CITY OF BANKS, OREGON
Planning Commission Meeting
April 28, 2015
Banks City Hall, Banks, OR

Chair Gene Stout called the meeting to order at 6:36 PM. The proceedings were recorded in digital format.

ROLL CALL
Present were: Chairperson Gene Stout, Rachel Nelson, Rodney Jacobs, Michael Lyda, and Sam Van Dyke. Ray Deeth and Lisa McAllister were excused.

Attending: Jolynn Becker, City Manager; Dan Kearns, City Attorney; Stacey Goldstein, City Planner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of minutes from the March 31, 2015 meeting
   M. Lyda moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of March 31, 2015 as presented. R. Nelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT
Chair Stout explained Planning Commissioners could still act as the liaison to the City Council if they wanted; however, in lieu of not having enough Commissioners attending the Council meetings, the City Manager would provide the update to the Commission.

2. City Manager Report – City Manager Becker reviewed the items addressed at the April 14, 2015 City Council work session and regular meeting. She noted the open house for the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan was scheduled for May 21, 2015 and the online open house, the link for which was on the City website, was available from May 20th through May 31st.
3. Planning Commission Liaison Report – (None)

PUBLIC COMMENT – There was none.

Chair Stout understood the City Council had changed the number of houses that could be built in Phase 9 of Arbor Village from 34 to 42 homes. He believed the attorneys had been less than truthful, and the Council approving that change without going through the Planning Commission would make the Commission's job harder when reviewing the application. He understood what the mayor was doing was for the good of the city, but he did not understand why the mayor was allowed to have ex parte communication, which he declared. He encourages people with questions to view the public record to get answers.

City Attorney Kearns explained everyone has ex parte contacts, which are required to be disclosed. Ex parte contact occurs any time factual information was obtained about an application or property outside the context of a hearing, including visiting a site. Elected officials generally have more ex parte contacts than Planning Commissioners because people talk to their elected officials. He advises to curtail their discussions with people because they made it difficult to render a decision based on the record. He confirmed that a consolidated application for the subdivision would come before the Commission for a hearing in August.

City Manager Becker explained West Hills had asked for a modification to have a range of between 34 and 42 homes, and Council was comfortable with that decision knowing the applicant

would have to prove to the Planning Commission that the 42 houses could be accommodated.

Chair Stout noted having Council make that change would make the Planning Commission's job more difficult because Council had said yes and Commission might not agree. He questioned the purpose of the Planning Commission if Council could make changes without going through the Commission.

City Attorney Kearns explained that Banks had the same process as every city in Washington and Oregon. The Planning Commission was to hold a hearing, take testimony, evaluate the criteria and make a recommendation to Council. City Council holds an additional set of hearings where the developer could request changes to the conditions recommended by the Commission for specific reasons; however, the Phase 9 decision involved a more elaborate process. City Council viewed the application the same as the Commission, that the City should derive some public benefit for eliminating a very expensive difficult condition. It took a lot of time determining what that benefit would be and getting a proposal to Council. City Council took the Commission's recommendation with five conditions and added additional conditions, as well as a development agreement. Framing the issues was an important job of the Planning Commission, who reviewed large applications, crystalized the relevant land use issues, and made a recommendation on how those issues should be resolved. Unlike the Commissioners, City Councilors are elected officials and must answer to the entire constituency of the community; therefore, they would view their job differently. Council's job was not to defer to the Planning Commission, but take the Commission's recommendation and make a decision, perhaps adding to it. Council was not required to rubber-stamp the Commission's decision, or vet their proposals and ideas to the Commission, but to listen to what the Commission said and consider the evidence in the record. The Planning Commission's decision on the subdivision application would be final, primarily, unless it was appealed to City Council. He clarified that the Commission scope of influence regarding any recommendation was constrained by the Code.

City Planner Goldstein said her role was to analyze the project set against the Code and provide that analysis and a recommendation to the Commission in the Staff report. The Commission's job was to review the project to see whether the Code requirements were met, and if not, determine a legal reason as to why.

City Attorney Kearns clarified there would be little time to hold a work session because the Staff report was available 7 days before the hearing. He recommended that Commissioners review the application, which would be available 20 days before the hearing, but he advised against having email discussions with Staff, which were outside the public eye, to address questions that should be part of the deliberation.

The Application would cite and provide analysis of the applicable Code provisions. The Commission's job was to look for parts of an application that involved some discretion, which was inherent in a PUD application. Unlike a straight subdivision, which had very limited discretion, PUDs provided more flexibility as far as what the applicant could do and what the City could require in exchange for any concessions being requested within the context of a PUD. Greenville Park resulted from the Applicant's request for the micro lots within the subdivision.

City Planner Goldstein added once the Staff report was issued, Commissioners could contact her with questions and she suggested noting questions for the hearing.

Chair Stout expressed concern about his dual roles of being on the Planning Commission, as well as the Homeowners Association (HOA) Board of Directors and trying to do right by both the

Commission and the Board, especially considering his fiduciary responsibility to the Board and the HOA. He confirmed the new homes would be included in the existing HOA. From a homeowner's perspective, he questioned the credibility of what had been stated at multiple meetings by the Applicant's attorneys.

City Attorney Kearns clarified the preliminary plat would look different than what was previously shown. No application had been submitted yet; the Applicant applied to remove Condition 9, which was not a development. In responses to questions about the property, the Applicant offered various scenarios and ideas, but there was no subdivision application. The preliminary layouts were from the 1990s.

- He clarified the Planning Commission had limited the development to no more than 34 units, and Council approved changing that to no more than 42 units; they did not state the Applicant could build 42 units. Two preliminary plans were presented at today's preapplication meeting, one for 38 units and one for 42 units, but more changes would be made. A number of factors and elements were involved in Phase 9, including lot sizes, the street layout, wetlands, and pedestrian and bicycle connections, all of which made it difficult to predict what that part of the development would look like when the Applicant was only proposing to delete a condition.

Councilor Nelson noted the public was concerned about the impact the development would have on traffic, adding that the Applicant's proposal could fall within the Code, but it would still impact livability. It was difficult to understand what the upper limits of the Code would look and feel like. There was also a big difference between safety and the desirability of living on a street impacted by traffic passing by due to the additional homes.

City Manager Becker said the Applicant must submit a traffic study, which would be part of the record.

City Attorney Kearns explained the Code addressed street dimensions and trip generation regarded the traffic impact on intersections; no street segment analyses were conducted. The national average for trip generation was 10 vehicle trips per day per single-family detached dwelling, so 42 units would be 420 vehicle trips per day, which was nothing. The practical impact on livability was determined by the AM and PM Peak trips.

Staff explained the Applicant's circulation model would be used to identify where the PM Peak trips would travel and how they would affect the operation of the intersections. The thresholds adopted by cities and states were taken from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) manual. The traffic analysis would compare the existing and projected number of trips.

To identify safety issues, data about the number of accidents, pedestrians being hit, etc. were studied. It was impossible to project traffic safety problems in the future if one did not exist today. The relatively narrow, curving streets and on street parking of Arbor Village helped slow traffic which was one advantage toward making it safe. Safety issues usually involved speeding and people often complain that streets were not wide enough so competing issues exist with regard to livability.

City Attorney Kearns cautioned the Commission about adding parking on both sides of the streets in Arbor Village without the advice of a transportation engineer. The Commission could make decisions about where on street parking could go and that was often dictated on whether the street was wide enough to get the City's largest fire apparatus through and have them operate effectively.

Chair Stout said he had measured streets in various cities and Banks' streets were the same width as Beaverton streets that had parking on both sides, which slowed traffic down. Having mailboxes on the side of the street with no parking would help make the neighborhood more liveable. In the past, he believed the city of Banks as a whole had ignored Arbor Village in many ways, but in the last two to three years, it was becoming more integrated into the city.

Commissioner Lyda noted a half hour had been spent on a non-agenda item that would be revisited at the hearing and he asked that the Commission move to the next agenda item.

WORK SESSION –

4. Marijuana Ordinance Review (carried over from the March 31, 2015 meeting)
   City Planner Goldstein briefly reviewed the two maps requested by the Commission as follows:
   - Buffers for the Light Marijuana Map were 1,000 ft from private and public schools, 500 ft from parks and libraries, and 100 ft from residentially zoned land, making the hatched area shown off Wilkesboro Rd, which was currently outside the city limits, the only place that would accommodate marijuana facilities. The land would need to be annexed into the City when it would receive an industrial zoning designation.
   - Buffers for the Heavy Marijuana Map were 1,000 ft from private and public schools, 1,000 ft from parks and libraries, and 400 ft from residentially zoned land, making the east end of Wilkesboro Rd the only area that would accommodate marijuana facilities.
   - The mixed use zones, indicated in purple, were well within the buffers that restricted allowing marijuana facilities in both scenarios, so mixed use zones would not be an issue.

   Discussion regarding the Marijuana Ordinance continued with these key comments:
   - The maps were helpful in visualizing the buffers. Either map could be forwarded to Council.
   - Banks is a mixed use city with homes next to commercial, for example, so why have huge buffer distances because when it becomes legal, some people could be smoking pot in their back yard right behind the school, yet a heavily regulated business that the City could control with the Code could not be in the city limits. Marijuana has just been thought about differently than alcohol; was it really that much more dangerous? What made it dangerous was the illegality of it, but it would become legal.
     - There was no logical reason to impose the buffer distances, especially if the distances were arbitrary. Some justification was needed for the proposed buffer distances.
     - The same Code regulations currently used for taverns should be used for marijuana facilities. Marijuana facilities would be regulated by the OLCC, just like liquor stores.
   - Although City Council directed the Commission to severely limit marijuana facilities within the city limits, the Commission did not have to agree and could articulate why.
   - A marijuana facility was as a business and a money generator, and entertaining any of the ordinance would cause the City to lose money.
   - While a great exercise, discussing this ordinance was a total waste of time. No one would want to set up a dispensary in Banks because of the high taxes on marijuana and because it was readily available.

- Some people would not want to buy marijuana illegally and would pay a bit more to purchase it legally. Marijuana had medicinal purposes and medical marijuana cards were needed to defend a person who got busted.
- Possession and use of recreational marijuana would be legal July 1st. Dispensaries would not become legal until about the end of 2016. Current applications for medical dispensaries were believed to be place savers for when recreational dispensaries go live.
- The Commission had to face the fact that marijuana was controversial; the measure actually failed in Banks by 20 votes. Banks was trying to attract more businesses and if the main stays were the tavern, distillery, and a marijuana shop, how would the city attract other businesses, like a bakery, for example? Who were the dispensary's patrons going to be and what affect would the facilities have on people walking on the streets with their kids?
  - It would be different if Banks already had a vibrant downtown and a dispensary came in, but the Commission needed to have some foresight as far as how more businesses would be attracted to create more of a downtown community/main street feel conducive to the city's current citizens and visitors.
  - The regulations could always be relaxed in the future when the City learned more about the effects on other cities and about the character and nature of marijuana facilities. Banks needed to get established before more controversial type shops opened anywhere along Main St.
- No open use was allowed under both medical and recreational marijuana. Marijuana could not be used at the facilities where it was purchased, unlike taverns. The City could regulate marijuana use at public places like the Log Cabin, and city parks, including the gazebo.
- Just because marijuana was allowed to be dispensed, misconduct would still occur.
- The owners of a dispensary located in City Planner Goldstein's neighborhood had been very active members of the neighborhood association and made great improvements to the property and building. They were aware of the opposition, were well-funded, and there had been no negative impact on a day-to-day basis.
  - That dispensary likely made an effort to fit into that established neighborhood;
  - Signage design would be enforced by the Code.
- City Attorney Kearns believed mail order or internet sales and delivery was allowed in Oregon under the medical program; however, massive personal grow limits exist under both the medical and recreation marijuana programs. The medical program prohibited selling marijuana for profit, limiting the profitability of that program.
  - Currently, marijuana retailers could deliver to customers pursuant to bonafide orders received on the licensed premises prior to delivery.
- A medical dispensary in Banks would serve as a place saver for when recreational marijuana went live.
- Staff reminded that most of the buffer distances came from the State, and the City would have to comply with the State's buffers minimum. The City's ordinance would augment the State's provisions.
- Like taverns and liquor stores, the focus was the distance from schools where there were minors who could read and the State did not want them to see this as a normal part of their day to day lives.
  - A recreational facility would be different, but still not like living near a bar where people use on site and a host of other problems were involved.
- There were fewer pros than cons to having the buffers; Banks would be a house divided. Again, from the business perspective, what was in it for Banks other than

more pain and anguish of monitoring the marijuana? What money would the City get out of it? Unlike other businesses, time spent working through this process, the regulation or marijuana, policing staff, etc. was more intense than anything else.

- Many local governments were looking for revenue sharing because the recreational program had taxing and revenue sharing provisions. Local governments were claiming huge law enforcement burdens, but no increases in vice or crime associated with marijuana facilities supported such claims, according to preliminary indications. Marijuana had not increased demand for police services at all.
- The ordinance language should include all forms of marijuana distributors, not just medical facilities, and simply follow State regulations regarding medical and recreational marijuana as those regulations were created by the State.
- Most cities were augmenting the State's provisions; some were regulating odor, primarily of the grow operations, which was difficult to regulate otherwise.
- The State provision required that marijuana facilities be in an industrial, commercial, or mixed use zone. Under State law, there was no buffer for Banks Vernonia Trail, so a pocket area would exist at north end of town but the library would be a factor.
- The Commission briefly discussed where where they would put a marijuana facility in town and indicated their suggestions on a map, noting the shopping center would be an option.

S. Van Dyke moved that the City follow the State regulations for placement of medical and/or recreational marijuana dispensing facilities as those regulations are created. M. Lyda seconded the motion.

- Concerns were expressed about the City being locked into whatever the State regulations were; however, the Code could be revisited after the State legislature, which was in session, decided on the recreational provisions and any amendments to the medical program.
  - The recreational provisions would not be as extreme because the medical provisions were created when marijuana was illegal. When recreational marijuana was legal and regulated by OLCC like alcohol, marijuana would be sold in every OLCC regulated facility, including the liquor store at Jim's Thriftway, because of the taxes.
- The shopping center had already denied a couple requests to rent space for medical marijuana facilities because the owner did not want that type of business in his business center.
- A smoke shop was proposed at the corner of Depot St and Main St that would eventually apply for a license to sell recreational marijuana, but the application had been somewhat withdrawn at this point due to the moratorium.
- With no master plan, it was uncertain where marijuana facilities should be; adopting only the State's rules rather than the Light or Heavy buffers was shortsighted.
  - In Forest Grove, marijuana facilities were not allowed in the downtown core, but out closer to Safeway
- City Manager Becker confirmed there were no legal indoor grow operations currently in the City of Banks. People were allowed to grow their own marijuana, but they must have a medical card. It was uncertain how commercial grow operations would be regulated, but it would be different for recreational versus medical due to the prohibition of making a profit with the medical program.
- Preparing a statement regarding why the Commission supported following the State's regulations on medical and recreational marijuana was a good idea. The Commission

could vote on it at the next meeting and perhaps add some factors to it. A minority report was also a good, so Council could consider both sides of the discussion unless the Commission was fairly unanimous in its decision.

- If an owner of a business park on Wilkesboro Rd did not want to have a marijuana facility on his property, he would be able to prohibit it and deny any requests.
  - Currently, facilities could not come into Banks, because the land on Wilkesboro Rd must be annexed first.
- If the City only followed the State's guidelines, someone could site a marijuana facility in Banks and that could not be changed.
- The recreational program did not have any restrictions, but gave local governments the authority to impose time, place, and manner regulations. The State's recreational program would not likely develop any buffers or standards because that was up to local governments.

M. Lyda did not think allowing marijuana facilities in Banks was a good idea financially. He preferred MJ Heavy to keep out the facilities of the city because they were not do good for existing businesses or future development. He noted his position had nothing to do with marijuana use; he did not want to tell people what to do.

R. Nelson concurred, adding she would support either MJ Heavy or Light, which were only slightly different.

Chair Stout wanted to use MJ Heavy to cover the whole town to leave no doubts.

S. Van Dyke believed the Commission was putting the cart before the horse, but that was okay.

S. Van Dyke moved that the Planning Commission recommend that City Council use MJ Heavy to site both medical and recreational marijuana facilities in the city. R. Nelson seconded the motion, passed 4 to 1, with S. Van Dyke opposed.

Staff would return with a draft recommendation for the Planning Commission to review and forward to City Council, should the Commission agree. The Staff report to City Council would discuss the various issues and concerns discussed by the Commission.

City Attorney Kearns recommended that a Planning Commissioner share the Commission's perspective when the matter went before City Council.

5. Food Carts in the City of Banks (carried over from the March 31, 2015 meeting)
   a. Staff Memo: Food Cart Regulations.
   b. Food Cart Regulations: Corvallis
   c. Food Cart Regulations: Grants Pass
   d. Food Cart handout – Portland
   e. APA Zoning Guide on Food Carts

City Planner Goldstein reviewed her memorandum, which summarized the information gathered about how food carts were addressed in other cities. Food cart resolutions were provided from other cities and she believed Corvallis had some good standards for the City to consider following. She described the two requirements and issues related to both

mobile and fixed food carts. Staff had tried to contact the business that was considering coming into the city, but their calls were not returned.

Discussion regarding food carts continued as follows:

- Because no ordinance currently exists, food carts were legal and people could just come into Banks and operate them, like a taco truck going into the lumber mill.
- Unless they were causing a problem, there was not much the City could do to regulate food carts coming into town.
- A simple checklist-type review with clear and objective criteria could be used by staff for permitting mobile food carts. Ideas for the checklist included, having a trash receptacle, ensuring the cart was not obstructing access or creating parking problems….
    - If the cart had no negative impacts, the operator could pay a fee and be given a permit for six months or whatever.
- The way food carts operated at Waltz Brewing in Forest Grove was a great example of what the City should do. Waltz does not serve food, so different mobile food carts are there on certain nights that just park in a parking spot next to the sidewalk. This way Waltz Brewing did not need a food service license.
- Establishing time limits for how long a food cart could park in front of a business, or in the right-of-way would be good. For example, for two hours but not overnight.
- As part of Staff's checklist, food cart operators could identify the sites they intended to occupy; perhaps designating the addresses or areas where they intended to be.
- There were three different types of food carts and they should be addressed separately:
    - Mobile food carts have wheels and are parked in a designated place for a certain amount of time each day and then leave. The City did not have much control over mobile carts, but could require a business license.
    - "Pod" food carts were trailers with tires that do not require land use review because they keep their wheels on, are not bigger than 16 ft long, have no permanent structures, etc. Water and electrical hook ups were usually provided through nearby private property owners; some have kitchens elsewhere.
    - Fixed food carts were like the coffee shop at Jim's Thriftway with hook ups and the wheels removed. Building codes would cover fixed food carts.
- Banks would be a good target for a mobile card, but food cart pods were not feasible in Banks due to the small market
- Mobile food carts should have City business license and posted food handlers and health code permits. The County health department currently inspects and regulates food carts and follows State health regulations.
- Food carts operating on a regular basis must encourage customers to pick up the litter or provide a trash receptacle.
- Perhaps the operator should be responsible for keeping the site free of litter.
- If a food cart was in a temporary location, the permit/business license should have a shorter duration, so if there was a problem with a particular vendor, the permit could be revoked.
- Food carts must have a City business license, but the owner of the private property where it is parked would responsible for garbage, ultimately. They were the only one who could truly enforce it and the only one the City could go after.
- The trail head could be attractive location, especially on weekends, but parking was already an issue. The Shell station could agree to have a food cart on its property.
- With two distilleries about to be permitted in the city, Banks could have a situation

similar to Waltz Brewing.

- Scappoose had no standards or direction, so the city manager permitted food carts on a temporary use provision but with no other standards. The generator of a mobile food cart had negative impacts for the business next door. Noise and smell issues were also a problem so the permit was revoked and that city began to develop standards.
- Food carts should be allowed in all areas of the city except in residential areas.
- Concern was expressed about food carts competing with existing restaurants in town and that having regulations that were too loose would result in loss of revenue for the city.
    - It was not the City's role to protect established businesses; let the free enterprise system work and businesses compete.
    - Food carts lower the barriers for entering into a business, and there were not enough businesses in Banks. One barrier might be the market being too small that operators might not want to commit to the required expenses.
    - Some food coats become successful and establish brick and mortar restaurants…
- Ice cream trucks are essentially licensed vehicles. Some jurisdictions limit how long they could stop in the public right-of-way, but violations were more like traffic regulations.
- Limiting how long a cart could be at one location would be hard to enforce, but it could set a threshold that if the cart was parked somewhere for a certain amount of time, it would be subject to the City's ordinance. No such parking enforcement exists in the city currently.
- Based on the existing Code, if the headquarters of a business is within the city limits, they must have a business license. Other cities require a business license if any business is done in that town for whatever reason. Staff was working to modify those City Codes.
    - Transient business licenses were used for ice cream trucks and door to door sales, which was different.
- Enabling food carts to set up like at Waltz Brewing in Forest Grove could attract more interesting and prosperous businesses and generate revenue for the City.
- Mobile food carts on site for more than an hour should be on private property, not just in the right-of-way.
    - When in the public right-of-way, the serving window should not be on the street side, but business owners would not do otherwise; food carts should be in open areas out of traffic.
- The sample regulations were for cities with much larger populations.
- A simple and efficient ordinance should be written and it could be expanded as the city grew.
- The pressure was off a bit now that the potential food cart applicant was no longer a factor, so the Commission should take time to work through the issues.
- City Planner Goldstein would look into food cart details at Waltz Brewing, including whether carts are allowed in the right-of-way.
- The next meeting should focus on truly mobile food carts, and then the next category could be discussed in June.

6. Adult Businesses Ordinance Review (carried over from the March 31, 2015 meeting)

Chair Stout read the draft ordinance from Page 4 of last month's packet and noted the first paragraph needed to be rewritten because it did not fit the rest of the document. He

understood language in the document was going to be cleaned up. He noted his prior concern about "which collectively accounts for 25 percent or more" and having no below [minimum] to discuss.

City Attorney Kearns stated the language should state, "described ~~below~~ ***above***" believed the language was designed to not characterize a 7-11 with magazines, for example, as an adult business.

The Commission and Staff reviewed conversations from the last work session, which included having parameters similar to marijuana facilities. Discussion continued regarding the Adult Businesses Ordinance with these key comments:

- Like food carts, the City had no regulations or Code to address adult businesses, leaving it open for anyone to do anything they wanted.
- Adult businesses involved tricky Constitutional issues.
- Siting the use in Banks was highly theoretical; having an adult business in Banks was highly unlikely and no such applications had been received.
- Generally, all adult businesses should be in one area of the city, and Wilkesboro Rd was the only place such businesses could be located. The City could address the issue when the Wilkesboro area was annexed.
- Nothing in the draft ordinance addressed signage. Verbiage for marijuana signage would probably apply closely to adult businesses.
- Any proposed business that was on the list should have buffers like the MJ Heavy
- Adult businesses were difficult to regulate because they were highly protected under the Oregon Constitution. In small towns, parents camp out with video cameras until the business closes. This was the most powerful tool for eliminating them in a community.
- The City did not have to regulate where such business could go. No such regulations exist for dry cleaners, gas stations or gambling for example.
- This was completely contradictory considering the process regarding marijuana facilities.
- Adult businesses could only be located in a commercial use zone.

The Commission advised Staff to return to get more direction from City Council about whether they really wanted the Commission to develop regulations and to research the legal ramifications.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT – (None)

BUILDING PERMIT REVIEWS – INFORMATION ONLY (None)

VERBAL STAFF REPORTS AND UPDATES– (None)

OTHER BUSINESS

7. Banks Bicycle Pedestrian Plan – An open house is scheduled for May 21st in addition to the online open house. Commissioners were encouraged to attend the open house and visit the website. The Plan would be coming to the Commission for recommendation to City Council.
8. Upcoming agenda for May 2015 – The agenda would include two annexation applications.
9. Council Creek Trail Plan – Materials were distributed to the Commission that included a map. Staff addressed clarifying questions and noted the website was www.councilcreektrail.com
10. Parking Workshop – A kick-off meeting was scheduled with the consultants doing the study

being paid for by the State. The parking study fell under the Main Street Revitalization work.

City Manager Becker noted the public hearing on Phase 9 would be August 25, 2015 and wanted to confirm the Commissioners' meeting attendance. West Hills was planning to hold a neighborhood meeting regarding the future plans for Arbor Village. She believed the meeting would be held around May 28th, but West Hills would be sending flyers to the Arbor Village residents.

- She noted an update from the pellet mill was scheduled for June or July. Regarding the water meter at Banks Lumber Mill, the transducer was added onto the 10-in line and the water was now being metered. She confirmed the mill would be charged for the first partial month. Staff and Banks Lumber had been working together to get everything calibrated and taken care of.

ADJOURN: The Planning Commission meeting adjourned at approximately 9:01 pm.

Submitted by: _____.
Stacey Goldstein, City Planner