerning a complaint which said that normal operating hours were Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Mr. Whittaker stated that under Site Geology, it said that the basalt material was consistent with geologic units described on DNR geologic maps. Under Limitations, the company making the report said that it did not warrant the accuracy of supplemental information incorporated in the report, i.e. the DNR map. He questioned the consistency. Under the Quality of Deposits, it said that it met DOT specifications. He stated that he had seen nothing that said that. Mr. Whittaker stated that in his consultations with several kinds of experts, including geologists, they had described the kind of testing they would have to do on site samples. He stated that he knew the DOT required crush tests. He stated that the staff report said the material met DOT specifications, but he could not find anything to substantiate that claim. That was another inconsistency. Mr. Whittaker stated that the staff report said that the impacts would not likely increase beyond present levels. He disagreed, stating that if the area increased, the impacts increased. He stated that the pit initially was supposed to stay at three acres or less. Mr. Whittaker stated that he did not feel he could rely on the county to adequately oversee this process to ensure that the guidelines and safeguards put in place to protect the environment and quality of life were followed. If this proposal went forward, it said that mining would not be a nuisance and, consequently, the county had to protect the quarry against anyone who wanted to take issue legally with the quarry operations. He stated that if the aquifer was breached, it appeared that the county would have to protect the quarry from that. Mr. Whittaker stated that he was the water manager of the water system for their small development. Their water tests for coliforms and nitrates had always been clean. If nitrates started to show up in the water samples, they would consider the quarry as a prime cause. Mr. Whittaker stated that the application in essence would allow a heavy industrial complex in a rural residential development.

Ron Nowak, Quilcene, provided a written comment for the record.

Rich Maki, Port Hadlock, stated that he lived his childhood years at the quarry site. He stated that it seemed like it was a perfect marriage with the county pit that was existing. He stated that it had been a way of life from his earlier years onward. Mr. Maki offered the opinion that the number seven for the number of employees was a bit off because the pit provided industry for the community which had taken a hit in recent years. He stated that Mr. Phillips did a very thorough job with his work, stating that planning was #1. Mr. Maki stated that he thought that if there was a problem with noise disturbance, Mr. Phillips would address it. He stated that he worked with Mr. Phillips quite a lot, stating that he went the extra mile to stay within the regulations that pertained to mining. He stated that they were very stringent, with safety being #1. If it meant changing what he was doing, if he could accommodate it as far as guarding or sound or noise regulating, Mr. Phillips would do it. Mr. Maki stated that Mr. Phillips was almost an inventor in coming up with ways to do things better. He felt Mr. Phillips was doing the best job he could. Concerning the county pit, Mr. Maki stated that the county had kind of let it fall into ruin but Mr. Phillips had reclaimed it and could make it viable again.

There being no further public testimony, the Chair closed the hearing on the Phillips/Maki application.

The Chair opened the hearing to any other public testimony on the other three amendments before the commission at this hearing. There were none received. The Chair closed the public hearing. The Chair outlined the agenda for the remainder of the meeting.

The commissioners discussed whether to hold discussion and/or make recommendations on the Comp Plan amendments at this meeting. They agreed to wait to hold their discussion until the next meeting in order to have time to review the materials they had received at this hearing.

### **C. STAFF UPDATES**

Josh Peters reported on the Agriculture Lands Committee meeting, stating that the committee had talked about the amount of work to be done and the timing of that work in order to meet the September 17 deadline for the staff report and recommendation. He stated that the original idea was to do a complete package (Comp Plan and UDC amendments along with site-specific amendments). Mr. Peters reported that after discussion with the committee, it had been suggested that we concentrate on the Comp Plan amendment language this year and then do any necessary UDC amendments next year as well as the related site-specific amendments. He stated that the site-specific amendments could not be reviewed against the criteria until the criteria was developed. Mr. Peters stated that with the Fred Hill Materials Hearings Board decision, the "bar" had been raised in terms of the kind of environmental analysis the county had to do at a non-project level. He stated that it seemed like the Ag Lands Committee generally supported the concept of only doing the Comp Plan amending language this year. He stated that staff would approach the BOCC about the idea.

Dennis Schultz stated that the Ag Lands Committee was in agreement with the suggestion. They thought the Comp Plan amendment was doable. However, because of the overall timing and staff's need for SEPA review time and the need for UDC implementing language to go with whatever was adopted for the Comp Plan, the committee did not think there was enough time this year. The committee would continue working on the UDC amendments and the site-specific amendments into next year based upon what was adopted in the Comp Plan amendment this year.

Jenny Davis asked if that was something staff wanted to do. Josh Peters stated that, given the Fred Hill Materials decision, staff had discussed the amount of SEPA review that was necessary for the Comp Plan amendment cycle. Mr. Peters stated that staff supported Mr. Schultz' suggestion to just concentrate on the Comp Plan amendments (narrative and goals and policies), which were essentially the criteria by which you would judge future parcels for consideration for ag zoning. Then in 2004 the county could consider the UDC implementing amendments, which would be dependent upon the adopted Comp Plan amendments, and also on the site-specific amendments. Mr. Peters stated that originally staff thought there may be 25, or 50 at the most, people interested in the site-specific amendments. However, the list was over 100. That meant that every one of those parcels needed to be analyzed against the criteria but we were still working on the criteria. In summary, Mr. Peters stated that the Director was in agreement with the suggestion, but staff still needed to approach the BOCC. Mr. Peters stated that the Director wanted to know if this was something the whole Planning Commission could support in terms of a strategy.

Tom McNerney commented that once the Planning Commission reached a recommendation on the Comp Plan amending narrative and policies, the committee could then continue right into working on the UDC, even before the BOCC adopted the Comp Plan amendment in December. Josh Peters agreed that was possible, stating that there may be some adjustments needed depending upon what the BOCC adopted.

Dennis Schultz stated that the whole purpose of trying to do it all in one project was that the county had hired Karen Driscoll to do it. Eileen Rogers asked about Ms. Driscoll's work and funding. Josh Peters explained that Ms. Driscoll was hired under a grant from the state. That grant money had been spent on her salary to date and on the mailing. He stated that the department had come up with some funding to pay Ms. Driscoll so that she could finish at least a portion of the project. Mr. Peters offered the opinion that the Ag Lands Committee and staff could continue Ms. Driscoll's work even after she had finished her current assignment. Tom McNerney suggested that the county contact the state about an additional grant in order to continue Ms. Driscoll's work on the issue. Mr. Peters explained the staffing being proposed for next year in the preliminary budget. It included a request for temporary long range planning assistance. He stated that one planner would be devoted to the Tri Area UGA issue. That left one planner for all the other long range planning issues, which staff knew was not enough, especially given the mandated 2004 Comp Plan update. Therefore, the department had requested a one-year contract planner to assist.

Dennis Schultz moved that the Ag Lands Committee continue working on the ag project and concentrate on the Comprehensive Plan changes, finish those first and get them submitted, and then start on the Unified Development Code modifications and complete as much of that as possible while the BOCC were still deliberating on the Comp Plan amendments. After completion of that, the committee would start considering the properties that would like to opt into the new ag classifications. Phil Flynn seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

#### **D. ADJOURNMENT**

Tom McNerney stated that the Planning Commission would deliberate on the site-specific Comp Plan amendments at the next meeting. Josh Peters stated that he would ask the Director about the request concerning his informal interpretation of UDC 4.24.6 with regard to mineral extraction operations.

Josh Peters stated that there were no other modifications to the staff recommendations. He stated that there was a chance one of the site-specific amendments would be withdrawn. He stated that the Donna Pall application may be withdrawn as it was possible her concern could be resolved in another way. If that was the case, the withdrawal would occur before the next Planning Commission meeting.

Concerning the agenda for the next meeting, it was noted that the consultant for the UGA sewer planning was expected to make a presentation. That would be in addition to the commission's deliberation and recommendations on the site-specific amendments. Josh Peters pointed out that the original plan for the Comp Plan review schedule provided for two meetings (September 3 and 17) for Planning Commission discussion and recommendation on the site-specific amendments.

Edel Sokol suggested that the commission deliberate at least the Wooden Boat School's amendment at this meeting. She pointed out that there were no changes or additional material to review for that amendment. David Whipple thought it was poor policy to debate on the same night as the public hearing because of the public perception that may create. Tom McNerney agreed. Phil Flynn pointed out that the commission had publicly announced that it would not do anything at this meeting in terms of deliberating the amendments. Ms. Sokol withdrew her suggestion.

The commissioners and staff discussed the upcoming Ag Lands and UGA Committee meeting dates. The UGA Committee requested that the secretary find them a meeting place for evening meetings in order to accommodate the request of the public.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

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

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

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