

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR APRIL 7, 2004

- A. OPENING BUSINESS
- B. DELIBERATION/RECOMMENDATION TO BOCC ON MLA#04-26, DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS (UDC) ASSOCIATED WITH AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES
- C. 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 Edel Sokol, Phil Flynn, Jenny Davis, Eileen Rogers, and Dennis Schultz.

DCD staff present were Josh Peters, Karen Driscoll, and Christina Pivarnik, consultant.

There was one member of the public present: Bud Schindler.

Tom McNerney announced that Robert Morgan and Tom Murray had resigned from the Planning Commission.

The minutes for March 3, 2004, were approved as submitted.

The commissioners briefly discussed the fact that there were currently three vacancies on the Planning Commission.

The Chair invited staff updates.

Josh Peters reported on the BOCC's process for filling the Planning Commission vacancies. He stated that there were currently two vacancies in District #3 and one in District #2. He stated that staff had taken steps to advertise the District #2 position and was awaiting the BOCC's decision regarding appointments to District #3.

Josh Peters stated that he had reorganized the web page regarding seawater intrusion since the county had received a Notice of Compliance from the Hearings Board.

Josh Peters reported that there were two compliance hearings before the Hearings Board scheduled for the following week. One was on the Brinnon Subarea Plan and the other was on the UGA. He stated that he would email the specifics to the Planning Commission.

Tom McNerney suggested that the commission discuss the status of the various Planning Commission committees. He thought it may be appropriate to disband the Seawater Intrusion Committee.

Tom McNerney invited comments from Christina Pivarnik on the UGA planning effort. Christina Pivarnik stated that there would be a public open house on April 14 beginning at 4:30 p.m. She stated that it was basically the next step in continuing the communication with the public about the UGA. One purpose was to answer questions the public had posed at the last open house. Many of those questions related to the sewer plan and its costs.

Phil Flynn asked Ms. Pivarnik to explain the public outreach process. Christina Pivarnik did so, stating that the county had utilized one-page inserts in the PUD bills to 1,800 households in the UGA. The county had also used a direct mailing to those 1,800 households announcing the open house. Press releases were also provided to the newspapers along with meeting notices in both papers.

Phil Flynn stated that there would also be representatives at the open house for the transportation and stormwater elements of the UGA planning to address

those issues. Christina Pivarnik stated that the members of the UGA Task Force would also be present along with pertinent staff and consultants.

It was noted that the next UGA Task Force meeting had been rescheduled from April 13 to April 20.

Christina Pivarnik explained the format for the open house, with two formal presentations being planned.

Tom McNerney stated that he would disband the commission's Seawater Intrusion Committee as that issue had been settled. He thanked the committee members and staff and recognized the important work they had done on behalf of the Planning Commission and county.

Tom McNerney reviewed the other active committees of the Planning Commission: the Comp Plan Review Committee, the Agricultural Lands Committee which had gone on to become the UDC Review Committee, and the UGA Task Force. Josh Peters stated that the Ag Lands Committee would still be needed to review the parcel specific Comp Plan amendments this year. Dennis Schultz suggested disbanding the Ag Lands Committee for now and reforming it later when the need arises.

Tom McNerney stated that, in the short term, the Comp Plan Review Committee needed to review the Comp Plan in relation to the UGA. That task needed to be completed and sent to the BOCC by July 1. He thought the UGA Task Force should also be involved in that review to some extent. In addition, the UDC would be amended to reflect the UGA planning. That task was to be completed by June 1 in order for the Planning Commission to review it prior to July 1. Both of those tasks must be coordinated. Mr. McNerney briefly discussed the role of the UGA Task Force in those reviews. He pointed out that the overall Comp Plan and UDC amendments must be adopted by the end of the year, but the UGA portions of those amendments were scheduled for completion and adoption by July 1. Mr. McNerney suggested that Phil Flynn chair the Planning Commission UGA Committee, which would review the technical aspects of the Comp Plan and UDC amendments for the UGA. He stated that the UGA Task Force was considering the broader picture for the community and was not as interested in the technical aspects of line-in, line-out amendments.

Tom McNerney and Phil Flynn discussed the dates and logistics of the Planning Commission's UGA review. Mr. McNerney asked whether another public hearing before the Planning Commission would be necessary for the Ag Lands UDC amendments (MLA04-26), which would need to occur before the commission took up the UGA issue. It was agreed that the proposal had not substantially changed, with no new topics being introduced. Therefore, another public hearing was not required.

Josh Peters asked for clarification about the tasks for the UGA Committee and the UDC Committee. Tom McNerney stated that the UGA Committee would review the development code regulations (UDC amendments) and Comp Plan amendments related to the UGA in order to have them ready for full Planning Commission review in June. The UDC Committee would be devoted to the overall UDC review, excluding the UGA issue, for completion by the end of the year. Therefore, in actuality there would be two editions of Comp Plan and UDC amendments, one for the UGA and one for the overall plans.

Phil Flynn asked if the Airport Committee was still needed. Tom McNerney thought the Port and Quimper people were fairly close to an agreement. He

did not think the airport issue would come up before July, when the commission could address whether there was a need for the committee.

Josh Peters reviewed the docketed items for this Comp Plan amendment cycle. They included the 2004 update proposal, which included both the Comp Plan and UDC, the UGA, the ag land parcels, and the two airport proposals. In addition, there was the UDC Omnibus HOPE proposal, which was related to the UDC Committee's work. He stated that, since staff had been focusing on the Ag Lands proposal, he was not sure which issue would be the next priority. However, with regard to the airport proposal, Mr. Peters stated that he had spoken with both parties. The idea was that we would work with the Port's proposal and modify it, stating that staff had found some things that they would recommend differently. After staff had reworked the proposal, the hope was that both parties would "buy off" on it before it came to the Planning Commission and public. Mr. Peters stated that staff's thought was to hold one public hearing before the Planning Commission on all of the Comp Plan amendments, with the exception of the UGA.

Tom McNerney stated that, with regard to the UGA, there were several plans being prepared: the Sewer Plan, the Transportation Plan, the Stormwater Plan, and the Capital Facilities Plan. He stated that the UGA Committee would need to review them.

Tom McNerney invited public comments.

Pat Rodgers, County Commissioner, stated that the BOCC was fully aware that there was no other body that had more importance to the future of the county than the Planning Commission. He expressed pride in the commissioners, stating that the Planning Commission had taken on an enormous amount of work, was serious about that work, and did thorough, quality work to pass on to the BOCC. He stated that he could not imagine the BOCC being able to do what they do without the Planning Commission's work. He expressed a tremendous appreciation for the work the commission did. He stated that he considered the Planning Commission partners in what the county had to do. He thanked the commissioners for their dedication.

Tom McNerney stated that it should also be recognized that the Planning Commission and staff were working as a team, which was reflected in the coordinated staff and Planning Commission recommendations that had gone forward to the BOCC in recent times. Phil Flynn stated that the Planning Commission was working "short sheeted" on staff, noting that one planner had recently left the county. That created even more work for the remaining staff. He thought something needed to be done. Mr. McNerney stated the belief that the BOCC recognized how hard the planning staff worked.

B. DELIBERATION/RECOMMENDATION TO BOCC ON MLA#04-26, DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS (UDC) ASSOCIATED WITH AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Josh Peters handed out a DCD memo dated April 7 with the staff recommendation for the ag lands proposal. He also handed out a memo from DCTED commenting on the proposal, stating that staff had modified the proposal based upon those comments.

Josh Peters stated that instead of re-doing the original application, staff had decided to work from it and create a new, "clean" proposal for Section 4.3. He stated that staff's position was that the work that came out of the Ag Lands Committee was good, so staff was essentially supporting that work.

Since then, through Planning Commission discussions and through some additional research, staff was advocating some variation from the original proposal. He stated that Mr. Schultz had worked with him on this modified proposal. He stated that the basic difference in the document presented at this meeting was a re-working of Exhibit B. Mr. Peters suggested that he review the April 7 proposal with the commissioners in order to explain the modifications proposed from the April 2 memo that was mailed to the commissioners.

Dennis Schultz stated that he had reviewed the April 2 memo, comparing it to the committee's work, and found that all of their proposals were contained in the new document. It was merely reformatted and rearranged.

Tom McNerney asked how the April 7 document differed from the April 2 document. Josh Peters displayed a notebook containing RCWs that could apply to agriculture. He stated that he was basically looking for definitions, but also to answer some of the questions the Planning Commission had, such as farmworker housing and feedlots. Mr. Peters explained that the difference between the two documents was that the April 2 memo only contained Section 4.3. The April 7 document contained the table and other sections of the UDC that related to Section 4.3. Therefore, tonight's document was essentially a supplement to the April 2 document. Mr. Peters noted that there were a few changes to Section 4.3 from the April 2 document, however. He explained those modifications. Some related to including some definitions in Section 4.3 rather than relying only on Section 2, Definitions, as a way of making it easier for the user. Mr. Peters outlined some uses that should be discussed and a determination made as to whether this county wanted to allow certain uses (e.g., feedlots or slaughtering), and, if so, under what type of permit process. Mr. Peters stated that staff suggested eliminating the references to the Shoreline Master Program because it made the whole section too difficult. That would eliminate Subsection 8. Mr. Peters stated that staff was recommending some modifications regarding Best Management Practices [BMPs] after consulting with Al Latham of the Conservation District and with the state. Mr. Peters stated that, based upon some comments from DRD staff, he suggested some modifications concerning constructing farm ponds. Mr. Peters stated that after the April 2 document came out, there had been a lot of conversations and emails. Therefore, he had decided to take the opportunity to incorporate some of those comments into the April 7 document.

Jenny Davis asked if Ms. Driscoll had reviewed the document and if there was anything she disagreed with. Karen Driscoll replied that there was nothing she completely disagreed with. She stated that she had spoken with both Mr. Peters and Mr. Schultz. Ms. Driscoll stated that she had some reaction to the section on BMPs (Page 2 of the April 2 memo). She stated that her husband, who had experience in the field, had also reviewed it. Ms. Driscoll stated that there were two sides to the issue. One was that the proposal was very detailed with specific language and references to source documents. Therefore, it was pretty "heavy" stuff. From the point of view of people who might want to challenge the proposal, the language probably looked pretty impressive. Maybe that was good because it showed that we had paid a lot of attention to environmental laws, etc. Ms. Driscoll stated that it was all recommended, of course; it was voluntary. But at least we were referencing it very specifically; it was not being glossed over. It was being taken directly from the Chimaquum Watershed Plan. Ms. Driscoll stated that the other side of the issue was that it looked very intimidating and confusing for the average farmer because of all the references to other documents, plans and laws. She stated that she would hate to see people get discouraged

because the code looked so formidable. Ms. Driscoll thought all that needed to be said in the code was that, for the ag lands, the BMPs were recommended and describe them in general and refer people to the Conservation District for details on how to carry out the BMPs, because the Conservation District was the entity that would guide a farmer through it. Ms. Driscoll expressed some ambivalence about which way would be best in the code because she could see both sides. She expressed appreciation for Mr. Peters' ability to pull all of the material together into one document.

Tom McNerney commented that the simple way may not be legally enforceable. He suggested that perhaps one way would be to have the code say one thing and to have a handout for the farmers that simplified it. Edel Sokol asked about the Conservation District. Mr. McNerney stated that, while it was a government entity, it had no enforcement ability. Dennis Schultz suggested that one way to deal with it would be to keep the code language as presented but to emphasize that the Conservation District was the resource to help a farmer implement the BMPs.

Josh Peters expressed his appreciation for Ms. Driscoll's review and comments. He agreed that she was right that the first part was complicated. Mr. Peters thought the language of most concern had to do with "existing functions and values" and "no harm and degradation". He stated that language came directly from the draft Chimacum Plan and was generalized a bit. He stated that he had not had time to redo the language. Mr. Peters thought that doing a handout was a great idea, but that would be done after this process. He referred to Page 3, sub IV, of the April 7 memo, stating that it referred to some sources, including the Conservation District. The next subsection (V) talked about things that would basically be in a farm plan. He stated that the farmer really did not need to be concerned too much about the existing functions and values and no harm and degradation "stuff". That was for the county to reassess in coming years through statutory obligation. Of course, the Conservation District would help the farmer work on the farm plan.

Josh Peters stated that Ms. Driscoll was correct in her comments about how others might look at the proposal. He referred to an email from the local representative of the Washington Environmental Council. That comment supported the suggested language. He noted that WEC was the original petitioner of a UDC appeal and thought his comment should be considered. He stated that the goal was to get something in place that would make everyone happy.

Tom McNerney suggested that the code language could be in place and the Conservation District could help develop the handout, because they were the ones who dealt with the farmers. Dennis Schultz suggested reorganizing Subsection IV to direct them to the Conservation District. If they wanted to read further, they could research the other references. Josh Peters agreed that he could rework the subsection if the Planning Commission wanted to give that general recommendation.

Karen Driscoll related the questions she had received from very educated people as a result of a mailing the county had done. She stated that people had been confused and wanted to know what it really meant. Ms. Driscoll agreed that she could support reorganizing Subsection IV as Mr. Schultz suggested. Josh Peters stated that the definitions could be moved to the end of the subsection because they were not something the farmers would be

concerned with. He pointed out, however, that the Chimacum Plan group was composed of farmers and it was language they wanted included in their plan.

Tom McNerney asked staff to summarize the recommendation for Subsection IV. Josh Peters asked that the Planning Commission also consider the additional modifications suggested by DRD staff for the subsection (Page 7 of the April 7 document). Mr. Peters stated that the Planning Commission recommendation would be for the BMP subsection of proposed Section 4.3 be reorganized so that the Conservation District's role in the actual recommended BMPs have a more prominent role in that subsection, and that the staff recommendations of April 7 be recommended as well.

Eileen Rogers moved that the recommendation for Subsection IV be adopted. Jenny Davis seconded the motion.

Edel Sokol asked if Ms. Driscoll had any other concerns. Karen Driscoll replied that, with the suggested changes, she thought the proposal was quite ready.

Tom McNerney stated that the recommendation would not change any policy; it would merely make some editorial changes. Josh Peters agreed, stating that he would simply reorganize the numbers and put the definitions last and include the staff suggested modifications of April 7.

Phil Flynn asked if the proposal should be reviewed by the Conservation District prior to the Planning Commission making the recommendation. Josh Peters stated that county staff had met with Al Latham of the Conservation District and discussed the proposal with him along with the Chimacum Plan. Mr. Flynn asked if the proposal would help DCD relieve some of the controversy and the time it took to explain to people how to navigate the UDC. Mr. Peters thought it would, especially if DCD and the Conservation District jointly developed an information sheet explaining some of the aspects of it. That would include a section explaining the farm pond issue. Mr. Flynn asked if the motion should be modified to include a recommendation about developing a handout. Mr. Peters replied that perhaps the commission would want to take it up as a separate motion because there may be other issues the commission would want included in a handout.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

The commissioners and staff moved on to other concerns.

Karen Driscoll referred to Page 6 of the April 2 memo under "Livestock Management". She stated that the reference said the definitions would be employed "subject to amendments in State or Federal laws and regulations". She pointed out that the definitions would automatically change if the State or Federal laws changed and that was different from the way the other definitions in the UDC were addressed. Ms. Driscoll stated that she was uncomfortable with that because it could make it more difficult for DCD to keep up with the most current definitions. Tom McNerney offered the opinion that it delegated your legislative authority to do that. Josh Peters stated that, typically, when the state changed a definition, the county would follow suit. He stated that the reason he included the phrase was because some of the definitions had recently changed. He explained that the AFO and CAFO regulations had been released by the EPA relatively recently. He stated that the definitions were basically verbatim from the State or Federal regulations. He explained that we were basically picking definitions related

to other statutes; we were not making them up. He stated that he was amenable to taking the clause out if it caused concern. Mr. Peters suggested that the commission talk about pulling all of the definitions out of Section 4.3 and putting them in the Definitions section. He stated that another reason he supported retaining the phrase was a reference on Page 7, Subsection 2 (April 7 document) which said "Any operation that meets the State or Federal definition for an animal feeding operation ...". He stated that the point was that we were relying on those definitions. Mr. Peters stated that his suggestion would be to move the definitions to the Definitions section but to keep the phrase.

Some commissioners discussed some of the definitions. One related to slaughterhouses and custom slaughtering. Josh Peters stated that there was no size in the definition. He stated that the definition came right from the state statute. What it meant was anything that needed a permit from the state. Mr. Peters stated that we would be using the permit from the state requirement as a cutoff. If someone was doing something that did not require a permit from the state, then, from a land use perspective, the county was making the assumption that we would not be interested either. However, if you needed a permit from the state, it must mean the operation would be of a certain intensity or size. Therefore, the county should look at it from a land use perspective to make sure it was appropriate for the area. The proposal basically was saying that it was appropriate in Ag Lands. The proposal said that it would be a Conditional Administrative [Ca] permit, which was a fairly easy permit, although it did give notice to the neighbors. However, if the use was on Rural Residential lands, it possibly should be a full Conditional Use permit.

Josh Peters suggested eliminating all of Subsection (6)(i) from Section 4.3 and moving all of the definitions to the Definitions section (Section 2). Tom McNerney entertained a motion to that effect.

Eileen Rogers moved that Subsection (6)(i) be eliminated and the definitions be moved to Section 2, Definitions. Edel Sokol seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Dennis Schultz referred to Subsection (iii)A. on Page 8 of the April 2 document and questioned the one thousand number. Josh Peters responded that the state required a permit if the farmer produced over one thousand chickens. However, they also decided that a temporary permit was required if the farmer had under one thousand chickens. Mr. Peters stated that the thinking was that if someone was producing over one hundred chickens on Rural Residential lands, it was probably more of an operation than just supplying yourself and/or friends. It might fit on Rural Residential lands and it might not. That was the reason for requiring a permit in the Rural Residential districts. Mr. Peters thought what Mr. Schultz was getting at was that he had not included a clause that over one thousand chickens was a "No" use in Rural Residential. Tom McNerney suggested reversing the verbiage to "between one hundred and one thousand" as being more clear.

Dennis Schultz moved that Subsection (iii)A. be changed to reverse the order to "between one hundred and one thousand" and to add another statement that over one thousand chickens were not allowed. Edel Sokol seconded the motion.

Tom McNerney asked for clarification of the subsection. Josh Peters replied that it meant that if you had an operation where you were slaughtering for sale one thousand chickens in any calendar year, that operation should be on

Ag Lands and not on Rural Residential. Dennis Schultz stated that the referenced section referred to non-ag land. Mr. Peters stated that we would not say anything about chickens in the Ag Lands section because that was part of agriculture. Mr. Schultz stated that an operation that slaughtered over one thousand chickens in a year required a state permit. Some commissioners discussed whether such an operation should be allowed on Rural Residential lands. Mr. Peters stated that it was included in the section because he had found a threshold in the statute. He stated that if the commissioners wanted to allow such an operation on Rural Residential land, it should be a Conditional Use. Mr. Schultz commented that it should be changed to say "fowl" rather than "chickens" because someone could raise turkeys or ducks instead. Mr. Peters stated that he used "chickens" because that was what the state statute said; it used "*Gallus domesticus*". Karen Driscoll stated that she had spoken with the Health Department about the issue. She reported that slaughtering 1,000 chickens took a lot of water and required a specialized septic system. She stated that such a slaughter operation, on that scale, could not be done on a domestic septic system.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

The issue of changing "chickens" to "fowl" was raised.

Tom McNerney moved to change the section to "chickens or other fowl" rather than "chickens". Eileen Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Josh Peters reviewed some definitions on the table in the April 7 document. He suggested replacing the "Feedlots (Stockyards)" definition, which was the existing definition in the UDC, with the other definitions which came from the statute. The same question applied to both "Livestock" and "Feedlots". Eileen Rogers supported using the statute.

Eileen Rogers moved that, in the interest of consistency, the definitions for "Feedlots", "Stockyards", and "Livestock" be taken from the statutes, replacing the current definitions in the UDC. Dennis Schultz seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Tom McNerney asked for clarification about "Animal Shelters (Kennel)". Josh Peters stated that it was the current definition and staff was not proposing it for amendment. Mr. McNerney stated that he raised the issue because the BOCC was discussing it. They were talking about creating a definition that would be consistent with the UDC and animal control. He did not think the Planning Commission should be creating an additional definition. Mr. Peters recommended not addressing the definition and to let the other process deal with it. He stated that he had merely included it on the table for informational purposes, adding that it could be removed.

Karen Driscoll referred to the issue of uses where a large concentration of animals would be found. She stated that Jefferson County was not likely going to be a place where such operations would be sited. She acknowledged that such operations created huge environmental concerns. Ms. Driscoll wondered why we were getting into it. She did not think it was anything that would interfere with any current or future farmer in this county. Dennis Schultz pointed out that the threshold for a Medium CAFO was 200 dairy cows or 300 beef cattle and would fit some of the existing farms in this county. Ms. Driscoll stated that the definition addressed such numbers of animals in a concentrated feeding operation; it was not talking about a number of

animals out on pasture. Josh Peters stated that he understood Ms. Driscoll's concern. He stated that the question for consideration related to the fact that we had what we used to call "Heavy Agricultural Processing" only being allowed in Heavy Industrial areas, which were few in this county. The proposed provisions could provide some additional opportunity, although it may never happen. The question was whether we wanted to say "No" or to allow a Conditional Use so that some day someone may want to do a grain elevator or a medium size CAFO. Another point was what would happen if some operation was someday inspected by the EPA and determined to be a medium sized CAFO. Those kinds of questions would be helped by the flexibility to have a Conditional Use. An alternative would be to just make them a "No" use. The commissioners discussed a beef operation on Center Road as an example. It was pointed out that the animals were confined during the winter months and out on pasture during the rest of the year. Mr. Peters referred to the definitions for an AFO and a Medium CAFO, stating that the example operation would be a "Yes" use in the Ag Lands district. In the Rural Residential districts, it would be allowed as a "Ca" use. Mr. Schultz stated that a large feedlot operation was not likely in this county. However, it was possible in the future for a dairy operation to become large enough to warrant a CAFO designation.

Josh Peters reviewed the permitting requirements for livestock management operations in designated Ag Lands. An operation that met the definition of an AFO would be a "Yes" use. An operation that met the definition of a CAFO would require a "Ca" (conditional administrative) permit. And a large CAFO, along with the other heavy industrial uses cited, would be a "C" (conditional) use permit. Mr. Peters stated that the question was whether we wanted to make the "C" uses a "No" use instead. The conditional use would be a Hearing Examiner decision. The consensus of the Planning Commission was to keep the provisions as proposed.

Karen Driscoll referred to Page 8 of the April 2 document where it addressed (7) Structures. She noted that agricultural buildings did not require a building permit. She referred to (i) where it discussed plumbing and a heat source and again to (iii) where it addressed a heat source. She asked if you had plumbing that was not just for the animals or a heat source, whether it meant that only the plumbing or heat source had to be permitted or if it meant that the whole agricultural building must meet code. Those were two different things. She asked for an interpretation of the intent. Josh Peters stated that the county used the Uniform Building Code, stating that (i) was basically the verbiage from that source. He thought it was an issue that should be raised with Al Scalf as the Building Official. Mr. Peters stated that Mr. Scalf had reviewed the section and suggested some changes, which he had done. He stated that he could not provide an answer to Ms. Driscoll's question because it was a Building Official question. Ms. Driscoll stated that her question to the commission was which way the commission preferred it to be. Tom McNerney stated the understanding that the only kind of building that did not require a building permit was a farm storage building. Any other kind of building that was used for other purposes, such as a workshop with heat, required a permit. Mr. Peters stated that his interpretation of the section was that, if a heat source was specifically permitted, the rest of the building would still be exempt. The commissioners agreed to not make any recommendations for changes in this instance.

Karen Driscoll referred to the suggestion by David Whipple to include "experiential treatment facility" as a use. She wondered whether the

commission wished to include such a use, stating that it was different from a school, which was addressed. The commissioners agreed that they did not want the use included in the section.

Tom McNerney entertained a motion to accept the proposal as modified.

Eileen Rogers moved to accept the proposal as modified. Edel Sokol seconded the motion.

Tom McNerney asked if the proposal required a SEPA review. Josh Peters stated that it had been done with the original proposal. Mr. McNerney asked if it would allow staff to create a finished product for the BOCC. Mr. Peters replied that it would. Mr. McNerney asked if a report from the Planning Commission to the BOCC would be required. Mr. Peters stated that he would draft a report for Mr. McNerney's signature. The commissioners agreed by consensus that Mr. McNerney should sign the report without it coming back before the entire Planning Commission.

The motion carried unanimously.

Josh Peters stated that this action completed this stage of the Ag Lands process. The next stage would be to contact the list of interested persons from the earlier process and do public outreach to others who may be interested. Then we would need to get the information needed to make recommendations on each of those parcels. Mr. Peters stated that stage of the process came under the auspices of MLA04-27, which was a docketed placeholder Comp Plan amendment. He stated that was the reason he suggested the Ag Lands Committee start meeting again when that process got underway. They should consider each of those parcels identified and make a recommendation as to whether the parcels should be designated as Ag Lands, and if so, whether they should be Prime Ag or Local Ag. Tom McNerney stated that the outcome of that Comp Plan amendment process would be a change to the land use map.

C. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair invited public comments. There were none received.

The commissioners discussed the agenda for the next meeting. Tom McNerney suggested an update on the UGA planning. Dennis Schultz suggested updates from the Planning Commission committees.

Tom McNerney requested that a UGA Task Force meeting be scheduled for April 20, which would be a rescheduling from April 13.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

These minutes were approved this _____ day of May, 2004.

Thomas McNerney, Chair

Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary