
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

➢ Study Session to consider oral and written testimony received and to formulate a recommendation to the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners on the: 2001 Docket for Comprehensive Plan Amendments, which includes proposals for textual revisions to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, dated May 7, 1998.

Chair McConaughy said that there has been some additional information regarding the Robinson site description, which is the application near Wal-Mart. He said that another piece of information was for the Ecklund file, which was located in South Kitsap. He then suggested that the members take some time to review the Memorandum from Laura Ditmer.

Jason Rice said that this memo from Laura Ditmer addressed some of the decisions made by the Planning Commission; the primary concern was the decision on the Tallman application, which the staff had recommended denial and the Planning Commission approved. He was concerned that, in coming to that decision, the Planning Commission may not have received all of the historical data on this project. He said there was consistent direction from within the GMA that when a commercial designation is outside the UGA it was considered urban growth. He said that any further decisions went with the subarea plans that have been approved for this area. He said the Planning Commission have a couple of choices which they can follow on the Tallman application: 1) the Commission can consider this memo and say okay, the same decision is upheld by the members; or 2) the Commission can reconsider this decision, which would require that there be another public hearing on
this application after the date was publicized, testimony is taken and then a new decision could be made.

Richard McConaughy thought that the Planning Commission presented a strong vote to approve this application.

Linda Rowe made it clear that the Planning Commission’s decision was a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners, who could overturn this decision, so why was it so important that the Planning Commission reconsider this application; shouldn’t this vote stand and let the Board of Commissioners make the final decision?

Jason Rice said that there were 2 applications in the same area; one the Planning Commission voted to approve and the other was denied. He felt that both of these applications were in the area that should be part of the overall study.

Linda Rowe said that access to the Ecklund property was by an easement road that serves other residential sites where the Tallman property has visibility from the highway and easy access from a main road.

Tom Nevins said that the Tallman application was approved by a 5 to 3 vote and the Board of Commissioners has, in the past, decided differently from the Planning Commission recommendation.

John Ahl said that one of the reasons this decision was made was because the members felt that ultimately the Tallman property would become commercial. He reported that there was no indication provided by the staff when this overall South Kitsap study would occur.

Linda Rowe felt that it would undermine the process, if the Planning Commission made their vote and then the staff comes back to them with the underlying request to change the vote.

William Matchett said he was happy to leave the vote as it was and let the Board of Commissioners decide if it should be overturned.

Richard McConaughy thanked the staff for bringing this issue to the Planning Commission’s attention, but the members would like to keep the decision the same as it was. He then stated at the hearing on January 15, during the discussion on Chapter 2 Land Use, there were some of the target dates that were proposed for removal.

(9:30 a.m. Deborah Flynn arrived at meeting.)
Jason Rice said that staff has reviewed the target dates and would provide additional language to replace these dates. He then read the following proposed text revisions to the members: Page 16, Revise Policy UGA-3; Page 18, Delete Target Date for annual report and Population forecasts; Page 27, Remove Urban Study Area discussion, policies UGA-15 – UGA-17; Page 29, Remove Study Area Plans related to the Illahee Urban Study Area; Page 30, Revise Policy CP-2; Page 32, Add wording that Planning Commission recommends the following; Page 33, Revise Table LU-2; Page 34, Modify language in Urban Low Density Residential; Page 37, Delete target date for Urban Design; Pages 42 and 44, Add wording that Planning Commission recommends the following; Page 43, Delete target date for Commercial Uses and Combine Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial into one category; Pages 48 and 49, Remove language regarding adoption of Greenways Plan and explain each separate component; Pages 45-50, Revise Open Space and Greenways consistent with the Kitsap County Open Space Plan; Pages A-17-A-75, Update Land Use Appendix to be consistent with the County Open Space Plan. He said that staff would correct the other indicators.

Tom Nevins felt that some of the indicators do not fall under the Planning Commission’s review and there may be some other information that would be necessary to make sure that the County was meeting those indicators.

Jason Rice reported that the Buildable Lands Analysis would state whether the County has been meeting the targeted goals.

William Matchett asked if the Buildable Lands Analysis was done annually?

Jason Rice said that the County would track Buildable Lands on an annual basis; the requirement was every 5 years.

William Matchett said that the new wording on Page 18, Land Use Item #3 would work; the former wording did not make sense.

Jason Rice said that the Planning Commission will review the Zoning and Critical Areas Ordinances during the work program and the rural areas will also be looked at as part of the process.

John Ahl said that he was comfortable that staff has done their homework on all of these amendments.

Tom Nevins felt said there is no measurement device to achieve the goals of the GMA and the Comprehensive Plan, which should be added.
John Ahl felt that measurements were great, but they may consume a great deal of staff time and expressed that there could be a trap to establishing a time line for measuring the goals; it may overlook the “big picture” of what was actually happening in this County.

A Motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Michael Gustavson that the Planning Commission approves the amendments to Chapter 2, Land Use, as amended by the staff memorandum of January 29, 2002. Vote: Aye: 8; Nay 0; Abstain: 1 (D. Flynn). Motion carried.

Richard McConaughy said that the item on the Stormwater Manual would be excluded until the presentation by County staff. He asked how the members would like to handle pages 2 and 3 of the Final Docket? He suggested that the Planning Commission consider all of items pertaining to the Land Use Section in one motion.

A Motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Deborah Flynn that the Planning Commission approves the amendments to the Land Use Section outlined in the Final Docket Items 1 through 19.

Michael Gustavson said that Item 17, referencing the amendments to the Kitsap County Stormwater Manual, should be exempted from the Planning Commission’s decision and that decision should be made following a public hearing.

John Ahl amended his motion to read that the Planning Commission approves Chapter 2 of the Land Use Section, Items 1 through 16 and 18, and 19, thereby exempting the section pertinent to the amendments to the County Stormwater Manual. (Deborah Flynn accepted the amendment.) Vote: Aye: 9; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

Jason Rice said that the Stormwater Manual as well as the Transportation Section were separate issues and addressed in the memo of November 27, 2001 from Robert Alire.

Jeff Rowe-Hornbaker of Developmental Engineering said that staff would prefer to have the Stormwater Manual separated from the Comprehensive Plan. He said this would allow staff to make changes to the Manual without having to wait until the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process, noting that there will be revisions on this Manual coming forth in the near future. He then read the memo dated November 27, 2001 from Robert Alire into the record: "The Development and Engineering Review Division of the Department of Community Development has been working with the Kitsap County Prosecutors Office on necessary revisions to the Kitsap County Stormwater Manual."
In order to adopt those revisions staff must incorporate the following amendments into the 2001 Comprehensive Plan amendments and review process: 1) Remove Part IV – Stormwater Manual from the adopted 1998 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan. 2) Adopt the Stormwater Manual as an Implementing Regulation as part of the County Code. And 3) Make the necessary textual amendments to the Land Use Chapter, Pages 53-57, to reflect the revisions to the Stormwater Manual. These additional amendments will require an amendment to the original public notice in order to consider as part of the final docket for the 2001 review process. Staff requests that the Planning Commission continue the Public Hearing to allow for adequate public notice to include the additional comments.”

Richard McConaughy said at present time there is stormwater language in the Comprehensive Plan and questioned if the proposal removed the Stormwater Section from the Plan so that rapid changes could be made, if necessary?

Jeff Rowe-Hornbaker said yes, adding that there would be public hearings on the Stormwater Ordinance if there were changes proposed to that Plan. He reported that there was a committee involved in creating a new document and there would be workshops and informational meetings held prior to the Public Hearing before the Planning Commission. He said that the Stormwater Manual would become a development regulation; it is currently included in the County Code.

Michael Gustavson said that he participated in the Shoreline Ordinance and felt that this was the same process used for it, which did not work out. He made it clear that the Stormwater Manual should still be included within the Comprehensive Plan and should not be segregated.

Tom Nevins asked if the County could not survive economically if this Section was removed from the Comprehensive Plan?

Jeff Rowe-Hornbaker said that the public review would still be part of the process; even minor amendments would have to go the Public Hearing process and could not be implemented without it.

John Ahl said under Policies in Section SW 4, “best management practices”, he felt that wording was vague and would like wording added to that Section that would actually pin down how things could be done. He felt if a developer reviewed this section he might not understand what he would need to do to develop a site.

Richard McConaughy asked if this proposal were adopted, could the wording best management practices be changed?
Jeff Rowe-Hornbaker said yes the wording could be changed. He said that “best management practices” was a term used in the engineering industry, but it could be better defined.

Linda Rowe asked if the changes to Stormwater Manual would change more rapidly than the Comprehensive Plan?

Jeff Rowe-Hornbaker gave some examples so that the members understood some of the reasoning why staff wanted to make changes to the Stormwater Manual.

Michael Gustavson said he was upset with the requirement for the 5,000 square foot impervious surface rule for the general homeowner as an example and felt that this ordinance actually needed a lot of visibility.

Linda Rowe said this discussion should be kept to the process and not the specifics of the Plan at this time.

Michael Gustavson felt that keeping this ordinance within the Comprehensive Plan provides a lot of visibility as opposed to keeping the Stormwater Manual separate and just having hearings on an ordinance.

Deborah Flynn said that hearings for an ordinance amendment are televised as well, noting that the Critical Areas Ordinance was a separate document from the Comprehensive Plan and she supported the removal of the Stormwater Manual from the Comprehensive Plan, which she felt would enable the Plan to be a much clearer document. She also explained that the Planning Commission would still address amendments to the County ordinances.

William Matchett felt that the Stormwater Manual would get more attention if it was not included in the Comprehensive Plan.

A Motion was made by William Matchett and seconded by Linda Rowe that the Planning Commission approves the Kitsap County Stormwater Manual, with the amendments outlined in the staff memorandum dated November 27, 2001. Vote: Aye: 9; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

Chapter 3: Rural and Resource Lands:

Deborah Flynn noted that there was also the target date issue with Chapter 3.

A Motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Mark Flynn that the Planning Commission approves the amendments to Chapter 3: Rural and Resource Lands as outlined in the Final Docket dated January 15, 2002.
Deborah Flynn felt she could not support the changes recommended in the Final Docket because they propose removing the target dates without replacing them with a new date.

Linda Rowe agreed and felt that there would be accountability to the citizens with the issuance of these dates.

Jason Rice said that he anticipated that the Director would be addressing these target dates at this hearing so he did not come prepared to respond to this.

Richard McConaughy asked if the Rural Policy was a portion of the Interim Rural Forestry discussion?

Deborah Flynn felt that the Interim Rural Forestry discussion could take place separately from the Rural Policy discussion.

Richard McConaughy felt that the Interim Rural Forestry needed to have a target date so it would be completed.

John Ahl said that the wording could be changed to “revise target dates” instead of delete them for Items 1 and 2; Section RL-34 on page 75 also addresses target dates.

William Matchett said he was in agreement with the revised target dates but in addition, he would like the County to know “it’s time to get on with it”.

The members then discussed what would be included in the Rural Policy discussions (Item 3).

William Matchett suggested that by the year 2003 or sooner would be an appropriate date, or by the end of 2003 or sooner would also be acceptable.

Lary Coppola amended his Motion to read: The Planning Commission approves Chapter #3: Rural and Resource Lands, with the inclusion of revised target dates on items 1 – 4 to the end of the year 2003 or sooner. Mark Flynn agreed with the amendment. Vote: Aye: 9; Nay 0. Motion carried.

Chapter 4: Natural Systems:

A Motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by William Matchett that the Planning Commission approves amendments 1 through 22 outlined in the Final Docket for the Natural Systems Section of the Comprehensive Plan.
Michael Gustavson said in the comment by staff, the Salmon Refugia Study should be deleted from the Plan (Item 12). He then asked if Item 19 eliminates all outdoor burning?

Jason Rice said yes.

Vote: Aye: 9; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

A Motion was made by Michael Gustavson and seconded by Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission recommends that the Kitsap Peninsula Salmonid Refugia Study be excluded from the County’s Comprehensive Plan.

Jason Rice said the Refugia Study was originally included because it was felt that it could be a part of the vision for the County.

Michael Gustavson said that document could be science-based information or a political document.

Deborah Flynn said that the Comprehensive Plan was a policy document and the Refugia Study was a study and felt it was not appropriate for inclusion into the Comprehensive Plan.

Vote: Aye: 8; Nay: 0; Abstain: 1 (Nevins). Motion carried.

- Chapter 5: Economic Development:

A Motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Michael Gustavson that the Planning Commission approves Chapter 5 Economic Development Items 1 and 3 and recommends changes to the wording in Item 2 to read: An Economic Development Summit shall be held annually in Kitsap County.

Michael Gustavson said that during the presentation by the Economic Development Council (EDC), it was suggested that additional industrially zoned land was necessary in this County and he felt that goal should be included in this Section.

John Ahl felt that a specific number of acres set aside for industrially zoned land should not be considered as part of the policy of this chapter. He felt unwilling to concede that the re-designation of additional industrially zoned land would improve the economic health of this area.

Lary Coppola felt that land was not the driving factor of the economics in this County and what he preferred to have included in the Plan and updated annually
were the EDC’s recommendations on the economy. He would also like to see an action statement added to the policies.

Jason Rice reported that the way industrially zoned land was added was based on the OFM population projections, which are not issued annually.

Michael Gustavson expressed that the annual review in the Buildable Lands Survey would show what types of land is available in this County.

Linda Rowe questioned how a County document could require that the EDC provide an annual economic summit.

John Ahl read from the Economic Development Section ED-9 and on Page 108 Item G to the members. He felt that this entire section should be reworded so that it makes sense.

Lary Coppola said if the County was serious about economic development, then it should be clearly stated in this Plan, if not, it should be removed altogether.

The members then discussed the importance of holding a yearly economic development summit.

Linda Rowe reiterated that the Comprehensive Plan was a County document and asked how Kitsap County could be in control of another entity preparing this economic development summit?

Jason Rice said that the County’s yearly budget includes a portion of the funding for the Economic Development Council and setting an economic summit could be part of the discussion on the yearly work plan that the Planning Commission will be considering at their next meeting.

Lary Coppola re-read his motion to the members.

Tom Nevins asked how this motion, which authorizes another organization to prepare a summit, was different than the referral to a study, which the Planning Commission just voted to delete from the Plan?

Lary Coppola said that the difference was that the EDC was charged with keeping a tab on the economics of the county.

Vote: Aye: 2; (Coppola, Gustavson) Nay: 2; (Ahl, Matchett) Abstain 4. Motion failed.
A Motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by William Matchett that the Planning Commission approves the amendments to Chapter 5: Economic Development, as outlined in the Final Docket.

Lary Coppola felt that this Section should be tabled until the Planning Commission has heard a presentation by the EDC on this matter.

Michael Gustavson felt that if the EDC provided measurable data that should be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

John Ahl agreed that more information was needed on Economic Development; however, 6 to 8 months ago the Planning Commission provided additional input for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Final Docket and this process was not proposed at that time. He said he would welcome the EDC’s presentation for the members, but this process should not be stalled for a presentation.

Lary Coppola felt that it could be 5 years until the Comprehensive Plan could be reviewed again.

Linda Rowe said that the staff should delete the dates in the Comprehensive Plan that have already gone by.

Deborah Flynn said that she agreed with John Ahl, adding that depending on what the EDC reported on during their presentation, there may need to be more public hearings on the amendment process and the other applications and the Final Docket would need to be held up until this matter could be determined.

Vote: Aye: 9; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

Chapter 8: Transportation:

A Motion was made by Michael Gustavson and seconded by Deborah Flynn that the Planning Commission approves the amendments to Chapter 8: Transportation as outlined in the Final Docket.

Deborah Flynn asked if the memo of Nov 5th from Greg Cioc was included in that Motion?

Michael Gustavson said that the memo was included in the Motion.

Vote: Aye: 9; Nay: 0. Motion carried.
Chapter 9: Shorelines:

A Motion was made by Michael Gustavson and seconded by Deborah Flynn that the Planning Commission approves Chapter 9: Shorelines, Item 1 as outlined in the Final Docket.

Michael Gustavson said he omitted Item 2 from his Motion because he felt that the Shorelines are being singled out for permitting restrictions that do not apply to other building permit applications.

Jason Rice said that the amendments (Items 1 and 2) outlined in the Final Docket, would make the County Comprehensive Plan consistent with the Shoreline Master Plan.

Michael Gustavson felt that some parts of this Plan were questionable from the scientific standpoint.

John Ahl said that the proposed amendments were a minimal change to an existing paragraph in Item 2. He reported that there are state laws that address development on the shoreline.

Linda Rowe asked if there was a Habitat Management Protection Plan already in place in the County?

Jason Rice said yes, if you fall within 200 feet of the shoreline.

Michael Gustavson expressed that he had a hard time accepting governmental regulations that created difficulties for people who wanted to develop their property.


A Motion was made by William Matchett and seconded by John Ahl that the Planning Commission approves the amendments to Chapter 9: Shorelines, Items 1 and 2 as outlined in the Final Docket.

Vote: Aye: 7; Nay: 2 (Coppola, Gustavson). Motion carried.

Final Docket:

A Motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Linda Rowe that the Planning Commission approves the Final Docket as amended. Vote: Aye: 9; Nay: 0. Motion carried.
A presentation on the processes involved for the development of the
Kingston Subarea Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 and the Draft
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement by Rick Sepler of
Madrona Planning and County staff.

Shannon Bauman introduced Rick Sepler to the Planning Commission and gave
copies of the proposed plan and maps to the members. She noted that the capacity
analysis was included with the maps.

Rick Sepler said that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and an integrated
plan would be issued in the near future. He reported that there are a number of
issues that have been resolved and it would be up to the Planning Commission to
determine which of the 3 Alternatives should become the Subarea Plan for Kingston.
He said that if there were major concerns by the Planning Commission on this Plan,
they could be included in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. He
recounted that the Design Study for Kingston dated back to 1998 and then, as
challenges were mounted on the County’s Comprehensive Plan, the Kingston Plan
was set aside until those issues in the Comprehensive Plan could be handled. He
said that the design guidelines of December 2000 would be included in the final
subarea plan that will address the commercial areas of Kingston. He reported that
the passenger-only ferry service, relocation of the sewer plant, design standards and
the different perspectives as to the future design of Kingston and significant concerns
about several new developments that are proposed for this area were all a part of the
discussions on the plan. He said that in February 2000 this steering committee was
developed after appointment by the Board of Commissioners. He said that the
committee met with guidance from Commissioner Endresen who gave them their
direction, which was to: Develop an overall vision for the community; Review the
goals contained in the Kingston Community Design Study (KCDS) for continued
applicability; Identify and evaluate alternative configurations for the Kingston UGA;
and if possible, develop a recommended (i.e. a “preferred”) alternative. He said that
in working with this committee, all agreed that the small town character should be
preserved, even though growth would have an effect on this area. He reported that
the preservation of the natural environment was linked to Kingston’s quality of life
and community character. He said that the committee discussed many issues in
their deliberations, which included the appropriate scale of new development and
the population and anticipated growth of Kingston. He said that the appropriate
scale of the Plan was the difficult part of discussions, brought on because there was
no actual population allocation given to Kingston. He reported that the goals of the
Design Plan were updated; then the committee moved to on to develop the policies
and draft alternatives for this Plan. He reminded the members that Kingston’s
community holds very strong opinions, which became apparent when discussing the
best range of alternatives to be considered. He said after great deliberation the
following issues came to light: Was there a need to expand the UGA; could population
allocations be accommodated within the current UGA? Would the quality of life and the
character of the community change if the UGA were expanded? How could they factor in those
large residential projects that would be developed at urban densities if they were outside the
UGA? If the natural systems were included in the UGA, would the densities have to increase
in other areas? He said that the steering committee developed three alternatives. He
reported that there have been workshops presented to the community on this Plan
and, after hearing the comments from the workshops, the committee did not change
their opinions of the Alternatives. He explained the 3 alternatives that were crafted:
Alternative A, maintains the existing UGA; Alternative B (Northwest Expansion)
includes the existing UGA and proposes to include the existing middle school and a
proposed new school site and provides a higher level of protection for the included
natural areas; and Alternative C (Northwest Expansion plus Arborwood) includes the
land in Alternative B together with the “Arborwood” project to the south. He said
that the steering committee was split on its decision, about half preferred Alternative
B and the other half preferred Alternative C. He reported than an EIS is being
prepared at this time, and there has been a scoping meeting on this EIS. He said
that the committee received a signed petition from those who were against the UGA
expansion to the north. He said there is a great passion on the issues in this Plan
and no clear-cut decision from the analysis. He concluded by stating that the key
issue was the urban growth of Kingston; there are those in favor and against growth
in this area. He felt that there would be plusses and minuses to each of the
alternatives – neither alternative is clearly the better of the two and that comes
through in the Draft EIS.

Deborah Flynn asked for the outcome of the sewer relocation and passenger- only
ferry service.

Rick Sepler reiterated that until the Comprehensive Plan was approved the subarea
plan on Kingston could not be determined. He then outlined where the proposed
sewer service will be located from the map. He made it clear that it was fully
discussed at the committee meetings whether the capital facilities needed to be
included in a UGA.

Jason Rice reported that on the map, the “lime green” is Urban Restricted; “yellow”
is Urban Low; “dark brown” is Urban Medium and “black” is the Urban High.

Rick Sepler said that there were no changes to the current zoning requested for the
UGA. He explained that the Arborwood project contains much of the critical area
constraints. He then gave the history of the Arborwood project, adding that until
the subarea plan is approved, this project is not allowed to progress.
Linda Rowe asked if the Arborwood development was included in the UGA, could the density within the development increase?

Rick Sepler said yes, if it was included the density could increase and this could be a significant population increase in the UGA.

Deborah Flynn recounted that when she was sitting-in on the steering committee meetings, one of the questions that arose was whether this project could be included at its approve density and not have the decision challenged by the Growth Management Hearings Board.

Rick Sepler said there was a mixed discussion on this issue, which he gave some examples of for the members.

John Ahl asked if staff has done a capacity analysis of the 3 alternatives?

Rick Sepler said yes, it was included in the Planning Commission’s packets.

John Ahl asked with regard to the 3 Alternatives, was it the intention that staff will propose a recommended alternative or will this be up to the Planning Commission to determine?

Rick Sepler said that the Commission could determine which Alternative they preferred following the public hearing, or staff could recommend one of the Alternatives prior to the hearing and the Planning Commission can determine if they agree with that recommendation.

John Ahl said that the Planning Commission could make a whole new design from the 3 Alternatives, but he felt that it would be more appropriate for the County staff to recommend a preferred Alternative. He expressed that Kingston was a stand alone UGA; there have not been any population allocations issued for Kingston at this time, and in looking at the past community plans for Manchester and Suquamish, it appeared that there was much more work that needed to be done on this subarea plan. He then noted Alternative C, which reminded him of the proposal from McCormick Woods on ULID #6, without any gaps.

William Matchett said he was pleased to see the northern boundary that has been presented with the Kingston UGA.

Rick Sepler said that the northern boundary issue would come back for discussion during the public hearing process. He felt that this proposed Plan would come before the Planning Commission again in a month or so following the conclusion of the Environmental Impact Statement.
Deborah Flynn summarized from the committee meetings that the area to the north, was included for discussion during those meetings; then the committee received a petition from the neighbors who did not want to be included in that northerly portion of the UGA, which swayed the committee to put off their discussions on this area.

Rick Sepler then gave the next steps involved for the design of this Plan, before it would come back to the Planning Commission for a hearing.

Deborah Flynn felt that the comments from the scoping meeting should be addressed in the Draft Environment Impact Statement.

Shannon Bauman said she would review the comments and make sure they were included in the DEIS.

---

Work Plan Discussion:

- Richard McConaughy said that at the next Planning Commission meeting on February 5th, there would be a discussion on the 2002 Work Plan.
- Jason Rice reported that the consultant from Parametrix announced that the Bethel Corridor project has received a 1.7 million dollar appropriation to begin construction.
- Laura Ditmer noted that staff would like to meet once a month with the individual members from the North, Central and South Kitsap districts and the Commissioner from that district. She said that the members could discuss this in more detail at Work Plan Discussion on Feb 5th.

John Ahl said that a periodic meeting with the Board of Commissioners would be beneficial.

William Matchett said that he would be willing to try this, but he wanted to know all of the information on each of the upcoming projects even if they are not in his area.

John Ahl felt that feedback from the Board of Commissioners would be appropriate as the Planning Commission goes through each hearing process.
Laura Ditmer said that next week, when the Planning Commission and staff discuss the 2002 Work Plan, staff would like to break down the Comprehensive Plan review process into a 1, 5 and 10 year process.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting adjourned at 12:17 p.m.
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