

**WHITMAN COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
September 21, 2022  
Zoom Meeting**

**MEMBERS:**

**Chad Whetzel, Chair  
David Tysz  
David Gibney**

**Brian Davies, Vice-Chair  
Rusty Jamison**

**Staff:** Alan Thomson, WC Planning Director; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planner; Brandon Johnson, Public Works; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

**Others:** Shelly Chambers Fox

**7:11 p.m.** – Chad Whetzel opened the meeting. Introductions were held.

**MOTION** by Rusty Jamison and seconded by Brian Davies to approve the minutes of August 3, 2022. Motion passed.

**Reports:** Alan Thomson

- a. Board of Adjustment forthcoming hearings – None.
- b. Forthcoming Administrative Use Permits – None.
- c. Forthcoming Variances – None. There is something brewing, but we don't have an application yet.
- d. Update on previous conditional use permits and variances – None.
- e. Update on previous administrative use permits – None.
- f. Board of County Commissioners' action – None.
- g. Update on previous Board of County Commissioners' action – None.
- h. Forthcoming Shoreline of the State Substantial Development Permits – None.
- i. Update on previous Shoreline of the State Substantial Development permits – None.

- j. Planning Commission forthcoming hearings – None. We will talk about this a little later, but nothing at the moment.

V. Unfinished business: Shoreline Master Program update continues.

Chad Whetzel – So, under the Shoreline Master Program update. Do you have anything there?

Alan Thomson – I tried to talk to the consultant today but failed to get through. She is looking to set up a meeting for our Planning Commission but I haven't confirmed that yet. Here is a potential time line for that one. I think they've got things to show us and now it is a question of getting it on the agenda.

We may be moving forward with a public hearing with the Planning Commission for these code updates which we will determine later on tonight. I'm looking at maybe meeting with the consultant for two possible time frames, October 5<sup>th</sup> or November 2<sup>nd</sup>. I'm getting ahead of myself here, thinking that we are going to have a potential public hearing for the code changes and the day would be October 19<sup>th</sup>.

That is not determined as of yet, but hopefully, by the end of this evening we will know whether it is going to happen or not. That is why I am thinking October 5<sup>th</sup> or November 2<sup>nd</sup> for the Shoreline Master Program update. Or we could have it on the 19<sup>th</sup>.

I'm not really sure how long the code changes in the public hearing would take, and then could we have the consultant for the SMA update? I don't know how long she needs. When I talk with her, I can find that out. Potentially, we will meet next month with the consultant with the SMA to have her get us up to speed. She also has meetings arranged with all the other towns, next month and into November. We may be able to see a draft sometime next month or maybe in November.

Chad Whetzel – I can be there on the 19<sup>th</sup> but I'm probably going to be a little late.

Alan Thomson – So, I am trying to figure out the SEPA because we need to advertise and there is a 14-day comment period which would end the week before October 19<sup>th</sup> so that gives us the opportunity to potentially have a hearing on the 19<sup>th</sup>. But we need to get through all the business tonight and you guys figure out if that will work or not.

David Tysz – Alan, I have a question. My kids asked me, now going up to the SMA. They have been threatened by Ecology that if they don't do the grassed-in areas, or plant trees or whatever, that they will nail them for \$1,000 a day. Can they do that?

Alan Thomson – I'm not familiar with the circumstances, David.

David Tysz – They have a creek area that flows right through their farm.

Alan Thomson – This is a private landowner?

David Tysz – Yes, my kids, it is part of the farm. Then Ecology went down, it is outside of Fairfield and I know it is in Spokane County. I told them I would ask our Planning Commission on the Shoreline. They just came to Tekoa on Monday and I asked them and they said the Shoreline Management rides and you're not going to be able to do anything to fight it.

I wanted to ask you, can my kids fight this? They farm right up to the creek and they don't want to give it up because they go a long way. They were told they have to tree-it in or grass-it in but they can't farm 35-40 feet on their side.

Alan Thomson – I don't know that I am able to respond to that, but that is in Spokane County jurisdiction and you should be talking to the Spokane County Planner. They have the same Shoreline Master Program as we do. That sounds a bit weird to me, but again, I don't know all the circumstances so I am reluctant to make any kind of comment. I would definitely investigate with the Spokane County Planning Department and find out more detail as to why Ecology might be doing that. There has to be some information that is missing, other than what you just told me.

David Tysz – Okay, thanks.

Rusty Jamison – I would agree and also, I would say you might get in touch with the conservation district.

Alan Thomson – It is weird because there are lots of places on the shoreline that are being farmed. There is nothing to stop that from happening as far as our code is concerned. They have been farmed and continue to be farmed so there is some missing information here that has caused Ecology to do what you are saying.

David Tysz – They got five nasty letters and the last one said if you don't comply you will be charged \$1,000 a day. They asked why they were picking on them and they said they picked out a few farms on the Hangman Creek area in Spokane County because you are polluting the river through your fields. I don't know how they are going to stop the rain from coming down but they do not want any mud or any dirt going into the creek anymore.

Dave Gibney – I believe there is some special thing going on about Hangman Creek but Alan is right, this is well outside anything that we can do anything about it here.

David Tysz – Okay, I'll tell them that they need to talk to somebody up there.

Alan Thomson – Talk to Spokane Conservation District because there is a joint effort between our conservation district up there and Spokane to protect Hangman Creek. I'm kind of guessing it has something to do with all of that up there.

David Tysz – They have talked to them twice already and they said that you will be doing it our way and that's it.

Alan Thomson – Sounds a bit heavy handed. Okay, let's move on.

**Adjourned – 7:21 p.m.**

**WHITMAN COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
September 21, 2022  
Zoom Workshop**

**MEMBERS:**

**Chad Whetzel, Chair  
David Tysz  
David Gibney**

**Brian Davies, Vice-Chair  
Rusty Jamison**

**Staff:** Alan Thomson, WC Planning Director; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planner; Brandon Johnson, Public Works; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

**Others:** Shelly Chambers Fox.

**7:22 p.m.** – Chad Whetzel opened the workshop.

Alan Thomson – That is it as far as the Shoreline Master Program. I will let you know after I have this conversation with the consultant tomorrow what time-frame we can work these things out.

Dave Gibney – Just a different side, how much longer are we going to be doing this Zoom? The emergencies are about to be declared over and without some specific authority to do it we are probably on the edge of that.

Alan Thomson – The covid thing is really not that much of a consideration or worry right now. The fact is the auditorium is still being used by the court.

Dave Gibney – Has our Commission declared a state of emergency suspending the public meetings in person requirement because of that?

Alan Thomson – Not that I am aware of.

Dave Gibney – Then we are really close to doing these Zooms with no physical presence without authority to be doing it.

Alan Thomson – I'll pass that on, Dave.

David Tysz – In Tekoa we meet as a city group everybody and public comes in. We've been doing that for three months.

Alan Thomson – It is not so much the pandemic, it is all about the upheaval of the courthouse. They are using our building, our auditorium.

Dave Gibney – I'm not at all sure that the Commissioners can't make this the way we get to do business. But if they have not, they need to.

Alan Thomson – I’m not up to speak on that one, Dave. I do not know whether they have or have not. I’ll look into it. Let’s go over all this stuff again. Basically, what we are going to do tonight is just review the potential changes again, and if you are okay with it, the plan then is to move to a public hearing.

Let’s start with ***Chapter 19.10 – AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT***

***B. Two (2) single-family dwellings per parcel conforming to provisions of Section 19.10.060 and not located within the CRD Opportunity Area. Adding a separate dwelling unit within an existing residence or converting an accessory building to a residence counts as a second residence.***

Alan Thomson – We are now proposing to change the permitted uses from one house per parcel to two. So, this is the code that tells everybody what is allowed on a parcel of land. Two single-family dwellings on a parcel and then “*adding a separate unit within an existing residence*” is just saying that you can convert any building into a residence or you can even have two residences in one building, so that is all that is saying.

The part that is struck out is no longer relevant. Does anyone have any comments or thoughts on this?

Rusty Jamison – We went over this last time. I remember it.

Alan Thomson – We’ve gone over this more than once, Rusty, but this is the final do-over. You were okay with that last time. I just want to make sure.

~~Page 2. Accessory Dwelling units conforming to provisions of Section 19.10.065.~~

We are striking this part because it is no longer relevant. If this is accepted, you can have two homes on a parcel so we are not going to call it an accessory dwelling unit anymore. It is two homes on a parcel of land. So that is no longer relevant and we are striking that.

Chad Whetzel – I was reading that first part there, where it says, “***Adding a separate dwelling unit within an existing residence...***” Can you give me an example of that?

Alan Thomson – Okay, under this heading here, this is what is allowed, residential-wise. So, you can convert a part of your home, your house, your residence, to what we used to call an accessory dwelling unit. You can do that inside the house or you can do it outside the house. You can have it separated from the house or you can have it inside. You can actually have two homes within one building which essentially would be a duplex.

Chad Whetzel – Okay. That is what I had a hard time picturing what adding one within a house would be.

Dave Gibney – Wouldn’t you be basically adding a separate entrance? And walling that so that they are two things?

Alan Thomson – Yes, that is the building code requirement. So, in order for it to be a separate residence it has to comply with the building codes and just like what Dave said, that would have to be done. Okay, so moving right along.

**19.10.050 – Height of Buildings.**

***D. Commercial wind turbines, transmission towers, and wind measuring devices such as anemometers, have no height restrictions.***

I am adding that in even though that is part of other codes. It wasn't on Chapter 19.10 in the Ag district so I think it is better to have this written in here in case someone tries to challenge me that wind turbines therefore should have height restrictions of 350 feet, and that's not right. So, I am adding it in here just to make sure that people can't argue that there should be a height restriction on wind turbines or for anemometers.

**19.10.060 - Rural Residential Use**

***Two single-family dwellings and one bunkhouse or one cabin per parcel shall be a permitted use whenever the requirements of this Title are fulfilled. The Planning Director shall certify through the Rural Housing Certificate (RHC) process that all requirements of this Title have been met.***

This is the start of how we determine what we would tell the public what applications are required. So Rural Housing Certificate over here, RRSR, it talks about that. So, now we are two single family dwellings and one bunkhouse or cabin on a parcel of land.

Chad Whetzel – Did we get definitions for those two things?

Alan Thomson – You'll see that when we get to Chapter 19.03. So, this again is not current language, that is why that is struck out. Is everyone okay with page 3?

Okay, onto page 4.

- a. *Creation of a new residential parcel that has no house on it yet.*
- b. *Alteration of an existing residential parcel less than 20 acres via a boundary line adjustment except when additional land is added to the parcel.*
- c. *Construction of a residence on an existing parcel **created before January 1, 2007**, which has not been certified.*

Now we are talking about the compartments, about how the planning office determines how to apply the code. You are creating a new parcel on "a." and you want to put a house on it.

On "b." you are altering the property line, a boundary line adjustment. Put a house on it, maybe an existing house on it.

On "c." we are talking about existing parcels that were there before January 1, 2007. Before we put the viewshed rule and other rules like that into place, parcels existed that were already legal parcels and we didn't want them to be, not allowed to build a house on. We didn't think that was right, so we have to create some language in the code that says that if you have a parcel of land that existed before 2007, we still think you should be able to build on it, but there are certain circumstances associated with that.

That means there is no certificate of zoning compliance. There is no rural housing certificate, the planning office has not had any application to apply to that particular parcel. But we had to have some restrictions put on it because there may be a spot on this parcel of land where you can get out of the viewshed or you can meet the setback and we need to make accommodations about that.

*“Natural impediments,”* so if the parcel is only a few acres in size and you can’t meet the setbacks because there are a bunch of trees, there is steep terrain, there are rocks, a hill, things like that then we will waive those particular parts of the current code that would apply to all other parcels. We will allow some sort of wiggle room for these people to be able to build on that parcel, but we want to try to have them meet the requirements of Chapter 19.10 as much as we can.

***Where there are no limitations as mentioned above, and no short plat requested, new residences, bunkhouses, and cabins will comply with the setback requirements of his Chapter. In the case of a parcel of land in existence prior to January 1, 2007, if the parcel is within an adjacent viewshed then a variance to the viewshed rule is required. Excepted to this requirement are lots and blocks that are part of a platted subdivision. In all cases, some part of any additional residence, bunkhouse, or cabin must be located within 500 feet of the first built residence.***

Here in the track change we have to think about parcels that are large enough more than 2-3 acres. What if you have a 20-acre parcel, and they are out there, and you have a quarter section. That would be considered a parcel that was there before 2007. So, it is large enough that you can potentially meet the setbacks for the requirements of the code and that would mean we would force you to do that if the parcel is large enough.

If you can get 100 feet away from the adjacent farmland, or if you can get 100 feet away from the road. You can get out of somebody’s viewshed. That is what this language is about. But then if there are no limitations and no short plat requested, then residences, bunkhouses, anybody that wants to build a residence will have to comply with the setback requirements of the chapter. That’s fair. If you can get 100-200 feet away from the adjacent farmland then you should be that far away.

*“If the parcel is within an adjacent viewshed then a variance...”* This is how it is right now, and it wasn’t in Chapter 19.10. It was in Chapter 19.06, which is conditional uses and variances, so I’m just adding this in for clarity but that is already part of code. If you have a parcel that is in someone else’s viewshed and it was there before 2007, we are going to give you an opportunity to have a variance to not to have to comply with the viewshed. That goes through the Board of Adjustment. I’m just adding that in here for clarity.

So, this gets back to the conversation that we had last time, the buildable area. The impacted area that you thought was a vague way to describe it. So, we talked about last time about 500 feet from the existing house and you all seemed to be okay with that distance. So, basically the distance from the original house or the new house that is built on there, the residential footprint would be 500 feet from that original house. You could put another house within that 500 feet or a cabin or a bunkhouse.

But I am just adding this in here because it needs to be made clear that there is a 500-foot bubble around and it has to be the first house that is built. If you don’t have any home on this land and you come into the planning office and you want to build a house on a parcel that was here before 2007, then yes, you can do that. Then we’ve got a location. That is where your first house is. If you come back to us and you want to build a second house, how far away can that be? The number is 500 feet. That is just adding clarity here to what that means. You can’t build a house 500 feet away and then use that house to go another 500 feet away for a cabin. That is what we are trying to avoid doing.

Chad Whetzel – I agree with all that but the way that it is written, to me that kind of implies that the whole house must be within the 500 feet? What I am thinking of, and if you like it this way, that's fine, but if you build a house that is 490 feet away from one corner to the next corner, the rest of that house does not fall within that 500 feet. So, is that legal or not?

Alan Thomson – What we have done in the past is we have adopted a protocol that says that any part of a new structure, like another house has some part of it has to be within 300-500 feet of where you are measuring from. We can do that again, if that is what you want.

Chad Whetzel – I just would like it to be clear so somebody doesn't come back later on and say, "Well, (inaudible).

Alan Thomson – I am open to any suggestions as to language, but I will take it off. In all cases some part of any additional residences, some part of needs to be within 500 feet. How does that sound?

Chad Whetzel – Yes, that works for me.

Brian Davies – Okay with me.

Alan Thomson – We are pretty flexible when it comes to this. We are not going out there with a measuring tape.

Chad Whetzel – No, but I can just see somebody arguing about that whole house doesn't fall within the 500 feet so therefore they are not allowed to do it.

Dave Gibney – Isn't there somewhere where you do nearest point to nearest point?

Alan Thomson – There is some language like that. I don't know exactly where that is, Dave. How I do this when somebody walks in the door, I tell them that some part of this house has to be within the 300 foot when we are doing groupings for instance, it is 300 feet and that is one thing I tell them. Some part of the house, not the entire house.

Rusty Jamison – Alan do you need to change the date, current date or just say 2008?

Alan Thomson – 2007?

Rusty Jamison - Well, it says "*Revised, 10-27-08.*"

Alan Thomson – That refers to, I need to look at that and see what the ordinance was referring to. That might need to disappear. When we come to the public hearing you might see that struck out and I'll tell you why. It might be language that we have already guesstimated that this is no longer relevant, but I will look into that.

So, the next part here. All that previously was done under what is called the Rural Housing Certificate. Now there is this thing that is called the Rural Residential Site Review, the RRSR, which is different than the Rural Housing Certificate. So, the circumstance that triggers a Rural Residential Site Review is if you want to add something like a shop, a barn, a garage on to your parcel. That doesn't require an RHC it requires an RRSR which is like a mini-review but none the less it is a review. So, that is this part here.

2. *Issuance of a Rural Housing Certificate shall not be required on an existing rural residential parcel for which no parcel enlargement, reduction or division is requested when a new accessory structure is built and an existing residence or an existing accessory structure is altered, expanded or replaced.*

That is the circumstance for an RRSR. Since we are adding a second house or a cabin or a bunkhouse, I think we need to have some sort of review done with that because accessory dwelling units did not require any more review. They were just going straight for a building permit. So I think that needs to be changed and if you are going to build a second house, you need to have a tool to make sure you are putting it in the right place, and that is the Rural Residential Site Review. Page 5.

***An RRSR will be required for the addition of a second residence, single bunkhouse, or single cabin on a certified parcel with the same requirements stated above about limitations due to size, shape, or existing vegetation applying. The second residence, bunkhouse or cabin must be within 500 feet of some portion of the existing residence. The setback to adjacent farmland for the second residence, bunkhouse or cabin can be no closer than the setback of the existing residence to adjacent farmland and no closer than 20 feet from the adjacent property lines.***

So, we are giving them some wiggle room again, just like we do under the RHC rules. If there is some limitation on your parcel that you can't meet setbacks, can't meet all the requirements of the normal code, then we will give you some latitude there, which is the same as the RHC. *"The second residence, bunkhouse or cabin must be within 500 feet of some portion of the existing residence."* So, we have kind of coordinated these two statements from above previously to this. Some part of the house has to be within 500 feet.

*"The setback to adjacent farmland for the second residence, bunkhouse or cabin can be no closer than the setback of the existing residence to adjacent farmland and no closer than 20 feet from the adjacent property lines."* So, this is an accommodation for if there is already a house on this parcel and it is say 50 feet from the adjacent property line, then your second house can be the same, 50 feet from the adjacent land but no closer. It wouldn't be fair to say the second house needs to meet the requirement of the 200-foot setback to ag land when there is already a house within that setback. I think you guys already thought that was okay, right? Okay, so that is what that is all about. Is everybody okay with page 5? Hearing nothing, I will move on to page 6.

#### Residential Group

*Definition: A residential group is defined as a collection of two to nine certified, residential **platted** parcels which are located such that at least some portion of each of the included residences is within 300 feet of some portion of another included residence.*

We talked about grouping before. That is one of the alternatives to building a house. You are either 1500 feet away from any other house or you are within 300 feet of an existing house that was there before 2007. So, that is part of the code right now. I am just adding the word *"platted"* parcels because it makes more sense to me. That means it was part of a plat that was done before hand.

So, this begs conversation. Since we have done the 500 feet for the developable area for a new house and current code for residential groups is 300 feet, can we align those together both to be 500 feet?

Does anybody have any thought or objection to increasing that from 300 to 500 to make it align with the 500 feet we have already agreed on?

Rusty Jamison – I'm just thinking about it as if, say one of my family members wanted to do a group like this. I guess the 500 feet might be okay but I know that as a farmer in the future, if the house got sold that I wouldn't like that as well, because it would be taking more of my farm, original farm out of production. Say as an example if my son had decided to build another house and then something happened and he wasn't going to farm anymore and then all of a sudden, the house gets sold.

I guess I would be okay with it either way but I know for the people that did do this here in Garfield, they are closer than the 300 feet and now as time has gone along, they are starting to wonder what they are going to do with all these homes that are very close together that met the needs of their family that are not necessarily going to meet the needs in the future. But that is kind of their personal decisions that they made so I feel a family should have a way of how they want to develop their farmland.

Alan Thomson – That is up to the landowners, Rusty, to decide how far. It has to be 500 feet but again, we give an example last time we talked of a landowner in WC that came in and had a weird shaped parcel. It was like an "L" shaped parcel, and 300 feet, it was hard for them to find an appropriate place. But, just outside of that 300 feet there was a better location but it was outside of 300 feet. So, that is what got us thinking expanding that now. In any case, it doesn't have to be 500 feet. It is up to 500 feet so somebody could choose to be 100 feet away, 200 feet away, but no greater than 500 feet.

Chad Whetzel – Correct me if I am wrong, but we are talking about two separate things. We are talking about a parcel with two houses on it verses a residential group which is separate parcels with separate houses but grouped together.

Alan Thomson – It is slightly different but it is not entirely different.

Chad Whetzel – The difference is you have two houses on the same piece of property. If I sell that property, both houses go with it. I can't separate the houses out unless I do a short plat. This is already platted so you have separate, anybody could own those. It could be somebody you know or somebody from across the country. But those houses are within 300 feet of each other according currently.

Dave Gibney – If you had this right now at the nine, you could end up with eighteen houses on the same footprint of total land. Keeping this down to the 300 feet has some mitigating, "let's not be too sprawly sort of thing." By the time you got 18 houses on one spot, you're almost a Steptoe or something.

Alan Thomson – Hold on, Dave. I don't think that works that way. So, when you come up with the number 18 are you thinking two houses per parcel for the new parcel you create?

Dave Gibney – Yes. Unless I'm wrong, your residential platted parcels under the other law could have two residences each on them.

Alan Thomson – Right, so the difference here is in, a good thing you can't do that so keep in mind that we are talking a house that was there. You have to have a starting point and that starting point is a house that was there before 2007 for a grouping. So, then that landowner has a choice. He can build another house within 300 feet of the original house but he has to plat it. He has to create a parcel so

that would be a parcel. But you cannot put a second house on that because that parcel would have been created after 2007. So, you can't put two houses on that for a grouping.

Dave Gibney – You've got, "constructed," not parcel created, here in your language.

Alan Thomson – Where?

Dave Gibney – In Number ii – *"Creation of a residential group. The owner of any residence constructed prior to January 1, 2007...."* So, that is constructed. That is not one that was platted.

Alan Thomson – No, hold on a second. If the residence was constructed before January 1, 2007, that parcel must have been created.

Dave Gibney – I guess I'm still thinking that this is a situation sufficiently different than new parcels on a land and that the 300 feet has some utility here.

Alan Thomson – It is different. That is fine if that is what you think but we are now, we have created a 500-foot one and yes, it is different but you basically are having to create another parcel under the grouping. You don't have to do that with the Rural Housing Certificate. You can do it eventually. You can build another house on one parcel of land with the RHC and then separate them further down the road. That is the main difference, is that you don't have to do a short plat under the RHC one.

This one you do under Residential Grouping. The distance is, I don't think that much of a big deal because there are some circumstances where this would be a bad thing just with people with weird shaped parcels like we illustrated. But then again, it is up to the landowner to choose how far away they want to go. If they want to go 500 feet and it goes into their field isn't that up to the landowner to decide that? He could do it with 300 feet into the field, as well.

David Gibney – I'm not going to fall on any swords saying that 300 has to stay there. I was just seeing as it may have some utility in an area where we already had crowding houses close together.

Chad Whetzel – I think it is a different enough that we could make the argument 300 feet is fine here, where we are trying to group them, whereas the other one is two houses on a single parcel.

Alan Thomson – Okay, if that is what you want to stay with, that's fine. We'll just stay with 300 feet there.

Chad Whetzel – Have you ever had anyone come in and want to do a residential group?

Alan Thomson – Many times. This is not uncommon.

Chad Whetzel – Have they had any complaints about the distance or has that been an issue?

Alan Thomson – It has been a bit of an issue. Sometimes trying to find a spot within 300 feet but it has never been something that hasn't been overcome. There may have been better spots just beyond 300 feet but I don't recall denying anybody that ability.

Rusty Jamison – If somebody wanted to do this and they were having a hard time, couldn't they come to the planning board at that time and make an exception?

Alan Thomson – No, you can't have exceptions to that. That would be a bad idea, Rusty. You open up that door and pretty much everybody is going to go through it. You have to have a bright line where you draw and that's what the code says. This is as far as you go. Unless the code changes.

Chad Whetzel – I'm kind of the opinion it has worked this long, let's keep it.

Alan Thomson – Okay, everyone okay with that one? Okay, let's move on to page 11, Accessory Dwelling Units strike out. We don't need these anymore since we are allowing a second home on the parcel, so we are going to strike all of that. And Historic Structures, Chad, yes, we need to keep this in. If you read this, you might have an Historic Structure already on your land and you want to build a second home on it, I think this is relevant here. It needs to be compatible with the historic building. Is everyone okay with that one?

Chad Whetzel – So, when you say historic structure, you are saying if I have a barn that is on the historic list then I have to try to make it similar?

Alan Thomson – It doesn't talk about accessory buildings. It talks about residences.

Chad Whetzel – That historic structure is a very different meaning than an historic residence.

Alan Thomson – The code says residence on the buildings.

Dave Gibney – The code right here says "*within a historic structure.*"

David Tysz – That could mean any kind of building on that property, then.

Dave Gibney – I agree if you got an historic house on the lot your second one should match the historic house. I am less willing to say if I've got an old round barn that I have to build new round house.

Brian Davies– Right.

Alan Thomson - Okay, under "a." it talks about primary dwelling structure. It doesn't say round barn.

David Tysz – I think someone would challenge you unless it is made clear.

Alan Thomson – What I don't know is where this original language came from. Did it come from an RCW? In that case it would be state law.

Chad Whetzel – I don't have a problem, like you said, if you have a historic residence, yes, you don't want to put some modern type construction work right next to that, but if it is a barn that is on the property then, it doesn't matter.

Alan Thomson – Keep in mind that this whole thing was under Chapter 19.10.065 Accessory Dwelling Units. This was part of that chapter, so again, that's just the dwelling unit.

Dave Gibney – So, you would just end up putting it in as part of the preceding chapter, or would it go into the, you are striking the whole chapter but then where does it go?

Alan Thomson – It would have to be a separate section so the last one here is “c.” and it seems to make sense to have this one as “d.,” so it would be separated. But again, maybe we need to make it clear we are only talking about residences, not having the residence look like a historic barn.

Rusty Jamison – I would say that if an individual is willing to use part of the historical structure in the remodel of a new house in the construction of a new house, in any way, shape or form, our language needs to be good so that it would encourage them to keep the old structure and use it rather than burn it down and start over. Because when you work with a contractor and he says you’d like to keep part of the old house or use some of the old chimney or whatever the case may be of the old historic structure, most of the time they really cringe and they throw you a dollar amount that is going to be higher to keep that structure than if you just tore it down and started over.

So, whatever we do here, if it encourages someone to use the historic structure, I think we should just be fine with that and hope that they use sense to maybe use brick with the old structure that was brick or whatever. Otherwise, you are just going to encourage people to get rid of the historic structure.

David Gibney – This was part of, “I want to add an accessory dwelling unit to my existing historic house.” That is really not the case. When I think about historic register and things like that, absent a certified local government situation like the City of Pullman, I’m not sure you can enforce such requirements anyway. In reality, a national historic register, all that says is that you can’t use federal money to tear it down, and about all the state historic structure is good is for you can do nice brochures and advertising. There aren’t any actual restrictions on what you can do with it.

Alan Thomson – Are you suggesting that we should just strike this, Dave?

David Gibney – I think you might want to do a little more research. I’m not sure it is enforceable. I think it is a great idea.

Rusty Jamison – I think it is a great idea so if somebody comes in and asked you, you have something there you can use to encourage to keep it as an historic structure even if it is going to be more expensive for them. I don’t think we should have restrictions on the way you use it.

Alan Thomson – What am I hearing here? Are we keeping this or are we leaving it out?

Chad Whetzel – After listening to Dave, I kind of agree with him that that was the accessory so if you’re adding on to an historical structure you want to keep it the same. But I don’t think it necessarily has a place there without the accessory units.

Alan Thomson – Okay, can we strike it? Is everybody okay with striking it?

Rusty Jamison – I’m okay with striking it and then if they ask about it all I would say is encourage them to keep it and that way we preserve some of the history in WC if they want to keep it on the farm.

Chad Whetzel – Like you say, Alan, you probably should check the WACs and make sure it didn’t come from somewhere in there. I doubt it, but let’s just check it otherwise I would say we can strike it.

Alan Thomson – Okay, for right now, that’s what we will do. Moving on, page 13. Short Plats and Subdivisions. We have gone over this before so this not relevant anymore so that is why it is being struck.

*A short plat means the division or redivision of land less than 20 acres into four or fewer buildable lots.*

I am making clarification on what a short plat means in WC and that’s a division of land less than 20 acres into four or fewer buildable lots. Then the next paragraph adding “residences,” in “C.”

*A shot plat maybe used to separate out parcel on which is located a residence or residences.*

Is everybody okay with the language on page 13?

Chad Whetzel – Looks good to me.

Alan Thomson – Then on page 14, **Chapter 19.10.090 – Conditional Uses and Administrative Permits**. We are adding “Commercial horse boarding facilities.” I explained that should be in here because other parts of the code says that commercial horse boarding facilities have to be a CUP.

“Non-profit environmental operations.” We debated this before and this is the language that you all landed on. So, I don’t think we need to go through that debate anymore.

“Agricultural and commercial trucking repair shops.” We talked about that one.

“Metal fabrication shops for construction and agricultural industries.” Our addition to the list of conditional uses.

Chad Whetzel – “Metal fabrication shops for construction and agricultural industrial industries.” Okay, that works.

Alan Thomson – I think that is it for **Chapter 19.10**. So, that was the biggest one. Let’s go to the SEPA chapter. There is only one correction on page 5 where it says, in A. *Appeal of the intermediate steps under SEPA (e.g., lead agency determination, scoping draft EIS adequacy) shall not be allowed.*”

We went over that one and that definitely is aligned with the WAC so that word, “not” needs to be in there. Okay with that?

Okay, “**Chapter 19.59 Surface Mining and Rock Crushing.**”

***B. A one-time expansion of existing permitted surface mining and rock crushing operations of less than 10 percent of the current quarry site does not require further conditional or administrative use permit review as long as the expansion does not fall within 1,000 feet of a residence. A residence owned by the landowner of the quarry site is excepted.***

You will recollect that in the comp plan we put in language that allowed the one-time expansion of existing quarries up to 10% of the current quarry site. That is what we agreed upon in the comp plan and we need to make sure that aligns with the development regulations which is this. Is everyone okay with that? Okay.

This one is different. ***Chapter 19.15 – North Pullman-Moscow Corridor District (N-PMC)*** I did not include this one in your package because this just came up. This is the corridor codes, the north and south corridor codes, Pullman-Moscow Corridor District. So, on page 6, under this part right here, if somebody wants to build something additional on their parcel in the Pullman-Moscow Corridor District, they originally have to go through a conditional use permit to build anything here. That is all part of the code.

But if you have an existing business and you want to expand it, you want to put another building on it, then what the code says at the moment is that that has to go through another CUP. There are some exceptions for the County Planner to make it administratively rather than through the Board of Adjustment, so these are the things that I would need to take into consideration here.

3. *Proposed modifications that may be decided administratively in this matter include:*
- a. *expansion of structures*
  - b. *replacement of structures*
  - c. *increase in height*
  - d. *placement or modification of signs*
  - e. ***additional structures***

Stormwater runoff, adequate parking, if somebody wants to put another building on their business. Here in #3, this puts some restrictions on what I can allow administratively. *“Expansion of structures, replacement of structures, increase in height, placement or modifications of signs.”* It doesn't say anything about additional buildings. I would like to add additional buildings to that list of administrative use review rather than a Board of Adjustment. What do you think?

Chad Whetzel -What are the conditions on some of the uses of these pieces?

Alan Thomson – It is mostly a CUP for any kind of business or activity that could cause impacts to surrounding landowners. So, if you are just sitting in your office typing away on your computer that doesn't have any effects on the adjacent landowner. Therefore, it would be a permitted use. But if you are a construction company that definitely is going to be a conditional use. So, in that code there is a list of conditional uses.

I can think of a particular case here. There is a business in the corridor right now that wants to add a storage shed. That business never went through a conditional use permit because it was built in 1983 before we had the codes. So, the code right now says that business needs to go through another CUP but in front of the BOA. If we put it in here, and it can be done administratively, it is still the same thing except it gets done quicker. I still have to apply the code the same as the BOA would and I just think it is better for the local businesses so they don't have to wait forever in front of the Board of Adjustment.

Dave Gibney – We have added a number of these administrative things that were conditional to become administrative in the time I've been here. More often than not, it applies to something that has been frequently coming up and rarely if ever denied by the BOA. Does this sort of thing happen often and does the BOA usually approve it?

Alan Thomson – Yes, they usually approve it and it happens frequently. I wouldn't say very often, but it does happen. We've had situations where things happen and they need to go back to the BOA. The

corridor district code is different from the agricultural code in the Ag district. If you are just going to add a storage building to your parcel in the corridor, what is the big deal.

Chad Whetzel – It depends on what you are storing.

Alan Thomson – Keep in mind, Chad, anything that I do administratively, is appealable to the BOA and is appealable to court. I apply the code just the same as the BOA does. I think I do a good job of doing that. This would take less time but if I made a mistake or somebody objected to it there is a procedure where they can appeal to the BOA. You have to be harmed in some way and you have to be able to prove harm in order to appeal something.

Dave Gibney – I'm inclined to go along with this but the argument you just made makes me ask, so why isn't everything administrative and then appealable?

Alan Thomson – That would be a good question and I would say that it should be administrative. I would go down that road, Dave. That is why I am adding this and maybe slow but sure looking at places where I think it should be administrative, because the outcome is going to be the same and in fact, the outcome could be better because I know the codes better than the BOA does.

Dave Gibney – The problem is that we have the Hearings Examiner now and no Board of Adjustment.

Alan Thomson – I wouldn't say I know the codes better than the Hearings Examiner but the BOA is different than the Hearings Examiner. So, I don't think there is any harm here because they are actually going to be seeking a variance because they are going to be about 10 feet away from the adjacent landowner. The adjacent landowner says, "No worry, no problem I'll sign off on the variance." This is just a storage area for an electrical business in the corridor.

So, it is not a big deal. So, this helps the applicants because it expedites things for them. It is not necessary for them to go through the BOA and it is difficult to get the BOA together. It's a public hearing and it takes time and effort and a little bit more money for the applicant.

Brian Davies – It shortens the process but the due diligence is still there and the code is there and possibly lets the landowner walk away with a better taste in his mouth.

Alan Thomson – Absolutely.

Chad Whetzel – I agree with all that but I guess what I am looking at is, is there some sort of a process to know that something is going on to decide whether or not if I am an adjacent landowner am I notified about that before somebody else is putting up buildings?

Alan Thomson – All adjacent landowners within 300 feet get notified ahead of time. That is standard operating procedure for any application. The adjacent landowners always get notified. In this case, the landowner has to get notified because they are going to go for a variance, as well. If they can't make the 20-foot setback.

Chad Whetzel – I realize that I was just thinking in general. If they are going to add an extra structure to their property, is there going to be the availability for someone to challenge that if they are so inclined.

Alan Thomson – Yes, anything that we do is always public notice. There is the SEPA checklist involved with this, there is a notice that goes in the paper, adjacent landowners within 300 feet are notified, so it is well notified. Okay, are we okay with that then? Okay, Chad?

Chad Whetzel – Okay, I guess.

Alan Thomson – No worry, it is not going to blow up on us.

Chad Whetzel – Well, no that is not the concern. It is just like you said, it is the corridor and you already have to do a CUP for it and now we are changing that exception, and it is changed from what the CUP originally said.

Alan Thomson – The CUP never existed. They don't have one. Now they will have one.

Chad Whetzel – So, was this built before the corridor?

Alan Thomson – It was 1983.

Dave Gibney – This particular one was but I'm agreeing with it looking into the future, one single example is not the reason to do this.

Alan Thomson – Okay, I will move on. **Chapter 19.41 Rural Community Center District (RCC-1)** This one is new. This came up recently. I took this to the BOCC. Someone in Steptoe wants to start an assisted living facility in Steptoe. They approached me and I told them they couldn't do it because it wasn't in the code. They are in an RCC-1 District which is Rural Community Center District in Steptoe. This district allows residences and businesses.

So, I took this to the BOCC and asked them. The applicants came in and petitioned the BOCC and they said it seemed to be a good idea. It is something that is needed and take it to the Planning Commission. So here we are.

What we are proposing is to add that to the list of conditional uses. It is not going to be an outright allowed use. There will be some activity there so impacts to the neighbors, so the reason why it is in the list of conditional uses. That means the neighbors will get notified of the permit application.

The BOCC advised the applicant to go out in the neighborhood and see how the neighbors felt about this. Now, I just got recently a list of about a dozen of the adjacent landowners who have no problem with it. So, we are asking to add this to this chapter on the conditional uses.

Brian Davies – So, assisted living facilities is kind of a wide broad description there. What could that entail?

Alan Thomson – When we get to the **Chapter 19.03, Definitions**, you'll see how it is being defined. It is kind of broad but it is basically people who can't take care of themselves anymore. These people own the home and they would be running that as a home-based facility.

Dave Gibney – Frankly, I would be okay with outright nursing homes in Steptoe.

Alan Thomson – One of the big concerns that we have had in the past is proximity to a hospital. We had somebody who was interested in doing this in the Rosalia area and the BOCC weren't keen on that at the time because of the distance to the nearest hospital. The BOCC today don't seem to be worried about that because it is pretty close to Colfax.

Chad Whetzel – The reality of that is that it is not really our concern. There is one in Garfield and that is quite a ways from everything. From what I have heard it is a great facility.

Dave Gibney – That would be the customer's concern on whether or not to use the facility, not ours.

Alan Thomson – Right. That is pretty much how the BOCC felt too.

Chad Whetzel – I'm more concerned why we are excluding drive-ins. On **"c." Restaurants, not including drive-ins.**

Alan Thomson – We could petition the BOCC to see if they would be okay with that.

Dave Gibney – We could strike it right now and see if they object.

Brian Davies – I have a question about the assisted living facilities. In the rural unincorporated county, or what is the zoning here? You said RR-1?

Alan Thomson – At the top, **Rural Community Center District (RCC-1)**

Brian Davies – So this can't take place just everywhere in the County? This is only allowed in an RCC-1 area, correct?

Alan Thomson – Correct, and there aren't too many of those around. You have to go through a CUP and if there was another particular part of the County that has RCC-1 Districts, which there are, if there was a concern the BOA would have to take that into consideration and could potentially deny it, if there were legitimate concerns about having it located in another RCC-1 District somewhere.

Brian Davis – The only reason I am asking these questions for everybody's interest is, I think they are great ideas. They are great facilities to site all over because they are certainly needed. I am a little afraid of some of the impacts and some of the lack of oversight of these facilities from county and state agencies and the ability for them to fall into disrepair and the ability for residents to walk away from them.

Then you have impacts that are put on the County. I'm just trying to think from personal experience about some of this stuff of being involved in search and rescue operations for people who walk away from these facilities. I just want to make sure we are doing the right thing.

Chad Whetzel – Some of the facilities that I've seen Brian, and I don't know some of them will just be a normal house in town that has four bedrooms that has a nurse there 24 hours a day and it has 3-4 residents.

Brian Davis – All that information, I'm sure it comes out when we go through a CUP and all that.

Chad Whetzel -It could be anything from people that just have some physical impairment that they can't dress themselves, or you never know. It could be a whole range, but the way that is written that does not include skilled nursing where you have to be hooked to IVs and everything.

Brian Davis – In the rural area the patients are really, I guess, in control of that and I'm just not sure how that works, if you are not in a metropolitan area.

Alan Thomson – My understanding is it is highly regulated by the State. They have to go through a lot of hoops to get through the State requirements.

Brian Davis – Like setting up a day care.

Alan Thomson – So, that is mostly regulated by the State and then, of course, there are the building codes that need to be applied. It is not an easy process to get through.

Rusty Jamison – I would like to say that in Garfield, I am familiar with that one. It is a nice facility, it is used. I definitely understand your concern, Brian, because our facility in Garfield has struggled financially from the get-go. It still struggles today.

If the owners who want to do this, I know it is out of our hands but I would very much encourage them to have someone who is knowledgeable with these facilities to review their operating plans and exactly how they are going to manage it. Because if they do construct it, and I know it is out of our hands, here, and it falls flat and they do walk away, it does create a mess for the city and the possibly the County too.

I don't fancy the idea of a facility being built and falling apart and then the taxpayer having to be taxed to keep the doors open. That can happen, but again, it isn't the planning commission's business to tell someone whether they can or cannot construct or might say, because we don't think they are good managers. We really are not in that role. We can say, yes, you can put it there or it is not legal and you have to go somewhere else. I know from the one in Garfield it is going to be hard for them to make a profitable facility in Steptoe.

Alan Thomson – Rusty, just a little bit of background information. The couple that are doing this, this is a single-family residence. It is a house and they have several of these elsewhere. They have some in Spokane and other locations. This is not their first rodeo. And, again, it is a single-family residence so if it doesn't work, it remains a single-family residence.

Rusty Jamison – That's encouraging.

Dave Gibney – If we were looking at this stand-alone and wanted to deny it, we would have to come up with some Findings of Fact that are defensible and it is a bad idea. I cannot think of any that is within our jurisdiction.

Rusty Jamison – I agree. I was just putting it in there. I was just saying in the future if somebody was going to build a stand-alone one or it didn't have a very good business plan, it is out of our hands but I know you can really sneak a lot of money into this stuff if you don't know what to do.

Chad Whetzel – So, correct me if I'm wrong. We will just use Steptoe as an example. If your building is an assisted living facility or converting an existing house, everything is on its own separate well. Correct?

Alan Thomson – Steptoe has a water system, a public water system and a public sewer system.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, because my thought was, I could see Rusty’s concern about size. You don’t want something about the size of The Bishop Place or The Regency in the middle of Steptoe. That is not the goal there. But where you are talking a house that has 4-5 people that fits the character of those unincorporated towns.

Alan Thomson – We are talking about Steptoe. If they wanted to build a facility, Steptoe would have to okay water and sewer. I am aware they are almost at capacity and they have been at capacity for a long time. There is no more water available, so if someone came along and wanted to build such a facility Steptoe might tell them, no. You can’t get water and sewer.

Chad Whetzel – Right, so I think the thing that is going to limit the size of all these facilities in these rural communities is going to be water, which is up to them or in the case of some place where they are on a well, the State laws say how many gallons they can use in a day.

Alan Thomson – Right.

Chad Whetzel – As far as having large scale facilities, I don’t think that is a concern.

Brian Davies – No.

Dave Gibney – How many more of these do we have to do in 43 minutes?

Alan Thomson – Only a couple more. So, let’s just blaze on through and hopefully, they are not too difficult.

Okay, **Chapter 19.03 – Definitions** Page 2

**Section 19.03.085 – Assisted Living Facility**

*Housing for individuals that require nursing care, housekeeping, and/or prepared meals as needed.*

Alan Thomson – Okay, page 3.

**Section 19.03.151 – Bunkhouse**

*A structure, often with bunk beds, used for sleeping quarters for ranch hands, or migratory workers.*

Rusty Jamison – I think that looks fine. I don’t know anybody that uses a bunkhouse anymore.

**Section 19.03.152 – Cabin**

*A recreational dwelling unit used for short-term, temporary occupancy which may be fully plumbed, served with electrical power, and contain a kitchen and bathroom.*

Alan Thomson – That language came out of Adams County definitions.

Chad Whetzel – I know where you are going with that but do we need to put another “may,” in there?

Alan Thomson – I think the word, “may” goes along with all of that. “*May be fully planned, served with electrical power,*” etc. I think “may” applies to all of that.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, I’m good with it.

Alan Thomson – Okay, the next one. **Chapter 19.54 – Nonconforming Uses and Special Exceptions**  
*B. The provisions of 19.54010(1) notwithstanding, the use of a building as a single family dwelling which is discontinued for a period longer than six months shall not subject said building to the restrictions of the zone classification, if and only if the lapse in use is occasioned by the good faith, continuing effort to sell said building for use as a single family dwelling.*

The reason I don’t like that is because this applies to a house that is no longer being lived in. So, the house still is there and I think this is old language that has been there a long time. I don’t think that should apply, because otherwise, you are saying that house is not consistent with the codes anymore and you can’t live in it. If somebody is not living in the house, I still consider that to be a viable residential parcel.

I think it should continue to be a viable residential parcel versus if you remove the house from the land completely, that is different. After six months after removing the house, then that land becomes subject to the current county code. I don’t think the current county code should apply to a house that is still there. It is non-conforming allowed. That is the reason why I struck it out.

Dave Gibney – Okay, I pretty much agree with you, but does the County have something about abandoned property or nuisance property, specifically the example in Pullman is Mimosa.

Alan Thomson – I am not familiar with that.

Chad Whetzel – That is the building that is falling apart but they won’t sell it, on Main Street.

Dave Gibney – How can you live in Pullman and not be familiar with it?

Alan Thomson – I have blinders on at times, Dave.

Chad Whetzel – He doesn’t actually live in Pullman.

Alan Thomson – I live in Albion.

Dave Gibney – Oh, okay.

Alan Thomson – That’s my excuse.

Chad Whetzel – I agree with Dave. Is there some process for the County to condemn buildings?

Alan Thomson – Yes, but it is through the building codes. So, there is not a zoning code for that.

Dave Gibney – Actually, that is the same status that Mimosa is that it is an eye sore, run-down and painting wouldn’t help it a lot and it makes the downtown ugly, but it is still compliant with the building codes until somebody tries to use it. There is nothing that can actually be done.

Rusty Jamison – I understand what you are saying, Dave, as far as a structure in the city. I think you need to remember that in the rural area a structure like this, and there is talk sometimes about these abandoned places that are just left. A lot of times a fire just occurs and the building is just gone. That can happen out in the farming area and I realize in the city it cannot happen that way. I guess what I'm getting at is it is a little different out here than maybe in the city.

Dave Gibney – I'm okay with striking it. I was the one who was wondering when we were going to get done. I apologize for bringing this up.

Alan Thomson – If everybody is okay with this, I think there is only one more to do.

### **Chapter 19.12 – Cluster Residential District**

Cluster development. Page 1. There are two different ways you can cluster and one is gone because that State law went away. That is the part about the long plat. So that doesn't exist anymore and that is why we are striking this.

*The minimum zone size for a short plat consisting of four buildable lots shall be 20 acres. ~~The minimum zone size for a long plat consisting of at least six buildable lots shall be 60 acres.~~*

*Lots may be as small as ½ acre. ~~As long as the short plat ratio of at least 5 acres per residence is maintained, or the long plat ratio of at least 10 acres per residence is maintained.~~*

### **Section 19.12.070 – Short Plat ~~and Long Plat~~ Subdivisions.**

Page 2

***Each cluster will require a public water system approved by the State Department of Health.***

Alan Thomson – Environmental Health is driving this bus here. That we did not do initially back in 2004 when clustering first started. We have to clarify that now if anybody applies for a cluster they have to get a public water system approved up front.

Chad Whetzel – They can still drill their own well if they want.

Alan Thomson – Yes, they can. Here on page 3 the Long Plat stuff has been struck. This is the long plat language that is no longer pertinent.

On page 7, I am clarifying the CC&R's.

***Prior to approval of any short plat survey ~~or preliminary long plat survey~~, any Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R's)***

Alan Thomson – So, that is everything that is on deck. If you are okay with everything here, and my thought is to bring this to a public hearing on October 19<sup>th</sup>. Is everybody okay with that date?

Chad Whetzel – I will probably be a little bit late. I can't guarantee I can be here at 7:00 p.m. I will try.

Rusty Jamison – As far as I know, I will be around. You want to try to have an in-person meeting?

Alan Thomson – I don't know what the situation will be like. If we can have it in-person, yes, we will do so.

Chad Whetzel – If we are doing it in-person I know I can't make it on time.

Alan Thomson – When we do go back to in-person we will still have the hybrid option open. A combination for people that can't get to Colfax, you could still tune in online. So, am I hearing anybody that is not able to come on October 19<sup>th</sup>? David Tysz are you available?

David Tysz – I can certainly do that. If the power stays with us. If we have it down here, I'm good to go.

Alan Thomson – Rusty, how about you?

Rusty Jamison – As far as I know. If I can't make it, I will let you know.

Alan Thomson – I'll have to send it out to the rest of the members so I can get a quorum. That is what I am shooting for. I'm going to put the SEPA in the paper next week and get through that 14-day comment period and then arrange for the hearing on October 19<sup>th</sup>.

Then with the Shoreline Master Program update, when I talk to the consultant tomorrow, I will try two possible times for her to tell us what she is doing. October 5<sup>th</sup> or October 19<sup>th</sup> but I am not sure about putting the public hearing and her presentation on the same night. That might be too much. I'll will ask her how much time she needs for her presentation. The next time would be November 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Dave Gibney – We would want to do the public hearing ahead of her presentation.

Alan Thomson – Yes. So, those are three possible times for the SMP update. As soon as I have a clear idea about it, I will get in touch with you.

Rusty Jamison - Is November 2<sup>nd</sup> an election day?

Chad Whetzel – It is the first Tuesday after the first Monday so it would be the 8<sup>th</sup>.

Alan Thomson – Okay, that's all I have for you tonight.

**MOTION** by Brian Davies and seconded by Rusty Jamison to adjourn. Motion passed.

**Adjourned – 8:57 p.m.**