

WASCO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

March 2, 2010

**Meeting begins at 3:00p.m.
Columbia Gorge Discovery Center
Classroom, lower level
5000 Discovery Drive
The Dalles, OR 97058**

I. REGULAR HEARING CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Don Hoffman
Vicki Ashley
Jill Amery
Mike Omeg

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Ron Archer
Joel Brown
Russell Hargrave

STAFF PRESENT

Todd Cornett, Planning Director
Gary Nychyk, Senior Planner
Brenda Jenkins, Planning Coordinator

III. PUBLIC COMMENT: Maximum 15 minutes, limited to items not being heard or discussed elsewhere on the agenda.

None

IV. APPROVAL OF PAST MINUTES- February 2, 2010

Vice Chair Ashley moved to approve the minutes as submitted.
Commissioner Amery seconded
Chair Hoffman called for discussion
None.
Chair Hoffman called for the vote

The motion was unanimously approved 4 to 0, 3 absent (Commissioners Brown, Hargrave, and Archer). A listing of the vote, as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 192.650.c., is as follows:

Chair Hoffman – yes
Vice-Chair Ashley – yes
Commissioner Hargrave – absent
Commissioner Brown – absent
Commissioner Omeg – yes
Commissioner Archer – absent
Commissioner Amery – yes

V. LEGISLATIVE HEARING PLALEG-09-06-0002:

Wasco County proposal to amend Chapter 22 – Flood Damage Prevention of the Land Use and Development Ordinances in the County, as well as the National Scenic Area. The purposes of these amendments are to: 1) Update the Ordinances so that they comply with current FEMA regulations pertaining to development within the an Area of Special Flood Hazard, 2) Reorganize and restructure the ordinances to make it easier for the administrator of the ordinances and the public to understand and implement the applicable provisions, and 3) include new provisions in the ordinances to clarify the regulations and / or are thought to be beneficial to the citizens of the county. Ordinance Changes will include Chapter 1 – Definitions, Chapter 3 – Basic Provisions, and Chapter 22 – Flood Damage Prevention. Additionally, minor revisions are being proposed to Chapter 2 – Physical Characteristics and Chapter 15 – Goals and Policies of the Wasco County Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Hoffman opened the session as follows:

- a. The Planning Department will give their presentation.
- b. Members of the audience who wish to provide testimony will be allowed to do so after the presentation.
- c. Planning Commission will close the hearing and begin deliberation
- d. if enough information is available the Planning Commission will vote on a recommendation to the Wasco County Court.

Information Availability:

- a. A summary of today's Hearing is available at the back of the room.
- b. All documents, comments and information pertaining to the proposed updates are available on the Planning Department's Website.

The Rules of Evidence are as follows:

- a. No person shall present irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious testimony or evidence.
- b. Evidence received shall be of a quality that reasonable persons rely upon in the conduct of their daily affairs.
- c. Testimony and evidence must be directed toward the subject hearing.

Disclosure of Interest:

- a. Does any Commission member wish to disqualify themselves for any personal or financial interest in this matter?

None.

- b. Does any member of the audience wish to challenge the right of any Commission member to hear this matter?

None.

- c. Is there any member of the audience who wishes to question the jurisdiction of this body to act on behalf of Wasco County in this matter?

None.

Next Step:

- a. County Commission will conduct a hearing which will result in the final local approval. The hearing is tentatively scheduled for April 7th 2010 in Rm. 203 of the Wasco County Court House. The time is yet to be determined. Notice of the County Commission hearing will only be sent to those who submitted comments in writing/email and those who signed in and provided testimony either at the February workshop or today's

hearing. All others will have to check the Wasco County Planning Department website. <http://co.wasco.or.us/>
Chair Hoffman called for the staff presentation and staff report.

Gary Nychyk, Senior Planner

Senior Planner Nychyk presented the staff report as follows:

Senior Planner Nychyk submitted a comment letter received from Ron Graves, Soil and Water Conservation District, into the record. The Commission took time to read the comments.

Goals: The Primary goals of the proposed legislative update are to:

- 1) Amend ordinances pertaining to the Flood Hazard Overlay to be consistent with FEMA regulations,
 - 2) Reorganize the ordinances so they are more understandable and easier to implement, and
 - 3) Include new provisions that Planning Staff feel are beneficial to Wasco County.
- Additionally, the contents of Flood Damage Protection (Chapter 22) will be moved into the Environmental Protection District (Division 1 – Flood Hazard Overlay) and Chapter 22 will be removed.

Last Meaningful Update:

The last meaningful updates to the Flood Hazard Overlay were in April, 1987: Although several attempts to update this ordinance have been made in the past few years, no request has been brought before the Planning Commission or County Commission.

Overall Process:

The overall process for this legislative amendment is as follows:

- Staff Researched and Wrote Draft Ordinances (one for the County and one for the NSA). This included...
 - Reviewing suggested amendments as proposed by the DLCD Natural Hazard Specialist.
 - Reviewing the current Oregon State Model Ordinance.
 - Writing a draft Ordinance.
 - Providing a draft Ordinance to DLCD Natural Hazard Specialist for comments.
 - Providing a draft Ordinance to FEMA Region X representative.
 - Providing a draft Ordinance to Gorge Commission Staff to initiate GC adoption.
- This matter came before the Planning Commission during a Workshop on February 2, 2010.
- For Today's Hearing (March 2, 2010)
 - Direct property owner notification included all properties within 200 feet of the Area of Special Flood Hazard (ASFH) Boundary as shown in the Wasco County GIS.
 - We also notified appropriate Agencies
 - All of today's information was made available on the Planning Department website and at the counter.
 - Comments may be submitted via email through our website, in writing, or at the Hearing.
- The next step in the process will be a County Commission Hearing (Tentatively scheduled for April 7, 2010 in Room 202 of the Court House)
 - Notification for the County Commission hearing will only be to those who have participated at prior hearings, submitted written comments, or requested to be notified.

Today's Hearing Procedure:

- I will present the proposed changes of note. There is a Summary at the back of the room for the audience. The summary corresponds to the changes I will be discussing, and I will be using the projector to show the actual amendments. Changes within the ordinance are marked by either yellow highlight (DLCD recommendations and text removal through strikethrough) or gray highlight (Staff recommended changes) and the sections are marked in the actual chapter by the use of blue highlight.
- Members of the audience will be able to provide testimony once my presentation is complete.

For their convenience, I have included a notes section at the back of the summary, and pencils are available at the back of the room.

Senior Planner Nychyk introduced the Flood Plain Maps that Wasco County currently uses. These are pdf copies of the official paper panels in the Wasco County Flood Insurance Rate Map. He indicated that the dotted pattern represents the Area of Special Flood Hazard. He explained that the information is generalized and can be difficult to interpret. It is important to understand that Wasco County only has approximate Area of Special Flood Hazard (ASFH) boundaries. That is why the notice of the proposed changes went to land owners within 200 feet of an area designated as the ASFH, instead of those properties that are directly crossed by the ASFH.

Proposed Changes of Note

A. Wasco County Land Use and Development Ordinance Changes

1. Chapter 3 – Basic Provisions and Zoning (Pages 3.110-10, 3.120-15, 3.210-13, 3.220-4, 3.230-4, 3.240-3, 3.250-4, 3.310-3, 3.410-3, 3.510-3, 3.601-3, 3.602-3, 3.603-4, 3.604-4, 3.606-3, 3.611-3, 3.612-3, 3.613-3, 3.614-3 and Section 3.740 Division 1 – Flood Hazard Overlay)

Staff Proposes to amend the “Development Standards” from each Zone as follows:

Floodplain: Any development including but not limited to buildings, structures or excavation, proposed within a FEMA designated flood zone, or sited in an area where the Planning Director cannot deem the development reasonably safe from flooding shall be subject to Section 3.740, Flood Hazard Overlay

2. Division 1 Flood Hazard Overlay

Now we get into the meat of the proposed changes.

1. Relocation: Again, the Flood Hazard Overlay provisions were relocated from Chapter 22 – Flood Damage Prevention to the Environmental Protection District Section of Chapter 3. This relocation was done in the County and NSA LUDO. Chapter 22 was deleted.
2. Overall Reorganization
Chapter 22 currently is composed of eighteen (18) sections that are poorly organized with unrelated concepts being grouped together and certain related sections being located in completely different sections. The Planning Department reorganized the ordinance into nine (9) sections that group similar concepts together.
3. Section 3.740 Flood Hazard Overlay (page 3.740-1)
 - a. Findings of Fact: This was recommended verbatim from the DLCD model ordinance.
 - b. Included a provision under Applicability to allow the Planning Director to evaluate proposed development that appears to be outside of the ASFH. The reason for this inclusion is to reiterate that Wasco County only includes Approximate A-Zones with no established Base Flood Elevation. Proposed language is as follows:
Although Wasco County holds and utilizes the official Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) supplied by FEMA, there is no Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for the County. This FIS typically provides the detailed information and cross sections necessary to establish the Base Flood Elevation in a given area. For that reason, the Area of Special Flood Hazard as shown on the FEMA FIRMs is only an approximation of the Floodplain

boundary. Without the FIS, the Director may require additional information to determine that a proposed development, which may appear to be located outside of an Area of Special Flood Hazard based on the FIRMs, is in fact reasonably safe from flooding as required by Section 3.742.B – Duties and Responsibilities of the Planning Director. In a situation where the Director determines that it is unclear if a proposed development lies in or out of the Area of Special Flood Hazard, it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to provide the Base Flood Elevation for the property using FEMA approved methodologies.

- c. We amended **Abrogation and Greater Restrictions** and Interpretation to include state building codes.
4. Section 3.741 Special Definitions **(Page 3.740-4)**
 1. **Section Header:** Added statement to clarify the applicability of Definitions found in this section only apply to this section.
 2. Added several new definitions including **Appeal, Base Flood Elevation, Basement, Flood Insurance Study, Flood Resistant Material, Improvement or Repair Cost, New Construction, Raised Structure, Recreational Vehicle, Regulatory Floodway, Variance, and Water Dependant**
 3. We also added Critical Facility: **A facility where the potential for even minimal water damage might be too great. Critical facilities include, but are not limited to schools, nursing homes, hospitals, police, fire, and emergency response facilities, and installations that produce, store or use hazardous materials or hazardous waste. (Approval of any new Critical Facility within the ASFH must be reviewed through the Administrative Variance provisions (Chapters 6 and 7) of the Wasco County Land Use and Development Ordinance.)** We will need to discuss the variance provisions in just a few moments.
 4. We amended **Manufactured Home** and **Substantial Improvement**.
 5. We also amended **Manufactured Home Park** to require a Variance to place a new or expanded manufactured home park within the ASFH.
 6. Finally, we amended the definition of **Structure** as follows: A walled and roofed building, **as well as any** gas or liquid storage tank, that is principally above ground.
 5. Section 3.742 Planning Director **(page 3.740-9)**
 - a. Added **Determination of Appropriate Review Method** to clarify which review process (Type I or Type II) would be used. This section gives the Director the authority to determine if a request can be reviewed through the Ministerial process. **(THIS LANGUAGE WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE NSA ORDINANCE)**
 - b. Added “Development” to the title of **Development Permit Review**:
 - c. Amend **Alteration of Watercourses** to include maintenance requirement and specific jurisdictions
 - d. Added two (2) responsibilities to the Planning Director in the **Information to be Obtained and Maintained** section.
 6. Section 3.743 Development Permit **(page 3.740-11)**
 - a. **Establishment of Development Permit.** Added language indicating that the Development permit is for all structures **and** all development.
 - b. Added provisions for **Establishing the Development Permit**. The added provisions allow the director to evaluate development that may appear to be located outside of the ASFH to ensure that the proposal is “reasonably safe from flooding”.
 - c. Added a section describing **Application Types**. This section identifies the situations where a Type I (Ministerial) application can be requested instead of the Type II

(Administrative) application. (THIS LANGUAGE WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE NSA ORDINANCE)

- d. Amended application requirements
- e. Amended Anchoring requirements per FEMA Region X
- f. Added a reference to FEMA 348 for construction materials and methods
- g. Added the requirement that residential structures shall be elevated a minimum of one foot above BFE:
- h. Added provisions for Partition and Property Line Adjustment Proposals:
- i. Amended Manufactured Homes for compliance with current regulations:
- j. Added language clarify skirting on Manufactured Homes:
- k. Added provisions specific to Recreational Vehicles:
- l. Amended Non-Residential Construction to require flood proofing “at or above” instead of “to” the BFE.
- m. Added provisions for Storage of Hazardous or Toxic Materials:
- n. Added recommended provisions and Variance requirement specific to Critical Facilities:
- o. Amended language from Floodways to describe requirements associated with Development Within Riparian Areas.
- p. And finally, we added criteria for reviewing Fish Habitat Structures

7. Section 3.744 Variances (page 3.740-9)

a. DLCD Recommended Changes

This entire section was added as a recommendation by DLCD.

After our discussions at the workshop last month, we did some more research on how variances to the Floodplain Ordinances are currently processed and how they should be processed. Currently, Section 2.060.B indicates that Variances to Floodplain Standards are to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Staff has found no state or federal mandate that requires variances to the Floodplain provisions to be heard by the Planning Commission. So it seems that we have the ability to dictate how variances will be processed. I see three separate ways we can go:

- 1) All Variances mentioned in the floodplain ordinance (including placement of critical facilities and manufactured home parks within the ASFH) are processed via the Planning Commission.
 - A. It doesn't seem like there are very many requested variances to floodplain standards, and there doesn't seem to be many instances where a Variance could be requested, so I don't think that the workload associated with the Planning Commission would be too onerous.
 - B. However, when the variance is requested, it will be based on very specific and detailed criteria accompanied by an engineer's or other consultant's report. This (it seems) would require staff to disseminate the application material into a recommendation.
 - C. If this route were chosen, we would likely update 2.060.B.16 to cite the proper Land Use Ordinance. We would also indicate within the ordinance itself that all variances are to be processed as quasi-judicial applications.
- 2) All Variances mentioned in the floodplain ordinance are handled administratively.
 - A. I firmly believe that Staff has the expertise and understanding of the ordinances to effectively evaluate and implement them. The only area where I could see a

benefit of having staff defer the decision is to more fully incorporate the politics associated with a request. (It should be noted that the Director can always defer a specific Administrative Application to the Planning Commission per section 2.060.B.14)

- B. I see no requirement that the Planning Commission is required to hear any variances to the Floodplain ordinances.
 - C. If this route were chosen, we would likely update 2.060.A.2 to include Variances to the Floodplain Ordinances and remove 2.060.B.16. We would also indicate within the ordinance itself that all variances are to be processed as Administrative applications.
- 3) Within the floodplain ordinance, we make specific citation as to how each individual variance would be reviewed.
- A. If it is decided that the Planning Commission will automatically review some requested variances but not all, then we would need to peel through the Variance criteria to determine which would be Administrative and which would be Quasi-judicial. Chapter 2 would then be amended to properly cite which variance requests followed each process.

Regardless of which path we choose, Chapter 2 will need to be updated to properly describe the correct process.

- 8. Section 3.745 Appeals (page 3.740-24)
 - a. DLCD Recommended Changes
This entire section was added as a recommendation by DLCD. All appeals will be processed as described in Chapter 2 of the LUDO
 - 9. Section 3.746 Compliance Required (page 3.740-24)
 - a. DLCD Recommended Changes
At DLCD's recommendation, we incorporated provisions indicating that all violations of provisions of Division 1 – Flood Hazard Overlay are subject to the regulations and policies set forth in the Wasco County Code Compliance and Nuisance Abatement Ordinance
 - 10. Section 3.747 Revising FIRM Maps (page 3.740-25)
 - a. Staff recommends including new provisions to educate Staff and the public regarding revising FIRM Maps.
 - 11. Section 3.748 Notes on Insurance (page 3.740-27)
 - a. Staff recommends including new provisions to educate Staff and the public regarding Flood Insurance.
 - 12. Chapter 22 – Flood Damage Prevention (Deleting this entire chapter)
This entire chapter will be deleted, and its contents moved into Chapter 3, Section 3.740 – Division 1 – Flood Hazard Overlay
-

B. Wasco County Comprehensive Plan

We are proposing some associate changes to the Comp Plan:

1. Chapter 2 – Physical Characteristics (Pages 2-21 – 2-22)
 - a. Replaced the hand-drawn Flood Hazard Area Map (Figure 10) with a modern GIS generated map
 - b. Updated references to the September 24, 1984 FIRMs from the November 1, 1977 HUD maps.
 - c. Changed “special flood hazard areas” to Areas of Special Flood Hazard” to be consistent with LUDO provisions.
 2. Chapter 15 – Goals and Policies (Page 15-21)
 - a. Updated references to the September 24, 1984 FIRMs from the November 1, 1977 HUD maps.
 - b. Corrected typographical error to a LUDO Section Reference pertaining to Geologic Hazard Protection. The citation currently reads “Chapter 3.700”, and will be amended to read Chapter 3.750”.
- C. National Scenic Area Land Use and Development Ordinance Changes
1. Chapter 3 – Basic Provisions and Zoning (Pages 3-27(A-1), 3-42 (A-2), 3-51 (F-1), 3-62 (F-3), 3-68 (R-R), 3-76 (PR), 3-85 (OS), and 3-90 (AS)), and Section 3.240 Division 1 – Flood Hazard Overlay)
 - a. Planning Staff utilized the proposed changes to the Wasco County LUDO described previously to establish changes to the NSA LUDO. However, it was noted that we would not be able to use the option to review certain requests for development permits within the Area of Special Flood Hazard through the Ministerial (Type I) process. Therefore, certain sections of the County LUDO as specified were deleted or modified to eliminate reference to the Ministerial (Type I) process.
 2. Determination of Appropriate Review Method (Type I or Type II) (WC Section 3.742.B.3):

This section has not been included with the proposed updates in the NSA LUDO because there doesn't appear to be a situation where a floodplain review could be performed through the Ministerial (Type I) process.
 3. Application Types (WC Section 3.743.B):

This section was not included in the proposed NSA LUDO updates. All development requests within the ASFH of the NSA will be processed as an Administrative (Type II) action
 4. Fish Habitat Structures (WC Section 3.743.E.10):

This section differs from the County LUDO by removing reference to the Ministerial (Type I) process. All development requests within the ASFH of the NSA will be processed as an Administrative (Type II) action.
- D. Final editorial revisions
- If approved a final editorial revision will be required. This will not change the substance of what is approved by the Wasco County Court. It will be limited to editorial changes including but not limited section numbers, references to section numbers and headers and footers.

Options

-Recommend approval of the proposal as presented, with the additional amendments discussed and any additional amendments made by the Planning Commission.

- Continue the hearing to a date and time certain for additional information necessary to make a decision and direct staff to provide the information.
- Recommend denial the proposal based on additional findings of fact.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Flood Hazard Overlay updates with the additional amendments presented by staff.

Conclusion

That concludes my presentation and I will entertain any questions you may have.

Chair Hoffman called for questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Omeg asked if the time was appropriate to discuss Mr. Graves Comments (Soil and Water Conservation District) Senior Planner Nychyk stated that the Commission could address those comments at this time if they wished. He then submitted the comment letter and an attached packet as a samples for a [typical](#) project. He explained that the question is; what is considered development, any development must have a permit.

Chair Hoffman define development as activities which could change the nature or behavior of the floodway versus those that do not, such as “scrubbing” the land with a cat would be development but planting vegetation with a shovel would not be development. Senior Planner Nychyk stated that he would have concerns regarding different interpretations of that definition.

Vice Chair Ashley asked for clarification on whether Senior Planner Nychyk was talking about flood Plain or the high water mark. Senior Planner Nychyk stated that he was referring to development inside the floodplain which is always broader than the high water mark. Vice Chair Ashley stated that this would interfere with the waterlines for water troughs for a spring development to pipe the water away to prevent mud holes. Senior Planner Nychyk stated that these uses [require review through Chapter 22](#) right now, but the County is proposing to review some of these uses as ministerial uses.

Commissioner Omeg stated that people that are doing habitat restoration, that are trying to repair banks, stabilize banks, provide habitats for fish are looking for practices that can be identified as being allowed to take place within the floodplain as long as they are conducted following the approved standards. Is it possible to say some of these practices can be done without getting a permit. He further suggested that they review some of these practices and determine that they are either development or not development. If determined not development we could then say these practices do not require a permit. Senior Planner Nychyk stated that might be possible however he is concerned with the interpretation of those identified practices. He fears that word will get out that certain practices don't need a permit, then landowners are making their own interpretation as to whether their proposed work meets the definition of the identified practices, which could lead for development inside the floodplain. Senior Planner Nychyk reread the definition of development and reminded the Commission that the definition is not Wasco County's definition but a definition from FEMA. He also reiterated that there are ramifications to not complying with the FEMA requirements regarding development within the floodplain. These ramifications include the possibility of Wasco County losing the ability to buy National Flood Insurance.

Commissioner Omeg stated that he could appreciate that concern, but that there were practices that do not require someone going in with a CAT to clear, many practices just require a few workers to go through with shovels and put in trees, or a 3-wire fence to keep the cattle from grazing along the stream banks.

Vice Chair Ashley feels that there should be an education session and maybe a letter of explanation to all landowners within the floodplain regarding this.

Chair Hoffman called for additional questions from the Commission
None.

Chair Hoffman called for testimony from the audience

Jan Huxel, Property Owner

Mr. Huxel stated that he had gotten a home improvement loan, the insurance company wanted a flood map, the map they received from Wasco County was from 1882. He inquired if customers could get an updated map from Wasco County.

Chair Hoffman explained that due to limited flooding and the population in the County we are not a high priority for mapping, he also explained that an individual could go and request a remapping of an area but that it would be a FEMA process not a Wasco County Process.

Chair Hoffman called for additional testimony from the audience.
None.

Chair Hoffman closed the hearing for deliberation.

Issue #1 the appeal process

Chair Hoffman feels that critical facilities should get the elevation to planning commission.
Vice Chair Ashley doesn't think everything needs to come before the Commission

Chair Hoffman suggested allowing the Director the authority to review these, subject to the ability to elevate to Planning Commission with his discretion.

Issue #2 reasonably safe from flooding language.
Chair Hoffman asked if the language needed to be further modified.

Consensus was to keep language as proposed.

Issue #3 what constitutes development

The Commission chose to define development as: Any man-made change to improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings or other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading paving, excavation or drilling operations, or storage of equipment or materials located within the area of special flood hazard. The Commission also chose to exempt low impact practices using hand based tools to perform habitat restoration activities. The Commission directed staff to develop language and forward it to the Commission for approval. Director Cornett stated that Staff would develop the language and run it past FEMA then get the FEMA approved language back to the Commission. Commissioner Omeg requested that Staff run the language past Soil and Water Conservation District as well.

Vice Chair Ashley moved to recommend approval of the proposed county ordinance
Motion died

Vice Chair Ashley moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Wasco County Land Use and Development Ordinance with changes as discussed and agreed upon by the Commission.

Commissioner Amery seconded
Chair Hoffman called for discussion
None.
Chair Hoffman called for the vote

The motion was unanimously approved 4 to 0, 3 absent (Commissioners Brown, Hargrave, and Archer). A listing of the vote, as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 192.650.c., is as follows:

Chair Hoffman – yes
Vice-Chair Ashley – yes
Commissioner Hargrave – absent
Commissioner Brown – absent
Commissioner Omeg – yes
Commissioner Archer – absent
Commissioner Amery – yes

Vice Chair Ashley moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Wasco County Comprehensive Plan with changes as discussed and agreed upon by the Commission.
Commissioner Omeg seconded
Chair Hoffman called for discussion
None.
Chair Hoffman called for the vote

The motion was unanimously approved 4 to 0, 3 absent (Commissioners Brown, Hargrave, and Archer). A listing of the vote, as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 192.650.c., is as follows:

Chair Hoffman – yes
Vice-Chair Ashley – yes
Commissioner Hargrave – absent
Commissioner Brown – absent
Commissioner Omeg – yes
Commissioner Archer – absent
Commissioner Amery – yes

Vice Chair Ashley moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Wasco County National Scenic Area Land Use and Development Ordinance with changes as discussed and agreed upon by the Commission.
Commissioner Amery seconded
Chair Hoffman called for discussion
None.
Chair Hoffman called for the vote

The motion was unanimously approved 4 to 0, 3 absent (Commissioners Brown, Hargrave, and Archer). A listing of the vote, as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 192.650.c., is as follows:

Chair Hoffman – yes
Vice-Chair Ashley – yes
Commissioner Hargrave – absent
Commissioner Brown – absent
Commissioner Omeg – yes
Commissioner Archer – absent
Commissioner Amery – yes

Hearing closed

VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:
None

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:
None.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
Adjourned at 4:30

Respectfully submitted,

Donald Hoffman, Chair
Wasco County Planning Commission

Todd Cornett, Planning Director
Wasco County Planning & Development