



**JEFFERSON COUNTY**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**

621 Sheridan Street  
Port Townsend, WA 98368  
(360) 379-4450

**JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MINUTES FOR MAY 2, 2007**

- A. OPENING BUSINESS**
- B. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**
- C. STAFF & COMMITTEE REPORTS and PUBLIC COMMENTS**
- D. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS FROM CRITICAL AREAS COMMITTEE/ADVISORY GROUP**
- E. ADJOURNMENT**

**A. OPENING BUSINESS**

The regular Planning Commission meeting was called to order at the WSU Learning Center at 6:30 p.m. by Secretary Cheryl Halvorson. She explained that, under Robert's Rules of Order, in the absence of any elected Planning Commission officer, it fell to the secretary to open the meeting and proceed to election of a Chair.

Planning Commission members present were JD Gallant, Henry Werch, Peter Downey, Bill Miller, Ashley Bullitt, Edel Sokol, Patricia Farmer, and Mike Whittaker. Bud Schindler was excused.

DCD staff present were: Al Scalf, Joel Peterson, Karen Barrows, and Cheryl Halvorson, secretary.

There were about sixty members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were: Moe Rogers, Dan Reandeau, Richard Germeau, Kirsten Harma, Sally Lovell, Todd Wexman, Chris Rehder, John Boulton, Steve Todd, Hans Daubenberger, Amelia Rae Watkins, Kathy Dickson, Renee Bush, Kenn Brooks, B and L Rosenberg, John Richmond, Jim W. Franklin, Clark Crandall, Virginia Crandall, Sandy Hershelman, Jim Hagen, Dennis Schultz, Frank Hoffman, G. Yount, James Fritz, Teren MacLeod, Robert Crittenden, Paul Heinzinger, Martin Ivers, Fred Weinmann, Byron Rot, Karl Meyer, Harold Paul Harvey, Owen Fairbank, Dianne Bonnivier, Phyllis Schultz, William A. Wheeler, Edna Forker, George Forker, Barbara Fisk, Adele Gouert, Connie Gallant, Judi Stewart, Joanne and Len Tyler, Pat Pearson, Roger Eichman, Larry Bonar, PUD Commissioner Wayne King, and County Commissioner Phil Johnson, plus one illegible signature.

**B. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Cheryl Halvorson explained that the Planning Commission had two options to consider. The first was to elect a temporary Chair to preside until the agenda item for election of officers, which was the first item. The second option was for the Planning Commission to take a motion to suspend that rule and move directly to the regular election of officers, which under the Planning Commission by-laws was called for at the first meeting in May (this meeting).

Bill Miller moved that the Planning Commission suspend the rule and proceed to election of regular officers for the year. Henry Werch seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Edel Sokol pointed out that the Secretary was not a member of the Planning Commission. Cheryl Halvorson responded that Robert's Rules was clear that the secretary would open a meeting in an instance such as this and did not require that the secretary be a member of the body. Ms. Sokol referred to an email from JD Gallant saying that this procedure was not legal, although she had not brought a copy of the email. There was a short debate about whether the secretary was required to be a member of the body (the Planning Commission) with no resolution. There was some sentiment that, while it may be implied, the commission should interpret it liberally and allow the commission's secretary to act in opening the meeting.

Henry Werch called for the question. The vote on ending discussion and going to a vote on the motion carried with six in favor (more than the 2/3 required to end discussion).

The motion to suspend the rule and proceed to election of regular officers carried with six in favor and two opposed (6-2-0).

The Secretary opened the floor to nominations for the position of Planning Commission Chair. Peter Downey and Bud Schindler were nominated. Cheryl

Halvorson explained that the Open Public Meetings Act does not allow for secret balloting so the election would be by a show of hands. Peter Downey was elected Chair with six votes to two votes for Bud Schindler.

The Secretary then opened the floor to nominations for the position of Vice Chair. Bud Schindler and Bill Miller were nominated. Bud Schindler was elected to the position of Vice Chair with five votes to three votes for Bill Miller.

The Secretary then turned the gavel over to Chair Peter Downey for the remainder of the meeting.

**C. STAFF & COMMITTEE REPORTS and PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Staff Updates:** None.

**Committee Reports:**

Mike Whittaker reported that the next two weekly meetings of the MPR Committee have been cancelled. He reported on the MPR Committee meeting of May 1. It included presentations by County Assessor Jack Westerman on the implications to taxes and another by Jim Hebert on economic development implications and experiences with other similar developments.

**General Public Comments:**

Peter Downey asked that the public wait to address the critical areas issue until after the presentations. The commission would take general public comments now.

James Fritz asked that everyone remember that Jefferson County has led the state for twenty years in monitoring and improving the water quality of our streams. The reason we had made such progress was because the county had worked with the landowners. We were saving the salmon and doing it in spite of the fact that there are now 300,000 California sea lions eating 80 pounds of salmon a day. He referred to a news article on that issue. In spite of the amount of salmon being eaten by the sea lions, we were still making progress. So we are doing a lot right. His point was that we should not turn our backs on the progress we've been making for the last twenty years. We should continue to work with the landowners instead of alienating them.

Kathy Dickson, West End, said she was the fifth generation of two pioneer families in the Hoh River Valley. She urged the Planning Commission to think hard about the consequences of regulating agriculture in the West County.

John Richmond, West End, said he was of the fourth generation of a pioneer family in the Hoh River Valley. They take their responsibilities for preserving the land and the livelihood of the people very seriously. They had had opportunities to subdivide their land but had chosen not to, because it would be bad for the land in that part of the county to have uncontrolled expansion of homes. There is a concept in their area about preserving and protecting the environment of the land. He related an early lesson he learned from his grandfather who harvested his potatoes and wiped off the dirt to return it to the land instead of washing it off in the creek. His grandfather's lesson was that we have to care for the land. He said the land means a lot to all the folks in the West End. They thought of it as sacred ground. They wanted to be able to continue to live there and provide for people by growing produce and livestock.

Kathy Dickson read a letter from Bob and Mary Huelsdonk of the West End for the record and provided a copy for the record. It talked about their farming and stewardship of their land and their neighbors' stewardship of their land.

It supported the ordinance proposed by the majority on the Critical Areas Committee.

Teren MacLeod read her written comments and provided them for the record. She addressed the months of work by the Critical Areas Committee. She spoke about small sustainable agriculture in this county. She spoke about the amount of public participation the committee had sustained over the nine months it had been working. She supported the committee majority's idea of minimum regulations while building on voluntary stewardship programs. She said that some would have you believe that these reports do not represent the people. She urged the Planning Commissioners to ask themselves where these voices come from and what their interest is, whether it's for the betterment of our county, environment and community. Every step of the way, the committee had made its reports available to the public for comments. The minority members could have done so as well but chose not to. She said that the committee's reports represented the peoples' wishes, the rural residents' wishes for a better future. She asked that the Planning Commission not give it away.

#### D. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS FROM CRITICAL AREAS COMMITTEE/ADVISORY GROUP

Jill Silver and Amy Hiatt and Bill Wheeler presented supplemental reports to the Planning Commission with a copy for the record. The Wheeler report was titled "Considerations of the CAO Subcommittee on the inclusion of Channel Migration Zones (CMZs) in the CAO Ordinance." The three Silver/Hiatt reports were titled (1) "Best Available Science, Flood and Channel Migration Hazard Areas, Thurston County", (2) "Minority commentary on: Fundamental/Foundational Principles and Values", and (3) "Recommendations on CAO Format and Administrative Provisions".

Bill Miller raised the issue of the Planning Commission's motion that the reports have fifteen minutes each. He asked that no rebuttal time be allowed. He said that the question and answer period should be for the Planning Commission to ask questions, not the public. If the public had questions, he asked that they submit them in writing to the Planning Commission. This meeting was for receiving the reports and not for debate.

Henry Werch said that he supported the motion that was taken and recognized the need to get through all the presentations. He endorsed the idea that there should not be debate tonight. However, he would not want the action of the Planning Commission to reflect any idea that the Planning Commission was not interested in hearing, at a later time, a rebuttal. Without that, he thought there would not be an opportunity for the various presenters to answer questions that may arise.

Peter Downey said that the Planning Commission would be open to hearing from the public on this issue for some time. He suggested that the commission just get through the presentations and save the debate for later meetings. He asked that the question and answer period be kept as brief as possible, asking only those questions that required immediate clarifications. The commissioners briefly discussed saving their questions until the end of the presentations. Mr. Downey thought it would be more important to ask questions after each presentation segment.

The presenters all had PowerPoint projectors available for their individual segments. Some used them while others did not.

Norm MacLeod presented the final signed committee reports to the Planning Commission Chair. Peter Downey thanked the committee for all the work and many hours the committee had performed in reaching these reports.

Norm MacLeod provided the first presentation, focusing on the **Preamble and Intent**. He provided a brief summary of the committee's work. He expressed

his appreciation to the faithful public who had continued with the committee over all the months of meetings, especially the recent meetings when the committee had gone late into the night.

Norm MacLeod said that the committee began in an atmosphere that was somewhat strained. The committee had worked for over nine months to try to relieve some of that strain. He discussed several issues facing the county and the amount of land that is in federal or state ownership, with only about five percent (5%) left for the citizens of the county. He spoke about the limitations of a small county. With any ordinance you want to have willing compliance instead of defiance. When people perceive that the regulations are too burdensome, they simply stop observing their requirements. The net result can be degradation of the environment. We can continue making our regulations ever more restrictive or we can take a different route and build a partnership between our government and citizens. The committee's choice has been to go with the later option by providing citizens with the maximum flexibility in protecting their critical areas. That meant maintaining a set of prescriptive regulations in the ordinance for those people who opt to not take advantage of a greater range of opportunities in a more flexible style. The committee was not saying "no regulations". They were saying that the regulations had to be there at a certain level, but it should be combined with alternative land stewardship programs that are voluntary for those who want to do so and to have monitoring.

Norm MacLeod said that monitoring was important whatever we did. We needed to ground truth as to what the scope of the problem is and whether or not what we were doing will fix the problem. He spoke about our Conservation District's successes, stating that we could use their model as a template. He said that meant we had to trust the people to manage their own property.

Norm MacLeod said that the committee's proposal could be successful and was supported by supplemental best available science [BAS] appropriate to Jefferson County. It uses monitoring to assure that critical areas are being protected. If the monitoring shows that what we are doing is not working, then we adapt and make it work better.

Norm MacLeod said that a lot of the majority's report is based on Island County's agricultural ordinance, which was upheld by the Western Hearings Board. He explained the differences between the three Hearings Boards. In general the Western Hearing Board has upheld alternative approaches. He said that the DOE does have a body of BAS with results and recommendations. There was nothing regulatory about those recommendations. The GMA encourages us to use more locally specific science if we can afford to produce it. While we cannot afford to do that, we have had a large body of supplemental science produced on a volunteer basis.

Norm MacLeod concluded that the concept is a shared onus where the government and the citizens share responsibility for managing natural resources and critical areas.

Norm MacLeod provided a summary of the committee's **Fundamental/Foundational Principles and Values**. He referred to the memo document dated May 1, 2007, and reviewed the twenty-three principles adopted by the committee. He provided information on SSB 5248 which was passed by this legislature. It provides a 3-year exemption for agriculture from critical areas regulations. During that time, discussions will be held on what form future regulations on critical areas as they relate to agriculture should have. Also, during that time, there is no specification that only existing and ongoing agriculture is exempt; therefore, new agricultural operations would also be exempt. However, it did not mean that we should not develop new voluntary programs that would improve our eco-systems.

Jill Silver provided the minority commentary on the Fundamental/Foundational Principles and Values document. They provided a copy of the original memo document with their comments in the appropriate places. Copies of their comment document were provided to the Planning Commissioners and one for the record.

Dr. Robert Crittenden provided a summary of his "Objections to Both the Majority and Minority Reports of the Citizen Advisory Committee on Critical Areas Code Updates". He provided a copy of the PowerPoint slides he used in his presentation to the Planning Commissioners and one for the record.

Jim Tracy provided a summary of his experience before summarizing the **Administrative** section adopted by the committee. He emphasized that this section only talked about how to administer the ordinance and did not address the substance of the ordinance. He outlined several major points of agreement between all members of the committee.

Jim Tracy provided a summary of the Administrative sections including Authority, Purpose, Definitions, and Reasonable Economic Use Exceptions. He said that the Reasonable Economic Use Exceptions section proposed a fairly revolutionary approach where the onus shifted to the county.

Jim Tracy said that he would, as an individual, provide to the Planning Commission during its public process a complete review and analysis of the May 17 draft.

Jill Silver provided a summary of the minority's report on the Administrative issues. She referenced three of their reports in the Planning Commission's packets: (1) Recommendations on CAO Format and Administrative Provisions, (2) Comparison of Formats of Three Different CAOs, and (3) portions of Jefferson County Critical Areas Ordinance Update Recommended Code Format and Language (including the Table of Contents, Recommended Organization/Format of the CAO, and Sections 6, 7 and 8 of the CAO Administrative Provisions). They supported using the Whatcom County ordinance as a model.

Bill Wheeler submitted two large 3-ring binders of background material for the record for the **Forestry** report. He provided a presentation on the Forestry report of the committee, although it did not refer directly to the "Forestry Report and Recommendations" document. He stated that Forest Practices were exempt by state law from the Critical Areas Ordinance [CAO]. He provided information on his background, especially as it related to being a small forest land owner. He emphasized that he did not represent the large forest land owners. He provided information on the amount of forest land in East Jefferson County.

Bill Wheeler showed a slide depicting the streams in the county, stating that they were all protected by a buffer, either through the Forest Practices Act [FPA] or through critical areas regulations. Almost all of them were overlaid with forest lands.

Bill Wheeler explained that the FPA regulated almost anything having to do with the raising of timber, including road and trail construction or harvesting or pre-commercial thinning. He discussed how the Forest Practices rules are developed. He noted some important definitions. One was that forest lands under the FPA was land capable of supporting and growing a merchantable stand of trees and has not been converted to something that is incapable of growing trees. A "merchantable stand of trees" is a stand of trees that is capable of being logged, pulped, chipped, etc. and transported to the nearest market and that will pay for the costs of logging and transportation. It does not have to make a profit. From a practical standpoint, in some cases a load of logs or sometimes one log will qualify for the forestry regulations.

Bill Wheeler explained that small forest land owners had special regulations and qualifications under the FPA. That generally applied to anyone who harvests less than 2 million board feet per year. He summarized the conditions that are not required to qualify for forestry. One is that there is no minimum size limit for forestry; you could have one acre and be subjected to the FPA. You don't have to be in the timber tax program. Zoning is not a criterion. The owner does not have to declare that he intends to manage the land for forestry. The forest comes under those regulations in order to protect it.

Bill Wheeler explained when the county gets involved in Forest Practices. He described the Washington State Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan which was an agreement between the federal government and the state.

Peter Downey opened the meeting to Planning Commissioner questions.

Henry Werch said that it seemed that the justification for including property under Forest Practices was very broad. He asked how the county could distinguish between land that should be governed by the CAO and a property that may be under the FPA. Bill Wheeler provided an example of his own circumstances when he applied for a building permit. The county wanted to apply a 150-foot buffer, whereas under the FPA, only a 50-foot buffer was required. The way the county had to deal with it, and the committee had tried to deal with it, was to recognize that the buffers for forestry were different. We are basically talking about the landscape; we were not talking about building houses. The FPA will never talk about building houses. It also will not talk about road building if the sole purpose of the road is to access your house. But if the land was in forestry, you have different regulations.

Al Scalf asked Mr. Wheeler to discuss the difference between commercial forest of long-term commercial significance under the GMA and "forested" land under the FPA. Bill Wheeler replied that the GMA and the FPA were not consistent. Forests of long-term commercial significance under the GMA were a designated resource land, similar to the designated agriculture land. However, Forest Practices could apply on any land where forestry is a legal and authorized use of the land, which includes the Rural Residential districts. Mr. Scalf stated that his point was that DNR uses the term "forested" for those areas in the community that are forested; it could be designated commercial forest under the GMA or it could be Rural Residential. If you convert from a forested activity to a non-forested activity, you are subject to the FPA when you do that conversion. Mr. Wheeler added that after you build a house on that converted land, you are subject to the CAO, but only for the building envelope. There is a real difference between the building and managing the rest of the land.

Jill Silver wished to clarify the minority position relating to the question Mr. Werch asked. She said she was at the table for the Forestry and Fish negotiations for two years and worked in forestry for ten years. She said the reason that Forest Practices and the GMA are different is because the FPA is intended for land that is in long-term forestry. There is very little impervious surface. There is a requirement for replanting on areas that have been harvested. While there are forests on some smaller parcels in this county, the majority of forest lands are on very large parcels and ownerships. Timber harvests are limited to a certain amount of acreage per year adjacent to other timber harvests. The buffers in Forest Practices were negotiated over a two-year period and ended up as a supposed consensus agreement. They are the result of limited science confined to the effect of forestry on sensitive resources such as streams, wetlands, channel migration zones, seven species of amphibians, and specific endangered and threatened wildlife. They are not meant for chunking up in 20-acre parcels and building residential homesites adjacent to those sensitive resources and maintaining open spaces,

such as yards and lawns, and having pets, etc. The intensity of the development that is anticipated under the GMA is very different from that anticipated under the FPA. She did not believe it was appropriate to use the FPA buffer distances. She discussed the FPA buffer for a Type S stream, which related to a certain height tree and could range up to 170 feet. The minority recommendation and the current CAO and the WEC Settlement Agreement all suggested 150 feet. While there are a lot of things the large forest land owners can do to reduce the size of the buffer from the 170 feet, it typically would not be possible for the small forest owner. Therefore, she was confused about how it could end up being less in some cases.

**Public Comments:**

Peter Downey noted that this is not a public hearing per se. There will be a formal public hearing on the CAO draft in the future.

Owen Fairbanks expressed his appreciation for all the work done by the committee. He appreciated Jill Silver's point that they were not concerned about farmers; their concern was with those who would move here and would not necessarily have much care for the land. He hoped we could set aside political agendas and work together to develop regulations that will be acceptable to the state. He thought time spent in court just "sucked" our resources that could be put to better use. He submitted a comment letter for the record.

Barbara Fisk was concerned about stringent regulations on farms and peoples' personal property. She submitted a comment letter. She was concerned about forest practices, saying that their property had been damaged by logging on neighboring property. It seemed that they don't want to regulate the logging but they want to regulate the landowners. She spoke about the siltation that has occurred in Tommy Creek and Donovan Creek, which was the result of logging.

Sally Lovell submitted a comment letter for the record. She appreciated the hundreds of hours of work the committee performed. She urged the Planning Commission to create an ordinance that was legally defensible. She supported the proposal brought forth by Jill Silver and Amy Hiatt. She also supported regulating channel migration zones.

John Boulton said he was a long-time member of the Conservation District. He spoke about his land in the Leland Valley, saying that there was a salmon stream running through it. He was in complete agreement with the position presented by Norm MacLeod on behalf of the majority of the committee. He was struggling with how to leave his property as a farm. Because there are three houses on his property now, it could be divided into three pieces. He would not want to see it reduced in size because of buffers.

Jim Hagen asked that the Planning Commission consider that these recommendations be evaluated in the context that we are engaged in an open process. It was not true that we have to follow the WEC Settlement Agreement or the DOE science. This was an open public process, as the Planning Commission had been told by both the BOCC and staff. There was nothing that obligated us to follow the Settlement Agreement or DOE; they were simply recommendations made by staff in the May 17 draft. When he was on the Planning Commission, staff told the commission that it was free to pursue other available options of science that the commission thought were valid. The GMA allowed for a bottom up planning process with deference to local circumstances. He thought that was a lot of what the committee had tried to address. He asked the commission to take into account what was best for our citizens and not what might be the path of least resistance exerted by outside forces. He pointed out that our 2000 CAO had never been found noncompliant. He said that we basically have had two CAOs adopted since 2000 that have been

valid upon adoption, although they have been under appeal. We have basically been under appeal for six or seven years by the WEC with really no appreciable benefit in the improvement of our critical areas functions and values. He asked the commissioners to keep an open mind and realize that, if we adopt something different that meets legal criteria, it does not mean it would be defeated by the courts. He thought everyone could support Jefferson County regulations crafted by Jefferson County residents and not be under the shadow of someone from Seattle or Olympia "bringing the hammer down on us".

Dennis Schultz agreed with Mr. Hagen's comments.

Kenn Brooks said he saw an email that one of the Planning Commissioners had asked for a summary of each of the reports. He challenged the commissioners to read all of the reports. If he could spend many hours writing them, the least the commissioners could do was read them. If the commissioners did not, his opinion was that they did not belong on the Planning Commission representing the public. He said that the May 17 draft and the minority draft were very prescriptive. The majority of the committee had taken a very different approach. The principles were based on the committee's sense of what was important for Jefferson County. From that, they created a new ordinance that is specific to Jefferson County and was different from any other ordinance in the state. It recognized the history of land stewardship in this county and the leadership of the Conservation District in actually putting conservation on the ground. It recognizes that Jefferson County residents could be good stewards and that they do not need to be dictated to by government. It attempts to form a partnership between government and citizens to truly protect our natural resources. As Mr. MacLeod said, if you force people to move from compliance to defiance, the end result will be to the detriment of our natural resources. The question was not whether or not we are going to protect our natural resources; that is a given in either case. The question was how to do that. Are we going to do that by creating a partnership between government and its citizens? Or, are we going to do that by creating conflict between the county government and its citizens? Ultimately, the choice will be up to the BOCC, but he was sure they would weigh heavily on the Planning Commission's recommendations. He asked the commissioners to imagine themselves as a property owner as they read the reports and ask themselves how they would like to have to hire an arborist to tell you that you could cut down a dead tree that was about to fall on your house. Or, how would you like to have any of the other provisions apply to you? He asked the commissioners to consider the real effect on the citizens of the county.

Roger Short apologized for his threatening comments at the last Planning Commission meeting. He spoke about his involvement with the Conservation District over many years. Voluntary stewardship was the only real true way to accomplish or move towards saving our environment and making our land better for wildlife. He had done a lot of things on his land that he had not been compensated for because he wanted to do them to enhance the wildlife habitat. In the next month, he thought the Planning Commission would hear a lot about the Conservation District and the things it was doing and some of the things it would like to do. He had seen many times where someone was dead against regulations, but after seeing proof that there was a need, they would go ahead and do something voluntarily to address the problem.

Larry Bonar commented on the overview of the whole process. The tenor of the whole process as represented in the Fundamental/Foundational Principles and Values was focused unduly on the rights of individual property owners and what the county cannot do, should not do, and should be proscribed from doing. It did not seem to contain any kind of overview of what the purpose of a CAO is and what its value is to the citizens of Jefferson County as a whole. It just focused on a small sub-set of those citizens and their needs and rights.

Frank Hoffman asked the commissioners to balance things and to favor protecting habitat and water for future generations. It seemed that we were more concerned about the future rights of people. He thought the focus should be on a code that is functional and workable.

Diane Johnson took exception to the idea that the agriculture owners were a small sub-set of citizens in this county when, in fact, they represented a large group of people in the county, with the residents of the city representing a small sub-set. She thought that deserved consideration.

County Commissioner David Sullivan expressed his appreciation for all the work that had gone into this effort. He also appreciated all the time and effort the Planning Commission will spend in reading these documents and arriving at a recommendation. For himself, he would be looking for a code that was reasonable, practical, and that we could actually implement and could afford to implement. The commission will have choices about whether we will take a higher risk or a lower risk. He encouraged the commissioners to look at the lower risk. We needed flexibility and it should not be too intrusive in peoples' lives.

Mike Belenski responded to what Commissioner Sullivan said about reading documents. It would be nice if the Commissioners had read the documents before staff came up with the May 17 draft. He wondered why the Commissioners would wait to read the documents until after 200 mad people came to the Planning Commission public hearing last year. His point was that, if Commissioner Sullivan was going to ask the Planning Commission to read everything, the BOCC should read everything as well, because he did not think they had read it in the past.

Commissioner Sullivan responded that he did not want to get into too much of a back and forth discussion. He said that the May 17 draft was a starting point. The whole process started at that time and it was continuing now. The process was getting more time.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting will be on May 9 (a special meeting) where the Planning Commission will hear the remainder of the reports from the Critical Areas Committee. There will not be a public comment period at the beginning of the meeting, but there will be one near the end. Peter Downey emphasized that everyone should understand that there will be a formal public hearing process later. Henry Werch suggested that if anyone had creative ideas about how the commission could proceed after the reports, the Planning Commission would like to hear them.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

**F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

These minutes were approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of May, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Peter Downey, Chair

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