

**MINUTES**

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Hoard called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present: Mike McHugh, Diana Stewart, Dan Frasier, Graham Matthews and Richard Hoard. Staff present: Deputy Director of Planning Leslie Hubbard, Environmental Health Director Kristy Anderson, Deputy County Counsel Joe Larmour, Assistant Planner Bella Hedtke, and Clerk Ruth Hanover.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Members of the public may address the Planning Commission concerning matters within their jurisdiction, which are not listed on the agenda and to request that a matter be agendized for a future meeting. No action may be taken on these matters at this meeting.*

Comments received from Dero Forslund and Lisa Wright.

**3. MINUTES – August 23, 2018.**

On motion of Commissioner Matthews, seconded by Commissioner Frasier, approves the Minutes of August 23, 2018 as submitted. Motion carried with Commissioners Stewart and McHugh abstaining as they were absent.

**OLD BUSINESS** – None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**4. AMENDMENT TO ZONING ORDINANCE NO. 315-XXX, SECTION 43.2 RE CANNABIS MANUFACTURING**

**PW-17-05**

**Public Hearing:** Amendment to Zoning Ordinance 315, Section 43.2 re Cannabis Manufacturing. Located County-wide. Applicant: County of Trinity.

Deputy Director of Planning Leslie Hubbard presented the staff report. She said the purpose of the item is for the Commission to discuss and provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding proposed amendments to the existing local regulations, e.g., shared use facilities and an amended approach to use permit requirements and additional zoning districts. She said this item was before the Commission on October 26 and December 7, 2017, and January 11 and May 24, 2018. The Board of Supervisors heard the item on April 17, May 1, July 17 and August 7, 2018. It was at its August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting that the Board requested the item return to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Chair Hoard opened the hearing to public comment.

Comments received from Matt Hawkins, Adrian Keyes and Deidra Brower.

No further comments being received, Chair closes public comment period.

Commissioner Stewart stated she thinks it makes perfect sense to do shared-use facilities and the Commission should strongly recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they be allowed.

Chair Hoard suggested starting with Section 2.2.A. Let's talk about adding AgForest to the list of allowable zones for non-volatile mechanical methods Type 6, Type N and Type P State License, and if we deem appropriate, instead of having a Conditional Use Permit, is that these may be subjective also to a Director's Use Permit. Commissioner Stewart stated she sees nothing wrong with doing that. It makes perfect sense. It's allowed for cultivation and she thinks farmers should be allowed to do some low impact manufacturing as well. Chair Hoard said he does agree with that, it would be a good fit. Commissioner Frasier said it fits. Commissioner Matthews said he has no problem with adding AgForest as an allowable zone. Commissioner McHugh said he was fine with it.

Consensus was reached to recommend adding AgForest (AF) as an allowable zone for nonvolatile or mechanical methods for Cannabis Manufacturing Facilities.

Chair Hoard then moved on to Section 2.2.B. He doesn't understand why microbusiness is being piggybacked in the Manufacturing Ordinance. He said he remembers when we were reviewing microbusinesses, it was stated that Cultivation or Manufacturing would refer back to the specific ordinance, and your microbusiness type endeavor would refer to those ordinances. He doesn't understand why microbusiness is referred into a Manufacturing Ordinance, and asked if this a proper way to push through an ordinance? He asked Deputy County Counsel Larmour if there would be a greater possibility of a legal challenges later, as they are being mixed in per se'. Counsel Larmour advised he didn't think it's going to create any increased risk of legal challenges, this ordinance refers to areas which their classification allows certain activities and to include microbusiness here might create some confusion, but he doesn't think it's a legal issue.

Commissioner Stewart said she agrees about the confusion. She said it was her understanding that all Cannabis Manufacturing Facilities, not just those involved in microbusiness, that were being looked at as not necessarily needing a Conditional Use Permit. Deputy Director Hubbard responded correct. Commissioner Stewart asked then why would it say "licensed as microbusiness?" Hubbard responded that was generated by the ad hoc by their desire to tie the two together. Stewart said but it doesn't, what it does is limit it to microbusiness, it says "licensed as microbusiness," it would eliminate anybody who's not licensed for microbusiness, was that their intent? Hubbard said she couldn't speak to that.

Commissioner McHugh said he might speculate that, if you look at the entire content there, it lists specific types of extractions that might be permitted, this is the first time Rural Residential has appeared for Manufacturing. He suspects they are trying to limit the types of Manufacturing that can creep into Rural Residential, and as we are constantly reminded, that is to address a small farmer situation to which the microbusiness notion is typically also applied. He said he's not sure why they both appear here, but he's guessing the intent is to expand into Rural Residential so that mechanical and low-impact extractions, as it's called here and they tie into microbusiness, is to prevent a large-scale manufacturing facility from showing up in Rural Residential. That's his speculation - he thinks that's an admirable goal.

Commissioner Matthews said large-scale, but limited to those three types which are low impact. Commissioner McHugh agreed, saying also Unclassified creeps in, and he still maintains the proper way to handle Unclassified is to classify it, zone it properly instead of continuing with Unclassified.

Deputy Director Hubbard stated she should add really, we are not suggesting most of these things as recommendations to you, but trying to generate a discussion and put it to you to make those decisions. McHugh stated he didn't understand what she said. Hubbard responded they weren't making a recommendation to you, they said here's what we are seeing from the conversations we've had with

people, and staff also went to them and said there's a bunch of people who are involved in our licensing program for cultivation that are going to want to do these other activities and there's no room anywhere to accommodate them to do that, so because of that, they said to put it to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Stewart said to her, it makes more sense that this read "cannabis manufacturing facilities, including those licensed as microbusinesses." Commissioner McHugh said again, this is the first time Rural Residential creeps into Manufacturing. If we say sure, let's do it in the Rural Residential areas, do you then want to make sure that a large Manufacturing facility doesn't show up in Rural Residential as an incompatible use of Rural Residential, regardless of the type of extraction, point one; and point two, if we are going to put in mechanical and low impact types of Manufacturing, is there a way to limit the scope of that in Rural Residential? He said if you want those types of extractions in an Industrial zone, he doesn't think you need to limit it; if you want to do it in a Rural Residential zone, then maybe we need to look at limiting it. The question is how to do that? He thinks what's been offered in front of us is tying it in to microbusiness. That's how he interprets it.

Commissioner Frasier said he would look at it as "cannabis manufacturing facilities licensed as microbusiness are allowed in those Rural Residential..." you could cut out everything beyond that, then it would make more sense. If they are going to allow you to get a Manufacturing License for microbusiness in those zoning districts. If you are not in those zoning districts, you can get a Type 6, N or P in all these other districts so he doesn't think it's really restricting anyone, it's allowing microbusiness in these other four zoning districts. Commissioner McHugh said he actually agrees with that. He said AgForest and the Ag Preserve are redundant under Paragraph B, because you can do them under Paragraph A. Right? At any scale, so there is no point in tying low impact and mechanical to those four specific zones, because you can already do those under Paragraph 2.A. in any of those other zones. He said what is new about Paragraph B is it introduces Rural Residential and Unclassified, and if the intent is okay in those zones we are going to let Manufacturing creep in there, if it's mechanical and low impact, and then do you specifically then limit the scale. To him, that's the derailment point. He's okay with mechanical and low impact going into those zones, the question is the scale of the operation in those zones, because you can already do it on any scale in the other zones.

Commissioner Stewart said she can live with leaving it the way it is written. McHugh said he can go either way on leaving AgForest and AP in there. Commissioner Frasier said he would suggest we get rid of those just so there isn't the confusion, we're not tying this Manufacturing License to a microbusiness, we are tying Rural Residential and Unclassified to a microbusiness. McHugh agreed, stating we don't want to add that confusion with Ag Preserve and AgForest. Chair Hoard said however if there was a way to limit the scope then we could officially add AgForest and Ag Preserve. Commissioner McHugh said he wasn't understanding. He said let's say you want to open up a Manufacturing operation using low impact, etc. and you happen to be in an AgForest, doesn't Paragraph 2.A allow you to do this? Frasier said he would say it does. McHugh read the paragraph and said that would include low impact and any other form of Type 6. Commissioner Stewart asked would that cover microbusinesses? Deputy Director Hubbard responded yes. Stewart said okay then, you are right. Commissioner Frasier said if we strike those out, basically what we are doing is tying Rural Residential and Unclassified to microbusiness, it's not the other way around. Stewart agreed.

Chair Hoard said he can agree with that. He said one thing he's concerned about is these very specific types of low impact extractions. He said there are new products and new ways to extract coming out on the market constantly, so what happens when some other low impact method comes out, are we going to amend the ordinance again. He doesn't really like being so specific about these certain methods, he hasn't had time to do the research, but would really like to see them kind of mimic more State regs. instead of being so specific, if you aren't doing one of these three then you are out. So, he does have a problem with that because the possibilities of the market right now are a bunch of different

options. He said he doesn't want to be limited to these alone. He said he would like to be able, if this goes back to the Board, to tighten that up, mimic more State regs. and be less specific.

Commissioner McHugh asked does the State use the term "mechanical" or "low impact"? Chair Hoard responded it does specify mechanical, but he did not read anywhere where it says low impact. McHugh said he thinks the County's intent is to make sure they are, generically speaking, low impact. If you can find verbiage which gives flexibility to the Planning Department to determine and if a You Tube video comes out showing what a reasonable person believes is low impact and the Planning Department agrees with that, he thinks they should have the authority to go on with that; if they are unsure of it and want to kick it up to a Conditional Use Permit, then we can listen to testimony why it is low impact. He thinks flexibility is okay.

Commissioner Matthews asked do we know how these three methods were arrived at? Deputy Director Hubbard introduced Kristy Anderson, the Director of Environmental Health, and asked her to speak to that. Ms. Anderson said she thinks the original issue came about because the State regs. have ethanol processing under nonvolatile and so that in a Rural Residential area might be an issue; mechanical, however, she doesn't see a huge issue with because there are no open flames. She said coming from a safety perspective, that's her take on it.

Commissioner McHugh said what if we were to say "low impact extractions such as Rosen Pressing, etc.", or others approved by the Planning Director who will have the option of punting on it and sending it up to the Planning Commission if he is uncomfortable that it meets the criteria. Chair Hoard said he would most definitely favor that. Commissioner Stewart said she would as well. Commissioner Frasier said we should just probably leave it as "such as" and leave an open end for other methods. McHugh said the Director always has the option of punting it to the Planning Commission, so if he's uncomfortable with some new method on You Tube he can just say I'm not making the decision.

Chair Hoard asked if there was any other discussion regarding to 2.A. He said we agree with Ag Forest. On 2.B scratch Ag Forest and Ag Preserve, leaving Rural Residential and Unclassified. Low impact, instead of "which is limited to" we'd change that to "such as", and leave the microbusiness aspect of it as Commissioner Stewart suggested "Cannabis manufacturing facilities including..." Commissioner Frasier said he thinks we should leave "licensed as" because we are restricting microbusiness in Rural Residential. Commissioner Stewart agreed.

With no changes suggested for Section 2.C, Chair Hoard moved on to Section 2.D which specifies "Shared Use Facilities".

Commissioner McHugh said just to be clear, the Shared Use Class 6 is a license, that license is obtained by the user or farmer that wants to go to the common facility, that farmer gets a Shared Use license, goes over to the manufacturer's facility, who is a manufacture Type 6 license, sets up the kitchen and these farmers go and get a Type S and they can all use this Type 6 licensee's kitchen, that's the model we're talking about and that Type 6 kitchen can go anywhere Type 6 can go and plus Rural Residential, that's what this was? Deputy Director Hubbard agreed.

McHugh asked what's the effect of the appropriate use permit, Sections 4.J to M, when kicked from Director's Use Permit to Conditional Use Permit. He asked are Type 7s available for S type usage? Deputy Director Hubbard responded yes. McHugh asked if they would be Conditional Use Permits? Hubbard responded yes. He said 4.K says 6, 7 or N licensees who wish to register as a Shared Use Facility shall obtain a Conditional Use Permit; so, 4.K seems to say where 4.D says "subject to first obtaining the appropriate use permit", 4.K seems to say you have to have a Conditional Use Permit.

Hubbard said for the facility. Commissioner Frasier said it seems like the Type S license would fall under a Director's Use Permit. McHugh said what's the S? Commissioner Stewart said the facility. McHugh responded the facility is a 6 or 7.

Chair Hoard asked who initiates the shared use, is it the primary? Hubbard responded yes, the primary licensee is the one that operates the facility. McHugh asked how does that person apply for a Conditional Use Permit to manufacture, somewhere on the form perhaps checks a box that says it is a Shared Use Facility, or how does it turn in to a shared use? Hubbard responded no, the Shared Use Facility they register that site, the site itself is not licensed. It's the primary licensee that has to have a license to operate the Shared Use Facility. McHugh said which is a premise that's under the license, so that license is attached to that premise, that premise then becomes a Shared Use Facility if he so registers. Hubbard responded right. McHugh said and that's what 2.d is talking about, is where you can do that, 4.K seems to say it has to be a Conditional Use Permit. Hubbard responded the appropriate use permit would be a Conditional Use Permit and we could say it that way. She said all Shared Use Facilities, the way we drafted it, require a Conditional Use Permit. McHugh said he's okay with this.

Commissioner Matthews asked a Shared Use Facility can do other things than just the microbusiness low impact, but they can also do those, or other people that are going to get the Type S? Because if we are restricting it to microbusinesses in Rural Residential. Commissioner Stewart said we're not. Commissioner McHugh said what the low impact is all about putting anything into Rural Residential; Shared Use is any manufacturing company can set up a Shared Use Facility at their premises and go get registered for that, for any type of manufacturing 6, 7, so this has nothing to do with Rural Residential low impact, except in Rural Residential it's going to apply that rule.

Commissioner Frasier said he still has issues with allowing Shared Use Facilities in Rural Residential, because even at the microbusiness level a Shared Use Facility, it depends on what Rural Residential you are in, that can be addressed under a Conditional Use Permit. Commissioner Matthews said in 4.L it talks about employees, the trips per week, and try to minimize the impact. Frasier said that would be for a Director's Use Permit anyway so it wouldn't apply here. He said they would have to go for a Conditional Use Permit which we can address that, but he thinks if it was tied to a microbusiness, he would be okay with it going through a Conditional Use Permit, but there are places where just having the extra traffic can be an issue in a Rural Residential area. McHugh said that's a Conditional Use Permit, but because it's in Rural Residential it falls, we are doing the low impact stuff, it has to be a microbusiness and then the Conditional Use Permit process will limit the amount of traffic associated with it. Commissioner Stewart said exactly, it shouldn't be an issue. Commissioner Frasier said he's alright with it.

Chair Hoard stated the changes he sees is first 2.D, change from "appropriate" use permit to "Conditional Use Permit". Commissioner Frasier said he thinks it would be clearer to say "Conditional Use Permit" instead of saying "see 4.J through M" and you have to go find it in another section. McHugh said you could just say "obtaining a use permit as specified under 4.K, if you only want to say it in one spot, but again it's saying the "appropriate" use permit, and that verbiage is used throughout in here. It's either going to be a Conditional Use Permit or a Director's Use Permit, except in this case it can't be a Director's Use Permit. It's misleading to leave that open. Commissioner Frasier said make it a Conditional Use Permit. Chair Hoard agreed. Commissioner Stewart agreed. Deputy Director Hubbard stated you want to make it read: "...first obtaining a Conditional Use Permit." Chair Hoard agreed.

Chair Hoard moved on to Section 2.E which amplified the restriction of legal boundaries of special districts. Commissioner McHugh asked if this is actually a change? Commissioner Stewart said it is exactly the same as the previous one. No changes necessary.

Chair Hoard moved on to Section 3, License Types Available. Commissioner McHugh said on 3.E just the wording of it; Type S licenses – the idea here is the Type S person wants to use a Shared Use Facility, goes and gets a Type N so they can make brownies or infusions and then they get a Type S so they can use the other person’s kitchen. Deputy Director Hubbard agreed. McHugh said so when it says “the licensees who are authorized to conduct operations...”, they are getting authorization by getting a Type S license. Deputy Director Hubbard stated she understands what he is saying.

McHugh said for his own education, what does it mean, the non-volatile extractions with the butter or food grade oil? Commissioner Stewart responded you can put your product into oil and heat it and it sits there for awhile until it absorbs some of the reactive ingredient and then you can make your brownies from what you extracted. McHugh said he’s just a little confused and asked Environmental Health Director Kristy Anderson what is it we are trying to do with the wording that’s here? Anderson responded she thinks what it’s trying to say is that once you have made a cannabis butter or something like that, you cannot therefore go and sell it to another licensee; you can infuse your own product, but you can’t package it and sell it to someone else because that changes the way things are regulated. McHugh asked if they call that butter or food grade oil? Stewart responded that’s the way of getting your concentrate so you can use that in your final product.

Counsel Larmour stated as he’s reading this, Section C talks about Type N license, it does talk about either edibles and means of packaging requirements, so it’s giving the use of Shared Use Facilities for packaging and edibles “under infusions of oils to create edibles, beverages, capsules, water cartridges, tinctures 540 or topical.” He said the fact that it is specifying Type N or P, both of those are directed towards edibles, but, it is tying it to the ability to do that in a Shared Use Facility. Commissioner Stewart asked so a Shared Use Facility would not be able to make a lotion say, something that is not edible? Counsel Larmour responded he doesn’t know of any section that would prevent that from happening, he thinks this section is directly addressing food products and packaging of food products.

McHugh said we are overloading one paragraph with something that is covered elsewhere, so in order to do infusions and make edibles, I have to have a Type N License; to use your kitchen to do that I have to have a Type S License, but I still have to follow all the rules under Type N if I’m making something that’s food grade, if it has to be done in a commercial kitchen it’s food grade; if you are making hand lotion in your facility, you don’t need to be food grade, but if I’m making brownies, the whole thing needs to be food grade, I can’t use your facility unless it’s a commercial food grade facility. He thinks the fact that he has to have a Type N because he has all the food stuff if he’s making food, no matter where he makes it, so restating it under Type S is confusing. He really thinks going off into the butter in this section kind of creeps into the rules under Type N, where he has to follow the rules in the first place to make brownies and this is under the section where we are saying what Type S is for.

Commissioner Frasier said his take on this is they are trying to allow small amounts of non-volatile extraction also under Type 6, because it says “Type N, P and non-volatile extractions with butter and food grade oil”. It’s not saying you can only do food grade oil and butter in your Shared Use Facilities, you can always do those, it’s limiting that instead of doing the State guidelines. Chair Hoard said he thinks we should actually defer to State Guidelines because, in fact, beginning with extractions, that is written word by word under the emergency State guidelines. He thinks we should just end this where it says “Type S License are available to conduct manufacturing operations at a registered “shared-use facility.” instead of restating State Guidelines. Commissioner Frasier said he’s fine with not restating State Guidelines. Commissioner Stewart said she is also. Commissioner Matthews asked if Counsel Larmour was comfortable with that. Counsel Larmour said yes, he thinks at this point if you are referencing the license type and you’re not putting special restrictions on it, it’s going to default to the State. Chair Hoard said then a period after “shared-use facilities.” Consensus was reached.

Chair Hoard moved on to Section 4 under Regulations, stating the only changes he sees are the change from “Conditional” to “appropriate” and references Section 4.J through M. He said not to jump around, but he’s curious about the Type S License, going to Fees, which is Section 5.f, it says fees for a Type 6, Type 7, Type N and Type P, there’s no shared-use fee? Or as long as you have these licenses you can just make an agreement with the primary, or how does that work? Commissioner Frasier responded you have to register with the County. Commissioner Stewart agreed, saying with the County that’s it. Kristy Anderson said that’s what happens with these kitchens, there may be five people who operate from that kitchen, but all five hold their own licenses.

Commissioner Frasier stated in Section 4.L.a.3, we should once again replace “limited to” with “such as”.

Commissioner McHugh asked, with reference to Section 4.L.b, where does the 6,240 hours come from? Commissioner Matthews responded three times 2,080 is full time, 173.3 times 12 is 2,080 hours. McHugh said times three, so that’s three full time employees.

McHugh said he doesn’t have any more comments on Section 4. Commissioner Stewart stated aside of the one change she is okay with Section 4.

Commissioner Frasier stated we did have some public comment about before starting operations, including infrastructure, and building begins they have to get a Conditional Use Permit. He thinks if you have a Building Permit for your infrastructure, he doesn’t think you should be required to wait until you get a Conditional Use Permit to do it, because if it’s part your plan, your application, and you are required to have this building and you go get your Building Permit, it should be up to the discretion of the owner whether they want to start building that stuff as long as its permitted. He said it might change the outcome of their Conditional Use Permit, but that should be at their discretion. He said maybe Counsel will want to weigh in on that, but he doesn’t think you can stop someone from building a permitted structure if they wanted to get that licensed. Counsel Larmour responded he didn’t think there would necessarily be a reason not to grant a Building Permit, but it could be part of the Conditional Use Permit process of whether there is going to be approval for that type of a business to be constructed. In general, plans would be provided and if the intent of the building is known, those processes generally run together so that you don’t have a lawsuit down the road. Frasier said what he is trying to say is that it just seems to him if they are in the process, they’ve applied for a Conditional Use Permit, and the way this reads it can be any infrastructure on the property. What if they want to build their house at the same time, do you have to wait to build your house or build a road on your property until after a Conditional Use Permit is done? That’s the way it reads, and it seems like you’re putting a lot of weight on that Conditional Use Permit. Even if they don’t get that Conditional Use Permit they, don’t get to conduct business, they might still want an open driveway and put the house there. He thinks stuff like that should be up to the discretion of the landowner, not a Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner McHugh said he thought Frasier crossed into a grey area; you can’t build a gas station until you get a use permit for a gas station, so if you are building a facility that has unique things in it that would require approval on the nature of construction for the business, you may have to wait; if you are building a metal box that is going to be a warehouse for a distribution center, you can probably get a permit for building a metal box, but you may have to change it to comply with a Conditional Use Permit as a subsequent, and you also run the risk of the argument we’re going to get – well I already invested in this, I don’t want to change, of which we hear a lot. Counsel Larmour said he thinks that’s the distinction and if the purpose of the building, or the building itself, have a unique characteristic, the perfect example is a gas station where part of the infrastructure is a buried in-ground tank, you generally will see those two run together. Deputy Director Hubbard asked what if you were to add

language specific to the operation. Frasier said he would be fine with that. Commissioner Stewart said that makes sense.

Chair Hoard asked if there were any more comments regarding Section 4. No changes to Section 5, he moved on to Section 6, Required Conditions, stating we added E.a & b. Commissioner Frasier said once again in E.a he would say including infrastructure and building improvements “specific to the new use”. Commissioner Hoard said again in line with “specific to new use”, would be Section 7.a through c.

Commissioner Frasier asked why is 100’ from all property lines highlighted in yellow in Section 4.J.c? Chair Frasier said he remembers when this was originally presented to us it was 200’ and we reduced it to 100’. Commissioner Stewart said she remembers that discussion and that was what we decided. Chair Hoard said he’s okay to leave it as is. Commissioner McHugh said he’d agree to leave as is.

Commissioner McHugh said in Section 3 the question was raised earlier about two different ordinances being decided under CEQA. He would note that in the Cultivation Ordinance, the first paragraph there, the 26055 citation is used, in the Distribution Ordinance the 15378(b)(5) is used, and this is the first time we’ve seen both citations brought up and said he is wondering what’s evolving with CEQA. Counsel Larmour responded it’s not uncommon for an ordinance or a change to be deemed under more than one section of CEQA, and there are two sections that you can find an exemption under CEQA you can use both of them. He said he wasn’t involved in drafting this ordinance and he’s not sure what triggered both sections, but County Counsel deemed that both sections were applicable exemptions under this ordinance, it would not be unusual to see that. McHugh said it’s not that it’s unusual he was curious about, it’s the change to the precedent he’s curious about. Counsel Larmour said and it may well be that’s the changes put in here for the Type S License, he’s not that familiar with it enough to be able to answer tonight, but in general if there is more than one section we will lay them in the CEQA section.

Counsel Larmour recommended, based on the number of changes involved, to reopen public comment on those changes.

Chair Hoard reopened the public hearing for comments on the changes proposed. No comments being received, Chair closed public comment period.

Commissioner McHugh moved to recommend the Board of Supervisors make the changes to the proposed Manufacturing Ordinance represented in Exhibit B with the following amendments to the draft:

Section 2 – Application, Subsection 2 Allowable Zoning Districts, Paragraph 2 – we changed the words “which is limited to” to be “such as”, and we deleted AgForest and Agricultural Preserve from that list, listing only Rural Residential and Unclassified.

Section 2 – Application, Subsection 2 Allowable Zoning Districts, Paragraph D - we changed “the appropriate use permit” to read “Conditional Use Permit”, striking “See section (4)(J - M)”.

Subsection 3 -Types of Licenses Available, Subparagraph E – we put a period after “shared-use facility” and deleted the rest of the paragraph.

Subsection 4 – Regulations, Subparagraph J – in the first paragraph, right after “including infrastructure and building improvements” we added the phrase “specific to the

use”.

Subsection 4 – Regulations, Subparagraph L.a.3 – where it says “Utilizes extraction methods” we changed “limited to” to “such as”.

Subsection 4 – Regulations, Subparagraph M – we added to the end of the paragraph “specific to the use”.

Subsection 6 – Required Conditions, Subparagraph E.a – the sentence ending in “including infrastructure or building improvements” we added “specific to the new use”.

Subsection 7 – Denial/Rescission of License, Subparagraph A.c – we insert the same phrase, so the first sentence reads “The applicant engages in site or building improvements “specific to the use” ...”.

Commissioner Stewart seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

5. **MATTERS FROM THE COMMISSION** – None.

6. **MATTERS FROM STAFF**

Deputy Director Hubbard updated the Commission on the meeting schedule. She advised we may have one item for September 27<sup>th</sup>, but if that item doesn’t go forward we will not have a meeting on that date.

Commissioner McHugh stated he would encourage staff to combine items so we are not meeting on just one item.

7. **ADJOURN**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:18 p.m.