

**PLANNING COMMISSION
 COMMISSIONERS HEARING ROOM, COUPEVILLE, WA
 TUESDAY MAY 13, 2008**

	<i>Members Present</i>	<i>Members Absent</i>
<i>District 1</i>	<i>Val Hillers</i>	
	<i>Ray Gabelein</i>	
	<i>Mike Joselyn</i>	
<i>District 2</i>		<i>Vacant</i>
	<i>Bill Massey</i>	
	<i>Alan Schell</i>	
<i>District 3</i>	<i>Wayne Havens</i>	
	<i>Deb Eidsness via video link</i>	
	<i>Scott Yonkman</i>	

Meeting called to order at 9:01 a.m. by Chair Val Hillers

ROLL CALL

Alan Schell, Mike Joselyn, Val Hillers, Ray Gabelein, Bill Massey, Scott Yonkman, Wayne Havens and Deb Eidsness via video link

Chair Hillers recognized the Planning Commission was one member short due to Sheilah Criders' resignation. Ms. Crider served on the Planning Commission for 14 years and did a superb job. Chair Hillers asked that Ms. Criders' contributions be recognized, stating the Commission would miss her wisdom.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The process was discussed. In the past the position of chair had been rotated by district. Chair Hillers asked if this was a requirement or simply tradition.

Jeff Tate stated he had checked the by-laws and it was not a requirement.

Ray Gabelein nominated Commissioner Alan Schell, Commissioner Mike Joselyn seconded the nomination.

Commissioner Schell stated he lives in a different district due to a recent move and asked if this would present a problem.

Mr. Tate stated he had not found anything that presents a conflict within the ordinance itself. He stated he should bring this to the Board of County Commissioners to see if they feel they need to make a modification.

Commissioner Alan Schell nominated Ray Gabelein, Commissioner Bill Massey seconded the nomination.

Commissioner Gabelein asked if there wasn't a provision that allowed a Commissioner to complete their unexpired term regardless of whether they have changed districts.

Mr. Tate stated he looked at the language in the Code and the only thing he could find related to removal and the factors that should be considered for removal are based around unethical or illegal conduct or lack of attendance.

Commissioner Gabelein stated he felt Commissioner Schell should be allowed to finish his term of service.

Mr. Tate stated the Commission was scheduled to meet again on May 27th, and since the only action items on this agenda were approval of minutes and several signatures of Findings of Fact from last year, today could proceed as primarily a meeting and discussion session with Chair Hillers maintaining the role of chair, and he will confirm whether it was an issue.

Commissioner Massey moved to defer the election to the next meeting. Commissioner Yonkman seconded, the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Chair Hillers advised there were four sets of minutes for formal approval; December 11, 2007, December 13, 2007, December 18, 2007, deliberations on the Wetlands and February 22, 2008.

Commissioner Mike Joselyn moved to approve all minutes as presented. Commissioner Ray Gabelein seconded, motion carried unanimously.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Jeff Tate started with the 2008 Planning Commission Work Plan binder. He advised the 2008 Planning Commission schedule is the first item in the binder and discussed the general outline. He asked the Commission to review to see if any dates show an obvious conflict. He stated he has tried to put an education item on each agenda to spend a few minutes to discuss something going on in the department, County or Legislature to help the Commission be better informed.

Commissioner Schell stated beginning in the fall he would have a conflict with his teaching schedule which means he must leave by noon on Tuesdays. Most meetings would be concluded by noon, but when they go over he would have to leave early.

Mr. Tate stated that when Planning Commission makes their recommendation and advances it to the Board he would like to keep the Planning Commission better informed of the outcome. He discussed methods of keeping the Commission members abreast of final documents and the means by which they would prefer to receive the information. Each member will choose their preferred method and advise the Department.

Wetland Ordinance Update

Two update items the Planning Commission dealt with in 2007 were Freeland and Wetlands. On March 17, 2008 the BOICC adopted the Wetlands Ordinance with 7 amendments to the Planning Commissions' recommendation. One of which was the implementation date. They modified some of the language regarding land use intensity, spreading it out into more categories of parcel size and clearing limits. There were some amendments advanced by DOE regarding mitigation banks and references to State Administrative Code (WAC) that had changed and required technical changes.

Since March 17th a core team of staff is working on all of the administrative things required, such as changing the Development Information Bulletins, attempting to describe the ordinance in plain language, changing applications, developing databases to track information, developing new forms required to be recorded as well as outreach to other departments and the public. There is a mailer going out to contractors, developers and to the skilled trades; those working on the ground. There is a long list of things required before July 1.

A week after the implementation date the Planning Commission will meet and discuss with a more comprehensive briefing. If there are questions that arise from the Planning Commission they can be addressed as well as discussing the on the ground application, learned from an administrative side as the Department determines how to implement the words.

Commissioner Massey asked what type of feedback has been received.

Mr. Tate stated the feedback has been very fruitful. Prior to adoption, Staff went out to twenty properties and tested this using staff with both knowledge of wetland and some without any knowledge of wetlands together with property owners and wetlands people from the Department of Ecology. This process was very enlightening, using the wetland ID guide, determining which questions showed inconsistencies in the answers. After the trial run, staff tweaked some of the questions to make the problem questions clearer, not with any substantive changes or changes to point value but with clarifying language. The Board adopted the worksheets in the guide, not the guide itself allowing tweaking of the

way questions are stated. As this evolves there will be more changes, but the bulk of the confusing areas have been addressed.

Freeland Sub Area Plan and designation as a NMUGA

The Planning Commission passed on their recommendation to the Board of Commission in late fall 2007, the Board held a public hearing in December and adopted the Freeland Sub Area Plan with some minor modifications and designated Freeland as a Non-Municipal Urban Growth Area. In February the Board signed their Findings, supporting that designation and adoption. The findings are lengthy and include a section setting forth a course of modifying the regulations. The sub area plan is a policy plan which does not address the regulations. The Board adopted the policy plan which guides how the development regulation should be written. State law requires that the regulation and the policy plan be consistent with each other. The policy plan is adopted the Findings of Fact establish a schedule for adopting the development regulations that support the plan and implement the plan. It also establishes a schedule for adoption of development and adoption of other supporting policy plans. The Freeland Sub Area Plan and NMUGA is a land use plan, but the infrastructure must be created and adopted to support the land use.

There was an appeal of the Freeland Sub Area Plan and NMUGA. That appeal goes before the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board. The petition lays out the issues, most of which related to Freeland Hill. It is to be heard by the GMHB here in Coupeville August 21st.

The BOICC thus far had been reluctant to direct staff to spend a lot of time and effort writing development regulations until the appeal is complete. We won't know what the end product will be until the appeal process is final.

Commission Gabelein stated he hoped there was some work that could be done that would mesh with whatever outcome of an appeal might be. He stated he was concerned with the frustration in the Freeland Community if this is delayed too long.

Mr. Tate advised that intensification of development can't occur until the infrastructure is in place. Discussion with the Board on how to move forward with the plan is ongoing.

Legislative Update

The first GMA bill, the Evergreen Communities Act ESSB 2844, deals with voluntary urban forestry programs and encouraging jurisdiction to develop forest retention and preservation programs for urban communities. It is a voluntary program. The Board could direct the Department or the Planning Commission to work on this, but there is nothing mandatory at this time.

The second Bill is ESSB 6580 which is a GMA amendment to incorporate a climate change element within a local jurisdictions' Comprehensive Plan. There was a lot of discussion on this bill as it moved through the Legislature. It originally came out as a mandatory element within Comprehensive Plans; the Legislature changed it to be a voluntary program where they are seeking pilot projects for counties to try to work in a climate change element. An incentive to encourage local jurisdictions to do that was indicated as it is not subject to GMA appeal. There are all sorts of conversations regarding how a local jurisdiction through land use policy can effect climate change. It allows counties to try to try to build something on their own.

Commissioner Gabelein questioned whether the Legislature was passing voluntary laws.

Mr. Tate responded in the GMA there are mandatory elements and voluntary elements. There are approximately 6 mandatory elements, but there are also several that are voluntary. The County actually has a couple of elements within our Comprehensive Plan that are not required under GMA but were done.

Commissioner Gabelein stated he found it interesting that the State talks about the transportation related green house gas emissions and the need for foreign oil, stating that transportation is the largest source of green house gas emissions in Washington. He stated that if the State did a better job of providing ferry service, people wouldn't be driving around in circles trying to get on and off the island. Maybe if the State spent their time solving that problem first before they spend time writing voluntary legislation.

Mr. Tate stated he struggled with how a rural community addresses this versus a urban community. There are many more ways to address this issue in an urban environment regarding transit and ways to achieve compact development that are more attainable than in a rural environment. We are encouraged to have low density, which in turn means people must drive further for services. There are many concerns at the State level concerning the I-5 corridor and 405 with cars idling or moving very slowly. It seems like the objective is noble and these crisis situations that are contributing to the problem need to be addressed.

Commissioner Gabelein stated there are a lot of cars idling in slow moving ferry lines and people taking a couple of different ferries where they used to just take the Keystone ferry. He stated that he personally felt if the State did a better job of doing what they are suppose to be doing instead of spending time on things like this we would be better off.

Mr. Tate stated these two bills were the only ones he wanted to expound on, unless the Commission had any questions on the remainder of the legislative update.

Mr. Massey asked Mr. Tate to look into the Housing Act to see whether it would impose requirements that might limit the County's ability to give special consideration for affordable housing projects.

Mr. Tate replied there were two pieces that might affected the issue. In addition to the Housing Act, SSB 5524 would need to be looked at during the Affordable Housing update.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Hillers stated there were a few items that needed to be done to rap up the 2007 docket, the first was adoption of the Findings of Fact on ZAA 012/07 Biershenk. She asked if there were any questions or changes.

Commissioner Gabelein moved to approve the Findings on the Rezone of ZAA 012/07. Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.

The next item is the adoption of Findings on the Public Right of Way Segregation. Again Chair Hillers called for questions or comments.

Mr. Massey moved to adopt the Findings on Right of Way Segregation as presented. Commissioner Joselyn seconded, motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

The 2008 Docket

Mr. Tate advised there are two items on the 2008 docket. The first is a submittal by Seattle Pacific University to designate Camp Casey Conference Center as an Existing Master Planned Resort. The second item is related to affordable housing.

Affordable Housing

Handout: Affordable Housing Briefing Paper.

The topic before the Planning Commission in the next couple of years will be several matters on affordable housing in the 2008 docket and there will also be some items in 2009. He stated he wanted to discuss other actions occurring outside of the confines of the Planning Commission on this issue.

Mr. Tate advised the gap between the median income and the average cost of a home has steadily widened between 1989 and 2005, making it increasingly difficult for lower income households to achieve home ownership.

In the brief provided, the table shows three time frames across the top, breaking up the average median income into eight year periods for which good data was available. It shows a steady income increase of 33% for each eight year period. The second shows the gap between the average cost of a home and the loan amount those in the affordable housing target group qualify for. The gap between these two figures has increased in far

greater numbers than the income increases. The figure has steadily rises from an 89% gap to a 121% gap.

All of the materials prepared over the last 25 years on affordable housing say the same thing, the gap continually widens. There has not been a coordinated effort to address this problem. There are many different groups that have an influence on housing costs; government can influence housing prices, private industry, and utility providers. There are roles for non-profit organizations; a lot of different groups could participate in a strategy for addressing affordable housing in Island County.

Commissioner Schell asked if the median income household represents two incomes.

Mr. Tate stated it represented two income households as well as one. It is going to be different from household to household. This is an average median of all households that bring income in Island County. It tries to come up with an average of what is normal.

Commissioner Schell stated the number was a key number and would like to understand it better.

Mr. Tate stated this is a number that is provided through census data and State information. He said he would like to provide the commission with the factors that go into considering what median income is.

Chair Hillers added that a median is different than an average. It is a count, the middle count so to speak.

Commissioner Schell stated the average housing cost should probably be a median house cost due to the fact that we have some houses that are in excess of a million dollars and when you take an average it becomes skewed. He stated the range of housing needs to be looked at and remove the million dollar homes that skew the numbers.

Chair Hillers stated it might be better to look at the range of the lower third of the houses and remove the excessively expensive houses that skew the average cost.

Mr. Tate stated that in January, Commissioner Massey approached the department regarding the Planning Commission looking at affordable housing in the 2008 docket. He submitted a sponsored packet of amendments that have not been included today, but will be included at the next meeting May 27th.

Staff will provide more information and more ideas of what can be done at a county level. The next meeting will address what things can take place immediately and addressed in 2008 and what is expected to be addressed in 2009. While Commissioner Massey has advanced a sponsored amendment to the Department for the Commissions' docket, the County's Council of Governments also started talking about affordable housing. The COG consist of the County, the two Cities, the Town and the Port Authorities; a collection of the governments in Island County.

After a meeting in January on this issue, the direction from the Council of Governments was to contact the planning staff of Langley, Coupeville, Oak Harbor and the County and the Island County Housing Authority, getting together to start developing an approach to bring together groups, agencies and individuals who have roles here and in the summer put on a summit conversation, trying to move that into some kind of action plan.

He asked for input regarding the suggested list of participants to attend an Affordable Housing Symposium attached to this briefing. Those whom might have ideas of other names or agencies to add to the list were invited to provide suggestions.

He said he would like to build on past efforts. In 2005 there was an affordable housing conference held down at Greenbank that included a lot of names on this list. Notes were taken and those will be provided at the May 27th meeting. The 2005 conference outlined a lot of the issues. There were different concerns that came up, different segments that need to be looked at such as senior houses, low income housing and people who have disabilities and their housing needs. There are different strategies, different gaps, different things that need to be addressed for different types of populations in need of housing. He stated he would be providing this information as a backbone, a place to begin a strategy to move forward.

Commissioner Gabelein stated regulations; whether Federal, State or County impact the cost of homes. He feels these needs to be taken into consideration during this discussion. He stated the State should be brought into that conversation, specifically not mandating regulations that drive up the cost of housing and then asking counties why they don't have affordable housing. The five, ten, twenty acre parcel sizes in the rural area have already blown out affordable housing in those areas.

Commissioner Massey stated he had the pleasure of chairing a committee of board members of the Saratoga Housing Group and their goal was to look at the Comprehensive Plan relative to affordable housing, looking at specific items that might be addressed which would give the County an opportunity to enact ordinances that actually create an opportunity for improvement of opportunities for affordable housing. What is now in the Comp Plan is merely lip service without providing tools to accomplish it.

The committee came up with a series of modifications to the implementation strategies of the housing element that might give the County an opportunity to enact ordinances now rather than later. He stated other Counties are doing this sort of thing up and down the State and Island County could do the same thing. He hopes the some of the ideas they are putting forward would lead to a change in the Comp Plan which would subsequently lead to changes in specific ordinances.

Mr. Massey handed out a copy of what he had submitted so that the Commissioners could read it and update themselves.

Commissioner Yonkman discussed pulling some numbers together, both structural requirements and regulatory, permit based that effect the price of housing.

Commissioner Schell stated he would like to look at the inventory of lower priced houses to see what is actually available.

Chair Hillers suggested looking at the lower third of the housing market.

Commissioner Gabelein stated he is seeing middle income people having problems. He stated school enrollment is a good indicator of the problem, it has steadily decreased. The lack of good paying jobs and affordable housing are both contributing factors.

Chair Hillers called for a break at 10:15 a.m., back on the record at 10:30 a.m.

DESIGNATION OF CAMP CASEY CONFERENCE CENTER AS AN EXISTING MASTER PLANNED RESORT

Hand-outs:

- CPA 400/07 SPU Application
- Camp Casey Master Plan
- SEPA Checklist
- Forest Management Plan
- Artist Rendition of the what it would like after full development
- Staff Report
- Revised Mitigated Determination of Non-significance
- Concurring Comment by Holly Gadbow, WWGMHB

Anthony Boscolo, Planner for this project provided a history of the designation of A Master Planned Resort. It is relatively new to Island County Code. Holly Gadbow a member of the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGBHB) provided some clarification in a concurring comment in the Final Decision and Order in Case No. 03-2-0008.

Mr. Boscolo stated the application itself was included with the other documentation, showing how the applicant meets the criteria of the Existing Master Planned Resort, both in the Comp Plan and the Island County Code.

The Master Plan is a guiding document that outlines development standards, locations and existing uses; how they change by size, how the uses would technically change and where a few new uses would be added, such as a small shop and possible coffee stand for the users of the site. Pages 6-17 provide a background of the document.

On page 28, figure 5 shows the illustration of the site plan. There are six new retreats being proposed; four lie within the forested area of the site, two are infill and would be visible from Engle Rd. There are forty small cabins being proposed as well, within the

forested area. Relocation of existing forested camp sites is also being proposed. Details of all the structures are located on pages 27 and 28 in the Master Plan.

The next section discussed was on page 43, regarding development standards. The site is located within Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve which requires additional level of standards to maintain the existing structures including the look and feel of the site with specific architectural standards. SPU is taking additional steps beyond what is required to maintain as much of the forest as possible.

The Master Plan is the guiding document for future development of the site. The Master Plan outlines the largest development that would be allowed on the site, but does not commit the applicant to develop to full capacity. There is a small amount of fluctuation that would be allowed within the County Code, but a ten percent deviation from the plan would require a return before the Board for approval of those deviations. It is a binding document that lays forth the plan for the site.

The next document, the SEPA checklist was discussed. The SEPA review is limited to the idea of this Master Plan. Additional conditions that will guide the development are contained within the SEPA Revised Mitigated Determination of Non-significance document.

There are number of attachments with the SEPA checklist that detail transportation, the number of vehicles that will be increased due to the development. It talks about how waste water will be dealt with, via onsite septic. It addresses the impacts on the local roads and the community. It also discusses where the water will come from, specifically the Coupeville water supply. An analysis was done determining there is sufficient water for the development as outlined.

Commissioner Massey asked for clarification of the 10% deviation. Would it be for total development or individual buildings?

Mr. Boscolo stated the total could not exceed the threshold without further review.

Commissioner Schell asked if there had been a perc test and where the septic fields were going to be located.

Mr. Boscolo replied there are a series of drain fields that show in the Master Plan. What is planned is rather unusual; they plan to use some of the water that comes from the treatment system for irrigating the ball fields. It will be fully treated and they hope to also use it to flush the toilets if it will be allowed. The Health Department has reviewed the treatment system and support the treatment system as an improvement to the ground water in the area.

Mr. Tate pointed out under the SEPA Checklist there are technical memorandums that discuss in greater detail the questions regarding water, septic and traffic issues.

The Forest Management Plan discusses the inventory of the forest, the sizes of the trees, showing the development. There is an area to the north on the site that is considered a Heritage Forest, a designated critical area in Island County Code. The proposed development is 100 feet to the south of the boundary that their forester has drawn. Within the Forest Management Plan they cover the impacts to the forest and the area. There are also a series of Best Management Practices (BMP's) that the forester believes SPU should follow when developing the site, these are reflected in the Revised MDNS.

The Staff Report indicates how the applicant follows the code, shows how they qualify as an Existing Master Planned Resort. It discusses the criteria in the code that outline what an area has to have to be considered, such as being in existence prior to 1990, containing a certain amount of acreage and being better used as an Existing Master Planned Resort than for forestry or agricultural purposes.

The current zoning for the site is Rural, without this Existing Master Plan Designation the applicant would not be allowed by the County to go forward and to apply for some of these new proposals. As an existing facility, they would be allowed to continue with existing activities, but could not expand. The Existing Master Plan allows the County and the public to get involved and establish a blueprint of the direction they will go and lay out how this can be achieved.

The standards within the Comprehensive Plan and the language with the Island County Code are both met by this plan and the Department recommends approval.

Chair Hillers clarified that approval will only approve the overall concept of a Master Plan, not the development. Mr. Boscolo confirmed that is correct. The individual pieces would still need to be analyzed.

Mr. Tate expanded on that idea, this is a phased review. The first phase of the review is the concept. The Master Plan, the code amendments that have been put together and are before the Planning Commission right now refer to the fact that there are lots of ordinances that need to be adhered to. Each one of those development proposals will have to adhere to the specific regulations, one of which is the NEW CAO. The Heritage Forest has been delineated by SPU with a boundary that is larger than the boundary on the County's map, provided by DNR. There are standards that they must adhere to.

The conceptual plan will occur over decades, not years. The plan is binding. If SPU sells the property a new owner would have to adhere to the plan or start this process all over. Included in the materials is the WWGMHB concurring comment by Holly Gadbow, outlining the fact that in 1998 the GMA was amended to include RCW 36.78.360 and 362 to allow for the kind of uses that exist and are planned at Camp Casey.

Chair Hillers opened the meeting to questions by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Eidsness commented regarding the Heritage Forest critical area in this plan providing a fantastic opportunity for education in regards to the new Critical Area Ordinance.

Commissioner Massey asked about a time limitation as found in most binding Site Plan.

Mr. Tate stated it is beyond a binding Site Plan. It is essentially a Chapter to the Comprehensive Plan and becomes a policy document that is incorporated into that plan with some accompanying development regulation to implement that plan.

Commissioner Schell asked if this is open-ended how it would be affected if regulations change.

Mr. Tate explained that implementing ordinances for critical areas is what will govern critical areas. Existing CAO standards at the time of development would apply.

Commissioner Yonkman asked what the indications were from SPU if this weren't allowed to go through.

Darrel Hinds, project manager stated they were extremely hopefully that the project would be approved, advised the money that is generated at Camp Casey Conference Center, remains there to maintain the buildings and the grounds. However, the money the students or parents pay to go to school at the SPU campus isn't diverted here.

If it didn't happen, SPU struggles to maintain the older facilities in the condition that they should be maintained, the buildings take more and more money as they age. New monies are needed to help maintain the facilities.

Commissioner Yonkman reads from the application. SPU would likely have to sell all or part for redevelopment without such expansion.

Mr. Hinds stated he tried to avoid stating that, but it is obvious however, some adjustment will be needed if new revenue is not made to address the cost of maintaining these older facilities.

Commissioner Schell asked about current and future staffing if this were implemented.

Mr. Hinds stated current staff is 11, which would be expected to increase to 16 with 9 seasonal employees.

Mr. Gabelein stated he hoped the project would be approved and feels the County is fortunate to have this kind of an owner there; it is obvious the property has been well cared for. The water reuse plan is going to be superior in the fact that the water will be put back into the ground where it came from. The purple pipe system proposed should be done more in Island County. He further stated this is an opportunity to allow private

enterprise to generate sufficient money to take care and maintain a historic facility instead of using tax dollars.

Commissioner Yonkman asked whether there is a demand for the type of facilities that is being proposed.

Mr. Hinds stated the demand is less secure due to the economic condition of the State. Years back when the facilities were newer there was more of a demand. The types of facilities that are there do not attract adult groups because these aren't the type of the facilities these groups need.

Commissioner Schell asked about the school being used for scientific research and whether that would be interfered with in the future by the proposal being too commercial.

Mr. Hinds answered no it would not interfere and the project would not be too commercial due to the reasonably limited number of facilities and how they are sited; it would not appear or be too commercial in any sense.

Mr. Tate directed the Commission to page 31 of the Master Plan; it includes a table that shows existing buildings and square feet as well as new buildings and square feet. There is also a further break down of new construction shown on page 37, table 4, that helps quantify the impact.

Mr. Tate further stated the SEPA determination issued in late March or early April. There are two processes occurring; the policy review of the Planning Commission and ultimately the Board and there is an administrative review, where staff evaluates the environmental impact of the proposal. There is the environmental evaluation at this conceptual level and there is an environmental evaluation of on the ground impacts of specific proposals that would be allowed. The environmental review continues for the life of the proposal, with each proposal put forward by SPU at each phase of development.

There are 28 conditions that have been attached to the Mitigated Determination of Non-significance. He stated the term is misleading; it doesn't mean the County thinks there is no impact. When the County does the evaluation it must consider all the other regulations and policies in place to consider whether the impacts from a proposal are addressed by other regulations. If there are regulations to address the impact then those regulations are presumed to address the impact. In this instance the majority of impact is addressed by current regulations. There are 28 conditions that have been added to the proposal to fill in areas where it is felt the regulations can be enhanced.

Comments were received during the two week period of the initial SEPA determination and based on the evaluation of those comments a Revised Mitigated Determination of Non-significance was issued.

Commissioner Massey asked what would happen if in the middle of the development of this Master Plan other developments in the area built up to a point that would affect traffic concurrency.

Mr. Tate explained that over time as SPU develops there will be a cumulative effect, there is no question that these issues need to be monitored. Over time conditions will be monitored and changes may need to be made to address cumulative affect such as traffic concurrency.

Commissioner Gabelein stated if there is an existing setback for a critical area and the plan is adopted he feels changes shouldn't be made during the process that would increase setbacks that would then preclude the master plan from being implemented.

Mr. Tate stated he would look at the Master Plan language itself to see how it synchronizes with the Comprehensive Plan and then address that as part of the briefing prior to the public hearing at the next meeting.

Chair Hillers called for any further items. There were none.

Commissioner Massey moved to adjourn, Commissioner Gabelein seconded, the motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 11:37

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Bradshaw
Administrative Assistant