

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
LAND USE PLANNING DIVISION
MULTNOMAH COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF MAY 26, 2016

- I. **Call to Order:** Chair John Ingle called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. on Thursday, May 26, 2016 at the Multnomah Building, Room 101, located at 501 SE Hawthorne Blvd., Portland, OR.
- II. **Roll Call:** Present - Ingle, Vice-Chair Jim Kessinger, Katharina Lorenz, Susan Silodor, Jeremy Sievert, Timothy Wood
Absent - Chris Foster, Bill Kabeiseman, Alicia Denney
- III. **Approval of Minutes: May 2, 2016.**
Motion by Wood; seconded by Silodor.
Motion passed unanimously.
- IV. **Opportunity to Comment on Non-Agenda Items:**
None.
- V. **Continued Hearing: Update to the Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan (PC-2014-3436)**
Ingle began to read into the record the Legislative Hearing Process for the Planning Commission for a public hearing, however, Michael Cerbone, Multnomah County Planning Director, advised him that because public testimony was closed on May 9, this was not necessary. This portion of the continued hearing is for deliberations.

Rich Faith, Senior Planner for Multnomah County, introduced Joanna Valencia, Multnomah County Transportation Planning & Development Manager, and noted that this is a continuation of the hearing held on May 2, 2016. He said tonight's staff report focuses on the testimony submitted from Metro and Carol Chesarek at that hearing. Their written testimony requested a number of changes to the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan (TSP). Staff had an opportunity to review the requested changes and prepared their responses, which are included in a table in the staff report. Staff's responses fall under three categories; agree, disagree or are neutral on the requested change. Of the changes that Metro requested of Appendix C, we would disagree with all of them, because that is the most recently adopted Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Plan, and is only being attached as an appendix. In making your recommendation this evening, we ask that the Planning Commission indicate its position on the requested changes and staff's responses.

Faith went on to say that the hearing was closed to oral testimony at the conclusion of the May 2 hearing, but the record was left open for seven days to accept additional written testimony. During that period, we received ten submittals, which are noted on pages 11-12 of the staff report. Most of the comments were directed at Metro's May 2 testimony, and were equally divided between support for, or opposition to, their requested changes. The West Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District (WMSWCD) had a concern about the capture and retention of stormwater run-off. However, we believe that is addressed by Stormwater Drainage Policy 11.4 in Chapter 11. We think, perhaps, the drainage district concentrated their review on Chapter 5 policies and were not aware of the policy in Chapter 11. Related to that, Carol Chesarek recommended that we

combine Policy 11.14 with the policies in Chapter 5 pertaining to stormwater management, and we concur with that recommendation.

There is one additional change to Addendum 1, which are the recommended changes that came from the County Attorney's office provided at the last public hearing. This pertains to the language in the plan that explains how adoption of the Comprehensive Plan will repeal the various Rural Area Plans, and why the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Plan is being retained as an appendix. In Carol Chesarek's letter dated May 9, she raises questions about two of the recommended text changes in Addendum 1 specific to Policy 4.1 and Policy 4.9, and points out that there should be some additional language in Policy 4.9 to make it read as it was intended. Staff looked at her proposed changes, and would agree with making them.

There is a new Addendum 2 that responds to several revisions to the TSP requested by Carol Chesarek in her May 2 letter. The addendum includes some additional detail sheets, one of which pertains to gravel shoulders as a bicycle and pedestrian facility. There are also additional detail sheets for some Transportation Demand Management options, and some background information as a footnote to Transportation System Policy 11, which opposes placement of new regional roadways in the county.

In summation, the recommendation of staff for the adoption of these proposed plans includes Exhibit A, which is the Comprehensive Plan with appendices A through E; Addendum 1, the County Attorney's changes to the Comprehensive Plan, with the two modifications to Policies 4.1 and 4.9; Exhibit E, which is the Transportation System Plan; and Addendum 2, which are the staff recommended changes to the TSP. There are a number of items raised in Metro's May 2 letter and Carol Chesarek's May 2 and May 9 letters that we still need the Planning Commission's direction on.

Faith also noted that Commissioner Foster submitted written comments that have been included for your consideration. Ingle said we had a significant amount of consultant assistance throughout the process, and asked if their input was incorporated with staff's responses. Faith said yes.

Ingle opened the floor for deliberations. They began with Metro's requested change #1, which deletes some text and adds other text to Chapter 1, page 26, regarding the characteristics of the West Hills. Silodor said her concern is the wording that says "create opportunities for county residents to enjoy nature". I will not vote for this if I do not know what the specific opportunities are that Metro has in mind. If it's going to be bicycles, then what kind of bicycles? If it's going to be mountain biking, then I would say no, because you have to widen trails and you have erosion. So for me, this doesn't work. And considering what happened at the last meeting with Metro's introduction into the process, I do not feel comfortable without specifics. When we did the Sauvie Island plan, we pushed for specifics, and that's what I'd like to push for from Metro. Ingle asked if her position was to leave it as is. Silodor said taking out "create opportunities for county residents to enjoy nature" would probably work.

Ingle said he was going to take a different approach. We had extensive Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) input on this. Commissioner Foster and I attended most of those meetings and we watched the process. It was very dynamic; there was a lot of opportunity for input, both urban and rural, and although it got heated at times, everyone was able to come to a compromise. I believe the document we have reflects that collaboration, that compromise, with the wording they thought was appropriate. So my position throughout this is going to default to the CAC. Unless it's something significant, I don't see change. I also don't see this document as being a publication

piece for Metro; describing what Metro does, what Metro owns, etc. There may need to be some clarification, but as a self-promotion piece, I don't see it.

Silodor said I really think Metro is not always acting in the community's best interest and is not really listening. I have grave concerns about this wording and would like more specificity. I think they have not gauged the importance of that land to those who live around it and who care for it.

Ingle said, I think, again, the simplest approach is to leave it as it is. Sievert said the fact that you and Commissioner Foster were involved as deeply as you were, that opinion is valuable to me. I agree with your position on this.

Wood said I generally agree, but I recall at the last meeting staff suggested there was some reason for this coming so late. I don't remember exactly what that was, so if we could get clarification, I would feel more comfortable striking it.

Cerbone said Metro's Open Space group engaged with us at the end of the CAC process and they wanted to make recommendations. My suggestion was to wait until the document was ready and make recommendations in that manner, like any other group that would be commenting on it. The intent was to have their comments available to you as part of the staff report, not to have them show up at the hearing and drop additional information, which is what happened.

Wood asked if they had the opportunity to get involved in the CAC process. Faith said when the document was in its drafting stages, it was circulated to all the various agencies, which we referred to as our Technical Advisors. They were asked to review the entire document, both narrative and policies. In the case of Metro, we sent it to their planning staff, presuming they would circulate it amongst others within the agency if they felt it necessary. I don't know if that happened or not, but their planning staff reviewed it and submitted a letter in response. It was much later when Metro's Open Space people got involved.

Jed Tomkins, Assistant Multnomah County Attorney, noted that one of Metro's written comments was, when talking about Metro, let's be accurate about what they do. I believe there is a good legal reason to do that, because you don't want to describe them in a way that is not true and have this document be inaccurate. Going forward, I think that would be ideal, and want to make sure everyone considers that.

Ingle said on this issue, staff recommends a neutral stance. Some of us are advocating to leave it the way it is. Wood said I'm comfortable with that. Ingle reiterated that will be his overarching thought process throughout most of these. It was agreed to leave number one as is.

Ingle went on to #2, Chapter 5, page 23: Fish & Wildlife Habitat. Staff is neutral on striking "natural ecosystems". I think I read that the wording "natural ecosystems" is in our current comp plan and we haven't incurred any issues to date. It was agreed to leave this as it is.

Number 3 is Chapter 8, page 3: Discussing agencies/recreational service providers. Ingle noted there is an extensive dialogue about what Metro is, the services they offer, history, etc. My feeling is that is more appropriate in Metro's own policy documents, and not needed here. Silodor agreed. Kessinger also noted that we did not define other government entities. It was agreed to go with staff's recommendation to make changes to the second paragraph, but delete the additional five paragraphs that Metro suggested.

Number 4, Chapter 8, page 4: Discussing Sandy River recreational facilities. They went with staff's recommendation to add the words "public and".

Number 5, Chapter 8, page 4 and 5: Figures 1 and 2. Ingle said I don't have a problem with most current data generating a new map; I do have some concern with having parks and open space as one color code on the map, because they are two distinct amenities with different levels of uses and impacts. But I don't know the fine grain detail of the maps we're producing. Silodor said I agree with that as well, I think it gets confusing for people.

Faith said I need to point out one problem, however. We get our data layers from Metro, and in looking at their most current map, I noticed that they now show one color, where they didn't before. So if we apply that new data, it is going to show up as one color. Ingle said in that situation, I guess we really don't have a choice. But if we had a choice, we'd prefer two distinct colors. The commissioners agreed.

Number 6, Chapter 8, page 6: Discussion planning documents. Ingle said staff agrees with the change to strike "land acquisition". The Commissioners agreed.

Number 7, Chapter 8, page 8: Goals, Policies and Strategies. Ingle noted that staff disagrees with the change requested because they believe "rural residents and visitors" encompasses everyone. Ingle said I remember very clearly a conversation about this particular wording and the CAC agreed that rural residents and visitors encompassed everything. The Commissioners agreed with staff.

Number 8, Chapter 8, page 8: Parks and Recreation Planning, (A) 8.1 adds the addition of Metro, and staff agrees with this change. Staff also concurs with striking "consistent" and inserting the word "compatible". Silodor said I think consistent and compatible are really not the same. Referring back to Commissioner Foster's remarks I think the wording should remain "consistent". I think it's a stronger word and I think that's what's important here. Kessinger said I guess I don't understand consistent being better than compatible, but that's the crux of the matter, right? Ingle said the CAC and staff considered this and the two words were hammered out, and consistent won over compatible.

Cerbone asked if it would help to hear the definition. Kessinger said yes. Cerbone said consistent is defined as "unchanging in achievement or effect over a period of time". The second portion includes the word "compatible, or in agreement with something", and the third bullet point would be "not containing any logical contradictions". Compatible is defined as "able to exist or occur together without conflict". Kessinger said the second definition of consistent is a synonym of compatible, but the other two definitions could be argued to confuse people. Ingle thought consistent would be more all-encompassing. Kessinger asked if we want to have a broad term that could be misinterpreted. You could argue that compatible is clearer. Silodor said I think consistent is clearer because consistency means maintaining and I think that's really important. I think we are trying to maintain something.

Ingle asked if there was a similar conflict with these two words in other portions of the document. Lorenz said 10B is complement and compatible. Cerbone said a lot of it is what was the intent of the CAC. What were they talking about? And what is your intent as you make your recommendation, that is what will help guide us. Lorenz said there are several more changes asking for compatible, so maybe we should come back to this one. Ingle said we agree with the change in 8(A), and we will revisit 8(B).

Tomkins said another way to discuss this, and you might want to get this on the record; Metro's explanation is consistent means "happening in the same way". And their concern is that recreation opportunities cannot happen in the same way as wildlife habitat and wildlife corridor protection. So, one thing you could discuss on the record is whether you mean consistent to mean "happening in the same way" or not. Silodor said I read consistent as maintaining the plan as it is. I still see a difference and I'm uncomfortable with compatible because I don't know what definition of compatible is going to be applied. Consistent I get, because the CAC worked on this plan, and the language was parsed until it was perfect. So, I'm not very comfortable with compatible without a definition. Ingle said I'm comfortable with consistent, but we can come back to that.

Number 9, Chapter 8, page 9: West Hills Policies and Strategies. Ingle said staff is neutral on the first change, which is striking "complementary to". The second part is striking everything after "Goal 5", which staff is comfortable with. I believe that the language we have is consistent with the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel plan, which has already been approved. So, we would keep the first part as it reads, but strike everything after "Goal 5". This was agreed upon.

Number 10, Chapter 8, page 9: Sauvie Island and Multnomah Channel Policies and Strategies, A) 8.9 staff agrees with this change, which would be a technical correction to strike "Greenspaces Master Plan" and insert "2016 System Plan". Everyone agreed.

Part B, Policy 8.9(1) currently states "Ensure activities will complement". The proposed change is to change "complement" to "be compatible with". Staff is neutral on this change. Wood said this is already adopted as a part of the Sauvie Island plan, right? Cerbone said yes. Wood said, to me, that's kind of the whole ballgame. Faith said all of the policies from the Sauvie Island Plan have been carried over into the Comprehensive Plan and have been distributed amongst various chapters and topics. Some of those that were felt could be applied county-wide have been slightly modified, such as where it might specifically reference the Island, so there are a few that have had some minor word changes. Although the Sauvie Island Plan will be repealed because it was adopted in 2015, it will be attached as an addendum to this Comprehensive Plan. That is primarily for the narrative and the context it provides as to how policies specific to Sauvie Island would be interpreted and evaluated. So, everything is being retained as far as the Sauvie Island Plan, which honors the promise made to the residents and property owners that we would not lose anything. Because these policies are being transferred into the Comprehensive Plan, there is the opportunity that they could be amended. I don't recommend that, but that option does exist.

Kessinger said if a policy is in both the Comp Plan and the addendum Sauvie Island Plan, that is only for reference, so if it comes down to a legal situation, the Comp Plan has precedence. Faith said that is correct. Ingle said I'm comfortable with leaving it as is, with the exception of striking the language after "Goal 5" in D) 8.10. The Commissioners were in agreement.

On to numbers 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, which all have a similar response from planning staff that because Appendix C: SIMC Rural Area Plan is in the adopted 2015 SIMC plan, the text should not be changed. The Commissioners accepted staff's position.

Ingle went back to 8(B) and the discussion between consistent and compatible. Ingle said I think they can be interpreted in the same vein. I don't know if it's our position to have a narrowly focused definition, so we could assume that consistent and compatible have some synergy. Kessinger agreed and said if you take it in context, you'll know which definition to choose, so I think it's adequate. There was agreement to remain with the word "consistent".

Ingle moved on to page 6 of the staff report, which is Carol Chesarek's suggested revisions to the draft Comprehensive Plan and TSP submitted to the Planning Commission on May 2, 2016. The first item was map formats, which was a request for larger maps to be included in the appendix at the end of the document. Faith said staff's response is saying that we could provide what she is asking for. The Commissioners were fine with that.

Of the missing maps that Carol is requesting, staff notes that two of the four requested maps (Rural Centers and DOGAMI historical landslide map) are already provided. They felt the Water Districts could be added, if the data layer is available.

Tomkins again brought up a discussion about the word "complement" versus "compatible". He felt that perhaps the word "consistent" should be used throughout. Ingle said with that thought, we would go back to #9(Policy 8.8) and #10(B)(1), (C)(2) and (D)(8.10) and change the terminology to "consistent with" where appropriate. Faith went through each of these for clarification. In #9(Policy 8.8), change "are complementary to" to "are consistent with". Number 10(B)(Policy 8.9(1) change "complement" to "be consistent with". #10(C)Policy 8.9(2), change "maintain harmony with" to "are consistent with", under #10(D)(Policy 8.10), change "are complementary to" to "are consistent with". Ingle reminded Faith to also strike everything after "Goal 5".

Ingle went back to page 6 of the staff report and the missing maps. Regarding Public and private non-profit lands, staff maintains that because many of these are such small properties, they would not show up well on Plan maps and there would be no benefit. The Commissioners agreed with this assessment.

Ingle went on to issue number 3, Chapter 2, Page 10, Carol recommended adding and striking some wording. Tomkins suggested there might be a discussion about what the Commissioners mean by "adverse impacts". It is perhaps subjective to any given individual what feels adverse to them or not. The other thing is we consider residential uses to be non-farm uses, so there is inherent tension there. Perhaps you need the word "substantial", or something similar. Ingle said I think "adverse impacts" works well with "encroachment by" because that offers a little bit more clarity. Silodor agreed. Ingle said "encroachment by residential and other non-farm or non-forest uses" is the driver of "adverse impacts", as opposed to leaving adverse impacts to be an all-encompassing umbrella of everything bad in the world. Lorenz said that's a good balance. Tomkins said I understand why you're suggesting that, but I'm not sure of the exact definition of encroachment. In my mind, I'm thinking of an actual physical invasion and that isn't necessarily what a house is doing. If the house is located on its own parcel, you'll never have this, but you could still have conflicts between the two adjacent uses, and I think the policy is more geared towards that. Perhaps staff has some indication of what the CAC was intending.

First Cerbone read the definition of encroachment, which is "to gradually move or go into an area that is beyond the usual or desired limits. To gradually take or begin to use or affect something that belongs to someone else". He said I think what counsel was searching for was quantifying adverse impacts; trying to put an idea of what it is, because an adverse impact could be something very small to one person and something very large to someone else. Ingle asked if inserting the words "significant adverse impacts" get us closer? Lorenz said "encroachment" is very specific, so I'm curious why the CAC used that word. Faith said I believe this is an existing policy in one of the Rural Area Plans, so it's a term that is probably just being carried over.

Silodor said I can't speak for all of our rural areas, but I think I understand it if I come from a Sauvie Island viewpoint, that this is meant to preserve the rural and the farm areas and not allow additional residential growth or multiple houses on lands now zoned for one house. Faith said it may be important to understand that this policy rests in the Rural Residential (RR) areas. We are talking about areas that are already zoned RR, which is primarily intended for rural residential uses, but within that zone, there are some existing farm and forest lands. I don't think it's really about preventing residential uses, which are permitted there, but maybe to be concerned about what impacts those could have. Silodor said I think part of the reason something like this would have been written in is because there is, to some degree, a lack of faith between the community and the County, or governmental agencies. Because I think enforcement has been tricky for rural areas. I think it's important to remind staff that what you're dealing with is not just a planning issue, but a real, emotional issue on the part of people in those communities and perhaps a lack of trust. So wording in the Plan is actually quite important.

Tomkins said in looking back at Ms. Chesarek's actual comments and her Exhibit D testimony from May 2, she says "the existing language sounds like we're fending off rural residential uses that might creep into farm and forest lands". But the concern is "ensuring that new replacement or expanding uses in the Rural Residential zone minimize impacts on farm and forest uses". This kind of thing is sometimes discussed in allowing these non-resource uses, or a competing use, "as long as it will not force a significant change in accepted farm or forest practices on surrounding lands, or significantly increase the cost of those farm or forest practices". This is from ORS 215.296. Ingle said so incorporating the word "significant" would be beneficial. Tomkins said, they use it there, but it's further qualified; they're talking about not forcing that significant change or the increasing cost.

Ingle said I would say keep it as it is. We're beating ourselves up over a couple of words. Otherwise it's going to need some additional narrative. Tomkins said one last thing. I'm realizing as I read this, I think the requested change would actually change this policy entirely. I earlier mentioned how I understood the word "encroachment" as a physical invasion, and I think the definition that the Planning Director offered supported that. So, as written, this is protecting farm land and forest land and not really the practices. I think changing it from encroachment to adverse impacts is actually a fairly different concept. Ingle said I think our position is to keep it just the way it is, with no change. The Commissioners agreed.

On to item #3 Grading and Fill, Chapter 2, Page 21, staff disagrees with the change and suggests we maintain the language we have. This was agreed upon.

Number 5, Chapter 3, Page 16: West Hills Policies and Strategies, staff agrees with the additional policy and the Commissioners agreed as well.

On to issue number 6, Chapter 5, Page 21, adding the words "wetlands and", a change that staff agrees with. The Commission concurred.

Number 7, Chapter 5, Page 31. Ingle said this seems to just be a housekeeping, clean-up issue and they agreed with applying the policy to page 22 of Chapter 5, under Fish and Wildlife section.

Number 8, Chapter 5, Pages 20 and 22. Staff disagrees with the suggested change and the Commissioners agreed with staff to keep it as is.

Under number 9, the Transportation System Plan, staff agreed with the suggested change, and the Commission concurred.

Number 10, Policy 13, staff generally agrees with adding detail sheets of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) options. After clarifying that this wasn't adding a new policy, but just adding detail sheets, the Commissioners agreed with staff's position to add an additional item for clarity.

Number 11, Policy 11, Mobility and Freight. Staff agrees that Addendum 2 should include a footnote providing background information on the policy. Kessinger said this was raised with the Cornelius Pass discussion when talking about how to handle the increased traffic. The concern was not having flexibility, and this particular statement is only referring to new regional roadways, not improving existing. Lorenz said but this isn't changing the policy, right, it's just adding the background information. Faith said the background information is specific to the Westside Bypass that has been contemplated. And the policy emerged from the West Hills Rural Area Plan. It's now been modified to be a county-wide policy, but the only context we provide for that is the Westside Bypass. The Commissioners support staff's position.

Number 12, Transportation Policies, Page 74, there is a typo, which will be corrected in the final TSP.

Cerbone said there was some general discussion in the paragraphs that follow in the staff report that are probably important for the Commissioners to acknowledge. Ingle said there were comments from ten people after the May 2 hearing, which Cerbone said were basically divided between being in support of Metro's testimony, and opposition to the changes. Regarding the comments from the WMSWCD, Faith noted that their issue is addressed by stormwater drainage Policy 11.14, which staff suggests moving into Chapter 5. That will complement and complete the other policies in Chapter 5 on stormwater management.

Ingle thought this was also consistent with the May 9 comments from Carol Chesarek, but Faith said Carol has some additional changes that she is seeking in that letter that were not included in the table. He suggested it might be worth looking at that letter, as some have not yet been addressed. Under Natural Resources, she makes the argument for combining Policy 11.14 with those in Chapter 5, which staff concurs with. A number of these are comments to Metro's proposed revisions, but she suggested some different language. Having already made decisions on those, I don't know if you want to revisit them. The general consensus was no.

Kessinger said a couple letters commented on Policy 12, where it says "discourage through traffic on traffic ways within unincorporated Multnomah County". That sounds like an active "let's reduce traffic somehow". Washington County, ODOT and Sarah Hanson commented on that policy, so what does it mean when you say "discourage"? Do you sit by the road and make faces at them, or do you actively reduce or limit the capacity of the road? Valencia said that's a good question. I think based on the comments from ODOT, they raised some concerns regarding the word discourage versus taking a look at other strategies, such as reduce.

Valencia said I think this is reflective of what we heard through the CAC process and the desire to keep the rural character of Multnomah County. She wondered if the Planning Commission wanted to explore different language based on the comments received. Cerbone gave three definitions of "discourage" from Webster, the first is "to deprive of courage or confidence". The second is "to hinder by disfavoring", and the third is "to dissuade or attempt to dissuade from doing something".

Valencia said I think the "hindering by disfavoring" speaks to Policy 11 in regards to opposing any new regional ways, and wanting to keep the rural character of this area. Ingle said I think discourage was a word we heard over and over. It really gets to the heart of the matter.

Kessinger said would we interpret that to say this is what we would like to see and we'll do what we need to do later? Valencia said I think saying discourage is making sure that our functional class remains consistent with this rural feel. We're not going to update our implementation documents and all of a sudden build Arterial facilities when the current facility is designated a Collector. With continued growth, I think with this policy, dissuade is going to be the key thing. There are a lot of studies going on trying to fix the congestion on ODOT facilities and regional facilities and we are sitting at that table. And we continue to encourage taking a look at solutions other than going through the West Hills. I think this will help guide us as we're sitting at the regional table by saying, in Multnomah County, we value our rural character. Cerbone said there was a fair amount of discussion at the CAC around how this was worded, and they liked the way it was worded.

Lorenz said at the last meeting, there were a couple of things that came up that I would like some clarification on. As far as the scenic view overlay, it was decided not to put that on the west side, is that correct? Faith said there is a policy that says to consider applying that scenic overlay to the west slope of the Tualatin Mountain in West Hills, which has not been taken out, that language is still there. Lorenz asked if there was any resolution on the question about the fire wood. Cerbone said we met with the gentleman afterwards and discussed the different ways to assist him.

Ingle said I believe we're through all the direction needed and can now entertain a motion to recommend adoption of the draft of March 2016 Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan, with the noted changes agreed upon tonight. Kessinger moved to adopt as stated. Sievert seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. Director's Comments:

Cerbone noted that we have the Dark Sky ordinance coming before you in June and we traditionally take the month of July off. Also, we are working on some amendments to the Accessory Structure component of the code, so that will likely be coming before you in the future. We're also looking at adopting specific regulations with how we deal with floating homes, looking to Portland as a model to guide us.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for June 6, 2016.

Recording Secretary,

Kathy Fisher