



JEFFERSON COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION

621 Sheridan Street

Port Townsend, WA 98368

(360) 379-4450

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR JUNE 6, 2007

- A. OPENING BUSINESS**
- B. AQUIFER RECHARGE**
- C. FORESTY**
- D. GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS**
- E. ADJOURNMENT**

A. OPENING BUSINESS

The regular meeting was called to order at the WSU Learning Center at 6:30 pm by Chair Peter Downey. Planning Commission members present were William Miller, Patricia Farmer, Peter Downey, Bud Schindler, Henry Werch, Mike Whittaker, JD Gallant and Edel Sokol. Ashley Bullitt was excused.

DCD staff present were Joel Peterson, Brent Butler, Cheryl Halvorson (secretary) and Angela Wade (secretary).

There were about 20 members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were: Frank Hoffman, James Fritz, Jim Hagen, Sandy Hershelman, Ross Goodwin, Renee Bush, Norman MacLeod, Edna Forker, George Forker, Jo Yount, George B. Yount, Dennis Schultz, Clark Crandall, and Virginia Crandall.

Staff Updates:

Brent Butler reported that he had filed for a City Council seat. He reported that it was determined that there are no conflicts regarding his potential role in City Council.

Brent Butler reported on the status of the No Shooting Area review committees. The BoCC will hold public interviews on Monday, June 11th and are expected to make appointments that day for the following Monday. After establishing its processes, the group will begin to review the Paradise Bay No Shoot Petition, followed by the Chimacum Creek Petition.

Brent Butler reported that the BOCC will hold a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Final Docket on June 18th.

Brent Butler reported that the BoCC approved the Climate Change Global Warming Resolution at the regular meeting on May 29th. The City will look at this topic at its July 2nd meeting. The Climate Protection Volunteers have already begun seeking training and funding.

Brent Butler reported on a survey regarding Economic Development. The survey took a random sampling of 1300 local businesses within the county, as well as an inventory of industrial lands. The information could be used in relation to the Industrial Land Bank Comp Plan amendment, if that amendment goes forward to the Final Docket.

Brent Butler welcomed Angela Wade, the new minute taker. Cheryl Halvorson commented that Jeanie Orr will remain the planning secretary, and will still be the main support person.

Brent Butler reported on the next meetings of the Housing Action Plan Network, which will be held at the Pope Marine Park Building in downtown Port Townsend.

At a past meeting it was noted that it is difficult to hear everyone, so Brent Butler provided a microphone for the meeting, although no one chose to use it.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes for April 18th, 2007 were approved as submitted. In discussion, Bud Schindler commented that he had asked staff to look into conflicting direction between Jefferson Co Resolution #54-97 and the Planning Commission Bylaws and he has not yet received a reply.

Brent Butler corrected an error that he made in reference to zero based budgeting. He had stated that the Dept of Defense created it, but in fact it was created by Texas Instruments in the 1960's. The minutes were approved unanimously.

The minutes for May 9th, 2007 were approved as submitted. In discussion, Bud Schindler commented that he wasn't at the meeting, and had requested a copy of Bill Wheeler's PowerPoint presentation but hasn't received it yet. Cheryl Halvorson responded that she requested copies of the PowerPoint from Bill via email, but hadn't received a reply from him. The minutes were approved unanimously.

The minutes for May 16th, 2007 were approved as submitted. In discussion, Bud Schindler commented that he hoped to see Eric Toews at one of the June meetings as the Commission has not yet met him. Bud Schindler also asked about the status of Larry Bonar's request for the critical area documents to be posted on the website. He is concerned that the staff isn't working on the action items developed at meetings. Brent Butler responded that these reports are available at county and city libraries and at the DCD office. They are available for download on the web, but it is too much information to post online. The minutes were approved unanimously.

The minutes for May 23rd, 2007 were approved as submitted. In discussion, Bud Schindler referred to page 11 of the minutes that requested staff to examine the budgetary implications of both the majority and minority proposals. He asked if there was anything to report on this action item. No response from staff. Bud Schindler also commented on a field trip recommendation from Al Latham. Peter Downey said the field trip idea was embraced by the Planning Commission. No motion regarding a field trip had been made. The Chair said that we can revisit the topic later. Bud Schindler referred to page 15 of the minutes, that Jill Silver had ordered 10 copies of the 2 volume DOE Guidance publication. Jill Silver stated that they were ordered but hadn't been received and asked where she should take them once they arrived. Peter Downey said to take them to the DCD office. Bud Schindler referred to page 15 of the minutes regarding weekly meetings. He said these are not reflected in the calendar and requested Mr. Peterson to report on this. Joel Peterson said that there will be deliberation from the commission that will decide on upcoming meetings. Bud Schindler suggested that at least 3 more meetings are needed for discussion. Peter Downey suggested returning to this topic after approving the minutes.

Henry Werch suggested scheduling a field trip as soon as possible. Cheryl Halvorson noted that adequate time would be needed to advertise the field trip. The commissioners agreed on a date of Wednesday, June 20th meeting at WSU Learning Center at 8:00 am and carpooling from there. Peter Downey invited the public to come on the field trip. It was suggested that staff work with Al Latham to choose three sites to visit. Henry Werch said he would like to spend less time visiting Agricultural sites and concentrate more on Rural Residential examples.

Committee Reports:

Bud Schindler asked if there was any news about the MPR EIS. Brent Butler replied that there was not.

Mike Whittaker asked if anyone had followed up with the Governor's office about the sanctions relating to the UGA compliance. Brent Butler responded that a settlement offer had been made late today but he couldn't yet speak to this. It was too soon to know how we would respond.

Public Comments:

Jim Fritz submitted 2 handouts, "A Costly Trade with China" from the Epoch Times by Heide Malhotra, about the adulteration of food products from China, and a Letter to the Editor. He spoke about wildlife in Port Townsend, how there is wildlife habitat available but little food for wildlife, especially in the monoculture tree farms of the Forest Service, DNR, and private timberlands. He said if the state is concerned about preserving habitat, they should start on their own property. His suggestion is that the DNR stop spraying weed killer in timber harvest areas, as this is creating desolate areas with little or no food available for wildlife.

Larry Bonar said that he had made the request that the Critical Areas Committee reports be put on the website. He asked, if that's too hard, if they could be made available on DVD or CD.

Jim Hagen said it would be useful to always have a Land Use Map in the room. In regards to converting forestland to rural residential land, he said it's incredibly difficult. In 2005, a number of these proposals were turned down, at least in part due to lack of political will. In 2005, one of the Comprehensive Plan Policies was to approve a Final Forestlands Ordinance and there is debate as to whether that has been done or not. Right now, we're relying on an Interim Forestland Ordinance. One of the last correspondences from DCD prior to the legislative decision on those applications in 2005 for conversion led him to believe that it hadn't been done. He said that there was lack of final process for conversion. This is just one more difficulty, never mind the process of converting forestland to commercial or industrial use, which he considers very unlikely. These issues also apply to other conversions, such as agriculture to rural residential or commercial and industrial. He asked that the commission take a look at how difficult these conversions can be

Peter Downey returned the discussion to the upcoming schedule. The Commission decided to have meetings each Wednesday in June and July, with a break on Jul 4th. Fish and Wildlife and Channel Zone Migrations are both slated for the June 13th agenda. Mr. Downey suggested Wetlands and Monitoring as agenda items at the June 20th meeting as they are relevant to the field trip the group will take earlier in the day.

Henry Werch said that there was a requirement for Eric Toews, Code writer, to attend meetings with the Commission in the contract that had been submitted. Peter Downey said it is worth discussing; it would be nice for Mr. Toews to attend one meeting with the Commission. He said the Planning Commission would like to meet with him before he completes his work, either June 13th or 20th. Brent Butler said Mr. Toews is tentatively scheduled to attend the Jun 20th meeting. Bud Schindler invited Mr. Toews to the field trip on June 20th. Brent Butler said that he would mention the field trip to Mr. Toews tomorrow.

Henry Werch asked Brent Butler to clarify the definition of “Line In, Line Out”. Brent Butler replied that it meant staff would prepare a document using line in, line out format reflecting the Commission’s discussion.

Peter Downey said the remaining agenda items for June 27th are Administration, Purpose, and Foundational Principles. It was mentioned that the Wetlands may carry over, and possibly other topics.

Joel Peterson referred to a memo from Al Scalf that was handed out under the subject Framework of State Goals and Requirements for Critical Areas Ordinances. This document covers issues relating to critical areas, and leads one through the Planning Enabling Act, Growth Management Act, and additional guidelines and laws that the Commission works with to develop the CAO.

Cheryl Halvorson mentioned that everyone received several handouts for today’s discussion: From the current JCC Code: JCC Article VI-E. Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, JCC Article VI-G. Geologically Hazardous Areas, JCC 18.15.150 Forest resource districts, JCC 18.20.160 Conversions of land to non-forestry use – Forest Practices. The last handout is the coversheet of the draft May 17, 2006 UDC Amendment, with notes that it proposed no amendments to the issues before the Commission tonight.

B. AQUIFER RECHARGE

Cheryl Halvorson said there were no proposals for amendments on Aquifer Recharge in the May 17th draft. Also, the committee made no recommendations for changes either.

William Miller suggested the Commission not do anything. He had compared the current JCC with the Whatcom County Code and found no substantive inconsistencies regarding Aquifer Recharge. His only comment was about how accurate our mapping is. He suggested that the JCC Code 18.15.240-255 be accepted as written.

Edel Sokol referred to WAC 265.195.920 Adapted Management Change in regards to Aquifer Recharge. She read the section and emphasized the statement that “change happens” and that “adaptive management” is required based on evaluation of “strategic monitoring.” She asked if adaptive management is included in our ordinance. Henry Werch responded that adaptive management may be an alternative if there isn’t adequate scientific information for aquifer recharge areas. Ms. Sokol asked if we have adequate scientific knowledge. Mr. Werch suggested that this issue be directed to staff to decide if we should include a paragraph on adaptive management.

Mike Whittaker referred to a DOE guidance document that provides guidance on critical aquifer recharge areas. He said there is a wealth of information in this document, including maps and pictures, and he imagines that there are likely similar documents available on other topics, such as wetlands.

Edel Sokol continued reading from the WAC doc: Step One, identify where ground water resources are located. Brent Butler affirmed that this step had been done. Ms. Sokol continued reading: maps are highly useful in determining public water supply locations, well locations, etc.

Mr. Butler responded that the maps are not complete. Ms. Sokol continued reading: performance standards are the criteria for designation of critical areas. (WAC 190.040). She said she doesn't think we have performance standards as an objective standard for comparison.

Dennis Schultz commented that the Planning Commission had worked on the aquifer recharge issue a few years ago and had addressed all the issues being raised. Peter Downey said he doesn't think the Aquifer Recharge piece needs to be altered and that saltwater intrusion zones have been recorded. William Miller agreed, saying that he recommended the Commission not change it because it seemed to address the issues. Edel Sokol said that we should get going on the science. Mr. Miller said that data has been recorded on Indian Island and Marrowstone Island. He said that the code that we currently have is adequate, and that it hasn't been challenged. Henry Werch asked the staff if it's working as written. Brent Butler responded that it is working and hasn't been challenged and he would leave it as is with the exception of looking at the issue that Ms. Sokol brought up about ongoing maintenance and the adaptive management approach. Mr. Miller said that there are measurements that can be taken on saltwater intrusion to determine if it's a high risk area and there should be a specific basis for designation of a critical aquifer recharge area. Ms. Sokol handed the WAC document to staff. Bud Schindler referred to the WRIA 17 issue and what information that might provide. While it may not be something the Commission wants to or can address now, it may be something for research

William Miller moved that the Planning Commission recommend that current Article VI-E Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, JCC 18.15.240, .245, .250 and .255 be accepted as written. JD Gallant seconded the motion.

Edel Sokol offered a friendly amendment that the motion be amended to include language "where the science is lacking that we will use adaptive management and monitoring." The friendly amendment was accepted.

Mike Whittaker commented that an effort needs to be made to update the maps. He would like to see the county make a commitment to improving the maps. JD Gallant asked who decided that "science is lacking?" Does this mean no science, or insufficient science? Peter Downey said this is an administrative decision.

The motion as amended was approved unanimously (8-0-0).

Edel Sokol asked if we need to add BAS? There was some discussion as to whether it was already included in the code or not. Peter Downey suggested that it could be added later if needed.

C. FORESTRY

Cheryl Halvorson listed the reference materials for forestry that were handed out. She also mentioned that the May 17th draft proposed no changes to the forestry section.

William Miller said he would like to bring forth a motion regarding conversion of lands to non-forestry use. It is not currently clear in the code what buffer size would be established regarding the land to be converted. He would like clear language in JCC 18.20.160 that establishes buffer

size for Environmentally Sensitive Areas. There was discussion that this addition may be redundant as it's mentioned elsewhere in the code, but Mr. Miller would like to see it spelled out specifically in this section. He said that there is language regarding the enforcement for penalties currently in the code that leaves it open to the court system to assign penalties. He didn't think this was adequate.

William Miller moved that the code writer add text to JCC 18.20.160, conversion of lands to non-forestry use, to clarify that buffer sizes established for the protection of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (see JCC 18.10.050) will apply to those forest resource lands that will be subject to the jurisdiction of Jefferson County upon their being converted (see JCC 18.15.210 (6)) to non-forestry uses. JD Gallant seconded the motion.

William Miller explained that essentially, the motion includes text specifying that land uses that are the result of conversions from non-forestry use shall be subject to buffer sizes established for the protection of Environmentally Sensitive Areas.

In discussion, Peter Downey asked if this would apply to all conversion of forest lands. William Miller replied that if land is under forest practices, or forest jurisdiction, it's under DNR, the feds, or the state. Under a conversion to non-forestry, Jefferson County then has authority, or jurisdiction, over the use and zoning. What Mr. Miller wants to make clear is what setbacks, boundaries, etc. the land is subject to under such a conversion. Although this information can be found elsewhere in the code, he had to bounce back and forth through the sections to find it, and would prefer that it be directly spelled out in JCC 18.20.160.

Jill Silver, a member of the CAO Advisory Group, referred to Report #2, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas, on page 9-10. She read from section B. Forest Practices Class IV General Conversions. "Parcels proposed for conversion shall be assessed for critical areas including CMZs, streams, geologic hazards, critical aquifer recharge zones, and wetlands, and those areas shall be buffered in accordance with the corresponding section of the JCC." She continued that when someone applies to DNR for a Class IV Conversion, the county is notified and the county can then choose to assess the property for critical areas, and at that point can request, or have in the code, that the critical area buffers be applied.

The Chair invited Ross Goodwin, DNR Jefferson County, to address this topic. Ross Goodwin said if DNR receives an application for a conversion permit, DNR does not accept it, but hands it over to the County for SEPA review. Then it is returned to DNR for their process. Essentially, the County gets the application first. Mike Whittaker asked how many conversions they have processed in the past few years. Mr. Goodwin answered that it was maybe 40-50 a year. Edel Sokol thought SEPA will take care of this issue.

Peter Downey was not sure the motion language is clear. William Miller responded that the point was that the motion would add language to the code that conversions would be subject to the critical areas buffers.

Patricia Farmer asked for clarification in a case where a parcel of land under Class IV Conversion forest management rule is bordering a stream and on the other side of the stream is another parcel of land that has been cleared. She said that if the cleared land is subject to the CAO, she would suggest that the Class IV land also fall under the County CAO. Edel Sokol

responded that the SEPA review would come into play at that point. Peter Downey said that the SEPA review will only get so far if there is nothing referencing it in the code. Discussion continued on SEPA and how it applies to residential land. Ross Goodwin pointed out that building permits are exempt from SEPA.

Peter Downey suggested revising the motion as a friendly amendment: Parcels proposed for conversion shall be assessed for Environmentally Sensitive Areas, as defined by CAO, and those areas that are identified as Environmentally Sensitive Areas, shall be buffered in accordance with the CAO. William Miller accepted the friendly amendment. It was pointed out that if it was redundant, the code writer could inform the Planning Commission and it could be changed later.

The commissioners discussed how a conversion is administered. Henry Werch was concerned that the code be clear on who would be doing the review and that it should be reflected in the forestry section.

Mike Whittaker added that, when harvesting without a permit, the County shall impose a 6 year moratorium on the land. He wondered how that was administered, saying the code was not clear. The moratorium should run with the parcel and not with the owner. William Miller agreed that, yes, a 6 year moratorium applies to the land, not the owner. Brent Butler affirmed as well that it has always been understood this way. The Commission decided to include this language to make it more clear and public-friendly.

Peter Downey summarized the motion on the floor: Parcels proposed for conversion shall be assessed for Environmentally Sensitive Areas, as defined by CAO, and those areas that are identified as Environmentally Sensitive Areas shall be buffered in accordance with the CAO. In the case of illegal harvesting, the 6 year moratorium runs with the land, not the owner and indicates the body that does the assessment.

The motion, as amended, was approved unanimously (8-0-0).

Edel Sokol moved that the Bill Wheeler Report #13 on Forestry be included into the code as appropriate but on Page 2, under (k) change the language from 5000 board feet of timber to 5504 board feet of timber. Bud Schindler seconded the motion.

Edel Sokol said that she had learned from a trucker that one truckload is 5504 board feet. At Peter Downey's invitation Ross Goodwin, DNR, said that it varies from truck to truck but a truckload was typically 5000 board feet.

Edel Sokol withdrew that part of the motion so that the motion would only direct the code writer to include Report #13 as appropriate.

JD Gallant said he thought the Commission had discussed not including extra documents, but instead providing specific language for motions. It was affirmed that the group had decided to just give specifics, rather than the reports that the code writer already has. Henry Werch thought it was important to let the code writer know if something had general consensus or if there was disagreement. William Miller said that his evaluation of Report #13 was that it was generally addressed in the existing code.

Discussion continued as to whether there is controversy around Report #13, Forestry Report and Recommendations, by Bill Wheeler. They thought that, if there are specific parts of Report #13 that should be added, the Commission should call those out. Patricia Farmer asked about trees being cut down for views and whether this issue is included in the report. There was consensus that this is an issue along shorelines and streams. William Miller said that it is already covered in the code.

Patricia Farmer said that protecting views shouldn't be in the ordinance and proposed a friendly amendment to remove the language in Report #13 on protecting views (#2 on the bottom of Page 2). William Miller seconded the amendment. The idea was that view issues should be addressed somewhere else in the code rather than in the critical areas section.

In discussion, Edel Sokol said that she sees the language as a restriction on cutting trees, not encouragement to do so. Patricia Farmer disagreed and said that she sees it as encouragement to cut trees to protect views, and wants to remove the language from the ordinance. Brent Butler said that the Shoreline Management Plan allows only limited trees to be removed from the shoreline buffer zone. Ms. Sokol said that removing the language on views would discourage the public's acceptance of the Land Trust. Ms. Farmer said that she understands that this is a very controversial topic, and she doesn't think the CAO is the best place for it to be addressed. Henry Werch pointed out that the introduction to the Add to Allowed Use Section of the report begins with "Except where restricted by conservation easements or similar restrictive covenants." He said that the allowed use of cutting trees for view purposes is restricted in buffer zones. Ms. Farmer withdrew her amendment.

The original motion on the floor is to agree to send Forestry Report #13 by Bill Wheeler forward as is. Under discussion, Peter Downey stated that the code writer would use this report to assist in drafting the code.

William Miller said that he still did not understand why the view issue was being addressed in the critical areas code. Peter Downey replied that it was because it pertained to critical areas buffers.

Bud Schindler suggested amending the motion to add commercial tree breeding activities to produce seeds to the Exemption or Allowed Use Section as (s) on Page 2. He also proposed changing the language of (l) under Allowed Use Section on Page 2 to read "emergency fire control, **prevention** and suppression." It would allow removal of danger trees.

The motion on the floor, as amended, is to agree to send Forestry Report #13 by Bill Wheeler forward, to add commercial tree breeding activities to produce seeds to the Exempt or Allowed Use Section as (S) on Page 2, and to change the language of (l) under Exempt or Allowed Use Section on Page 2 to read "emergency fire control, **prevention** and suppression."

The motion was approved with six in favor and two opposed (6-2-0).

Regarding Forestry Report #13, Patricia Farmer moved to change the language in section 2.2 on Page 3, to say: "Trees greater than 12 inches in diameter at breast height shall be preserved, but may be shaped, windowed/thinned or pruned, **but not topped**." Henry Werch seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued as to the inappropriateness of topping trees.

The motion was approved with seven in favor and one opposed (7-1-0).

D. GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS

A motion was brought forward by William Miller, to accept the current Article VI-G Geologically Hazardous Areas, JCC 18.15.270, .275 and .280 as written. Edel Sokol seconded the motion.

William Miller reiterated that he would like the maps brought up to date, but otherwise he compared the current text to that of Whatcom County and found that it is adequate. He said the issue was not part of the Settlement Agreement or the appeal. Peter Downey was concerned about the lack of enforcement regarding geo-hazards. It was agreed that enforcement could not be affected by changing the code.

The motion was unanimously approved (8-0-0).

Before moving on to public comments, the Commission talked more about the calendar. The agenda for June 13 will be CMZs and Fish and Wildlife. The June 20 agenda will be on Wetlands with the field trip in the morning.

Edel Sokol requested that there be a large land use map, including the West End and park overlays, available for future meetings. Brent Butler said he would provide a map.

Bud Schindler raised the issue of the Planning Commission having enough time to review the code writer's draft. They agreed to change the schedule so the Commission will have July 11 and July 18 for review and to make changes. The legal notice will appear on July 25 for a public hearing on August 8.

Public Comment:

Roger Short, Chimacum, said that the discussion on time confirms his feelings that this is set up, and has been manipulated either by the Board or the staff. He also said that the maps need to be more accurate. He has had issues with the maps on his own land and suggested that they need to be more accurate to gain the public's acceptance.

Jill Silver suggested that the Planning Commission members revisit the geo-hazard section of the May 9th minutes. On page 3, the minority recommends that CMZs be adopted and incorporated in critical areas. CMZs incorporate a number of migrating geo-hazards and they mostly occur in the mapped high hazard zones. The high hazard zones have been mapped by geoscientists and the Bureau of Reclamation, and have been identified on the big rivers on the East side. She suggested that the Commission look at the comparison table in Report #2 that lists which counties have included CMZs in their geo-hazard sections. She pointed out that there are definite geo-hazards in the CMZs and it's not necessarily the same process that would be followed as what is in the current code.

Denny Schultz said that, regarding Jill Silver's comment, only 4 members of the subcommittee recommended including CMZs. The other 14 members recommend doing nothing with CMZs.

Dick Broders said that the maps for CAO are for information only, with one exception, Aquifer Recharge. Accurate maps are needed for Aquifer Recharge and those are the most inaccurate. He referred to a Geology Map of the area. He said this is the map that the County referenced when establishing critical aquifer recharge areas. When he was on the Planning Commission about 10 years ago he did an analysis of the Geology map with well-log documentation and found the error rate to be 70% to 95% because only surface information is recorded on the map. He doesn't have a suggestion on how to get better maps, and suggested possibly studying well-log data to produce a better map.

Norm MacLeod preceded his comment by saying that it is not meant to criticize specific staff. He said that since the last CAO has been adopted, legislative and WAC changes have been made, and asked why staff hasn't been asked to report on these changes. He said that a comparison between such a report and what is currently in the ordinance would surely necessitate some changes in the ordinance. Mr. MacLeod continued that there is not adequate science for Aquifer Recharge. There is wide variation between the DOE and USGS aquifer recharge data. In regards to individual parcels, he gave Sunfield Farm as an example. Sunfield has significantly changed their farming methodologies, and he doesn't think it's been considered how that will impact aquifer recharge areas. He has heard from a retired glacial geomorphologist that the glacial structures underneath this area are among the most complex in the world. So, he emphasized, we do not have enough science for Aquifer Recharge. Regarding land conversions, Mr. MacLeod asked the Commission to consider conversion to something other than residential. What happens then? Mr. MacLeod also spoke about the framework memo that was received today for the first time. He was surprised that the senior staff is just providing this information now when they've been reviewing this topic for over 1 year.

Larry Bonar quoted a portion of the report referred to by Mr. MacLeod. On page 12 of the Memorandum re: Framework of State Goals, it says "Where there is an absence of valid scientific information..., counties and cities should use the following approach: (1) A precautionary or no-risk approach, in which development and land-use activities are strictly limited until the uncertainty is sufficiently resolved. (2) As an interim approach, an effective adaptive management program..." He suggested adding this language.

Jim Hagen, Cape George, referred to the memo, saying that sometimes it is easy to overlook the context that you're making decisions by. On page 27, it talks about criteria governing Planning Commission assessment – the growth management indicators. He suggested that these are the guidelines the Commission should base their recommendations on. He also commented on the statement about submitting whole reports to the code writer. He didn't understand what was meant by "if they were challenged or not" and didn't think this would really matter. He would avoid the outlook that a report be disregarded or accepted based on whether it was challenged.

Jim Fritz said that, in regards to tree topping and trimming, power companies should be exempt. Also, he said that insurance companies often require a fire buffer zone, about 30' around a home, and the code shouldn't conflict with this requirement.

Frank Hoffman referred to Bud Schindler's comments on action items directed to staff. He asked how you would know that the things requested tonight will actually occur if staff doesn't follow up. He said that there is often a disconnect between the staff and the Planning Commission. He asked whether the items discussed tonight will reach the code writer.

Dennis Shultz said that CC and R's quite commonly have mandatory tree topping. He suggested the Commission should consider that.

George Yount gave thanks for the work that everyone is doing. He said that the consistency between counties is helpful.

Roger Short asked why the code writer was not present at the meeting.

Norm MacLeod said that sharing at the BOCC public comment period on Monday morning at 9:00 is the best way to get the County's attention. He was referring to Peter Downey's code enforcement comment.

Chair closed the public comment period.

E. ADJOURNMENT

Edel Sokol asked staff if the comment about Sunfield Farm had been addressed, noting that there is a PUD wellhead there. Brent Butler responded that Environmental Health may have dealt with it, but he couldn't confirm that.

Mike Whittaker requested a staff report at the next meeting with an update on what the code writer has done to date.

Peter Downey reviewed the agenda for the June 13th meeting: CMZs, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, and an update from staff on the code writer's progress.

Edel Sokol suggested that the Commission look at the Jefferson County map at the next meeting.

Brent Butler thanked Cheryl Halvorson for all of her efforts. There was unanimous applause.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:37 pm.

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

These minutes were approved this _____ day of June, 2007.

Peter Downey, Chair

Angela Wade, Secretary

