

**Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Port of Tahuya
Amended and Approved Minutes of the September 18, 2004 Meeting
9:00-10:45 a.m., Tahuya Fire Hall**

Attendees: Harold Carey, Roger Schuettke, Betty Matthews, Gary Harris, Steve Griswold, Jerry Hofstatter, Doug Neyhart (arrived at 10:15), Brad Carey (Alt), Linda Sollars (Alt). There was one public attendee.

The meeting was called to order a 9:00 a.m. by Jerry Hofstatter, Chair.

A schedule was set for the next 4 meetings: Sept. 25, Oct. 2, Oct. 9, and Oct. 16. All will be 9:00 a.m. – noon, at the Tahuya Fire Hall.

Discussion:

Since this was our first meeting after the summer recess, each attendee present was invited to make “General Comments” about the committee’s progress, their views on how we should process, or any other issues they felt needed to be discussed. The following items are not verbatim statements; they are summarizations of each person’s comments (in order of presentation):

Brad Carey – Discussed that despite our amended charter to draft a new Comprehensive Plan, our original – and the true – purpose of the CAC was to help the Port decide what to do about the Public Access Plan. He feels we should: a) Finish the sections of the Comprehensive Plan we have drafted at this point so they can be turned over to the Port Commissioners; b) Recommend that the Commissioners un-adopt the Public Access Plan, with the suggestion that if they want to bring it forward again, the proper legal procedures, together with other CAC specified procedures, including quality of Life Values and associated procedures, be followed for doing so; c) Recommend that the current CAC be disbanded and another committee formed, following correct legal procedures, to further address the POT Comprehensive Plan. Re this last point, Brad expressed concerns because the existing CAC was chosen by Bob Gilbert and himself (Brad), rather than being appointed by a more formalized process; d) Also expressed concern that the CAC members might be opening themselves up to possible legal action as a result of recommendation that we made or procedures we followed. Brad also indicated that should the CAC be continued as presently constituted, all CAC members are now aware of the alleged partiality with which Chairman Gilbert selected its members.

Roger Schuettke – Believes that we can finish our appointed task by Oct. 16, and that we should communicate to the Commissioners that we recommend that the Public Access Plan be un-adopted.

Betty Matthews – Disagreed with Brad’s concern that the CAC might be liable; felt that if the Commissioners set up the committee, then any legal liability would be the responsibility of the Commissioners.

Linda Sollars – Believe we can and should finish our current draft of the Comprehensive Plan by October 16, and agreed with Brad’s statement that the Public Access Plan should be un-adopted and that proper legal procedures should be followed if the Commissioners wish to re-consider another such plan.

Gary Harris – Pointed out that we probably will have no action on our draft Comprehensive Plan until a 3rd Port Commissioner has been chosen. The Port needs a Comprehensive Plan, and we have already drafted all our key sections except the “Planning for the Future” section. We need to give the Commissioners the criteria they can apply to all proposed projects, but not tell them which projects to do; i.e., we need to give them a planning tool. Gary supports un-adopting the Public Access Plan, but suggests that it might be kept as a reference tool. He also mentioned, regarding questions of legality, that respect for ourselves and others and a fair and ethical approach is the key to dealing with the current issues. Gary did not feel the governing law related to public officials was as important for the Commissioners to follow as was ethics.

Steve Griswold – Agrees with Brad that the CAC should have been chosen by a 3rd party, and that our real reason for existence was to address the Public Access Plan. He feels we should finish up our present draft and present it, along with the Quality of Life Values section - which he feels forms the basis for the Comprehensive plan - and including the Planning section. He feels that because the Port is dysfunctional at this time, we should present our results and wait to see what will be done with it. Steve also mentioned that the PAP was not necessary to obtain Grant Funding (for example, the Port of Allyn did not have a PAP but was able to obtain grant funding and do projects) and that the Comprehensive Plan should only contain that which the POT planned to do.

Steve also discussed at some length how he expected the CAC membership to have been selected vs how it was actually selected.

Jerry Hofstatter – Feels that we should finish our current draft of the Comprehensive Plan by October 16, and that we should decide as a committee whether to recommend un-adoption of the Public Access Plan.

Harold Carey – Feel that we should not do anything further until the Public Access Plan has been un-adopted, and that we should vote as a committee on whether we recommend the un-adoption of the PAP. He also feels that our statement to the Commissioners should recommend the un-adoption, but keep open the possibility of further considering projects and/or activities as long as the proper procedures, including Quality of Life Values and associated procedures, are followed.

Doug Neyhart – Asked, “Why do we even want to address the Public Access Plan, since it was taken off our charter?” He also pointed out that our draft Comprehensive Plan does not include the Public Access Plan. He expressed concern that making a specific recommendation by letter to un-adopt the Public Access Plan, if sent prior to submission

of our Comprehensive Plan and Recommendations, would get the committee involved in the politics of the pending lawsuit, and he thinks we should avoid that involvement.

Motion to Recommend Un-Adoption of the Public Access Plan:

As a result of the above discussion, the Committee discussed whether to give the Port Commissioners our recommendation to un-adopt the Public Access Plan now, in a letter specifically addressing that topic. Doug Neyhart suggested that we instead incorporate the un-adoption of the PAP into our Recommendations that will be submitted to the Commissioners. Because we were not able to come to consensus on whether to send a letter, Harold Carey proposed the compromise solution of voting on the issue at this meeting, making sure that the results were in the Minutes, and then adopting Doug's suggestion to make the un-adoption a part of our Recommendations. There was general agreement that we not do a letter, and that we accept Harold's compromise.

Steve Griswold moved that we include in our Recommendations to the Port Commissioners that the Public Access Plan be un-adopted and removed from the POT Comprehensive Plan. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Also before the motion was made, and also after the motion was made and voted on, Steve and others discussed the fact that at some future date, provided the proper procedures, including the Quality of Life Values and associated procedures were followed, the day might come when the Public Access Plan or some part thereof could again become part of the Port of Tahuya's Comprehensive Plan.

Other discussion:

Discussion of the legal liability of committee members; no final decision on the issue.

The Committee also discussed the obligation of the Port Commissioners to follow legal procedures and their oath of office to the best of their ability, and to respond appropriately when it is pointed out that legal process is not being followed.

Action Items:

Steve Griswold and Harold Carey will go over the minutes from July 17 and will present them for approval at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Minutes prepared by Linda Sollars, Sept. 19, 2004 and amended Sept. 27, 2004.

**Port of Tahuya Citizens Advisory Committee
Amended and Approved Minutes of September 25, 2004 Meeting
Tahuya Fire Hall, 9:20 a.m. – 12:20 p.m.**

Attendees: Jerry Hofstatter, Steve Griswold, Gary Harris, Roger Schuettke, Harold Carey, Brad Carey (Alt), Linda Sollars (Alt).

Jerry Hofstatter, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m.

Clarification and Discussion of June 27, July 10, and July 17 Minutes:

Because the several amendments to the Minutes from the July meetings had caused some confusion, time was taken at this meeting to go over those Minutes and clarify the changes that had been made.

Harold Carey brought a document that presented several comments regarding the June 27 and July 10 meetings. It was decided to attach Harold's document to the Minutes from July 17. However, later in this (Sept. 25) meeting the Committee decided instead to attach the document to the Minutes of today's meeting (see below, item (b) under "Review and Discussion of September 18, 2004 Minutes").

- Steve Griswold read through the July 10 Minutes and answered any questions about them.

Steve Griswold also read through the July 17 Minutes. The following changes were made to those Minutes:

- a. Decided that a note be added to Section 4.2.4 that Chris Rhone did not attend the CAC meetings.
- b. Section 4.2.8, item (v) should be corrected to read "...a minimum of every 3 years."
- c. Harold Carey suggested that to avoid future confusion, "Unapproved" be added to the original Minutes' title. Once changes are made and the minutes are accepted, the title will be changed to "Amended and Approved." This was agreed to by those present.
- d. Roger Schuettke stated that it should be agreed that meeting minutes are to be sacrosanct; i.e., there are to be no changes in Minutes without a vote by the Committee. This was also agreed to by those present.

After further discussion, reported below, of issues that were related to the July 17 Minutes, Steve Griswold moved that the July 17 Minutes be approved with the corrections noted. The motion was seconded and passed.

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

Discussion of Items Related to the July 17 Minutes:

As Steve Griswold read through the July 17 Minutes, follow-up discussion related to several items occurred:

1. Re the footnote convention, Steve Griswold says he will add the footnotes to the sections of the POT Comprehensive Plan that Laverne McIntyre distributed during the week of Sept. 20th. He will then send the formatted documents back to Laverne.
2. The Committee decided to add the filename to the footnotes on the final report to the Commissioners, and to the CAC Minutes. Steve Griswold will add the filename to the formatting.
3. Re #3 from July 17 (Reference documents from WPPA), it was noted that the Committee had not yet received the documents from Doug Neyhart. Harold Carey said he has the same documents and will provide copies.
4. Item #4 and its sub-items from July 17th were discussed, with the changes to items 4.2.4 and 4.2.8 noted above.
5. It was noted that most of the action items from July 17 were not done yet, because we did not have time to cover them at the Sept. 18 meeting. Steve Griswold said he would complete all the unfinished items from this section (Item #4 and sub-items) before the Oct. 2 meeting.
6. The cover letter, written by Jerry Hofstatter, was tabled; Jerry will send the Committee members a revision by e-mail.

Review and Discussion of September 18, 2004 Minutes:

Because the Sept. 18 Minutes contained summaries of personal statements by each Committee member, we took some time to allow each person to review their own section of the Minutes and correct any omissions or misstatements. Individual members made some corrections.

In addition, the text of the motion to un-adopt the Public Access Plan was corrected, after we discussed and reworked the text to better reflect the sequence of the original discussion and subsequent motion.

Steve Griswold moved that the Minutes of September 18 be approved with corrections added; the motion was seconded and passed.

As a consequence of the discussion of the Minutes and for clarification, the following motions were made at this (September 25) meeting:

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

- a) Steve Griswold moved that we add as an addendum to the Minutes of September 25, 2004, the comments that Harold Carey had written and submitted at this meeting, as relative to the Minutes of June 27 and July 10. The motion was seconded by Harold Carey and passed unanimously.

- b) Steve Griswold moved to re-affirm the motion voted on at the September 18, 2004 meeting relative to un-adopting the Public Access Plan and removing it from the Port of Tahuya's Comprehensive Plan; and adding as a supporting document the "Brief History" that Harold Carey submitted at this meeting (read into the Minutes to all members present and amended by the Committee). Harold Carey seconded the motion; the motion passed 4-1.

New Business:

Roger Schuettke moved to drop Robert Zachary and Chris Rhone from the members' mailing list so they no longer receive copies of the Minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

Jerry Hofstatter reported that he had taken a telephone poll of all Committee members, excluding the alternates and R. Y. Woodhouse, who he could not reach by phone. Jerry asked the Committee members if they wanted to revisit the Committee's Charge from the Port Commissioners. No one he contacted wished to revisit the Charge.

Harold Carey and Steve Griswold stated that they wanted to be on record as believing that the Port of Tahuya's Comprehensive Plan should be reviewed annually.

Action Items for October 2 Meeting:

1. Steve Griswold will finish the action items from Section #4 and sub-items noted in the July 17 Minutes.
2. Jerry will revise the cover letter and send it by e-mail to the Committee members.
3. Steve will send out, via e-mail, the latest version of the Recommendations.

Jerry Hofstatter adjourned the meeting at 12:20.

Next Meeting: October 2, 2004, Fire Hall, 9:00 a.m. – noon. The agenda will include:

- Review Minutes of September 25 meeting
- Review the cover letter for the Report to the Commissioners
- Review the remaining Recommendations, starting with number 8.

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

Minutes prepared by Linda Sollars, September 27, 2004

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

Attachments:

A: Harold Carey's comments regarding the June 27 and July 10 meetings.

Attachment A: Comments from Harold Carey on meeting Minutes from June 27, July 10, and July 17. Mr. Carey originally requested that his comments be entered into the meeting minutes for the July 10 meeting, but agreed that to avoid confusion they could instead be included as an Attachment to the September 25 Minutes, since they were submitted at the September 25 meeting. The text in standard typeface is from the Minutes; Mr. Carey's comments are in italics.

[From July 10 meeting -- ls]

Attendees: Harold Carey, Gary Harris, Jerry Hofstatter, Laverne McIntyre, Roz Woodhouse, Roger Schuettke, Doug Neyhart, Brad Carey (alt.), Steve Griswold (alt.)

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM by Jerry Hofstatter, committee chair, and adjourned by Jerry at approximately 12:00 Noon.

Minutes of Past Meetings:

- Approved minutes from the meeting of June 27th, 2004 amended as follows:
 - a. Item #2, second sentence, is change by deleting "commissioner Cindy Olson refused to second the motion" and replacing it with "the motion died for a lack of a second". *(((Steve Griswold was the one who stated "commissioner Cindy Olsen refused to second the motion". His statement is 100% accurate. The change required by the majority of the CAC is just one of many endless examples and/or attempts made by the "stacked" majority of the CAC to "sanitize" the minutes; i.e. falsify reality. I can swear, under oath if necessary, that Commissioner Olsen refused to second the motion. I was there and saw her body language, I heard the tone and inflection of her voice, I witnessed her facial expressions, I witnessed her defiant attitude, etc. To say in the minutes of the CAC "the motion died for a lack of a second" is a willful and purposeful falsification of the written record. Let me again refer*

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

members of the CAC to RCW 42.30.010 Legislative Declaration – “The legislature finds and declares that all public commissions, boards, councils, committees, subcommittees, departments, divisions, offices, and all other public agencies of this state and subdivisions thereof exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business. It is the intent of this chapter that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly. The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.” The People have the right to know that “commissioner Cindy Olson refused to second the motion”. How else can they hold commissioner Olsen accountable for her vote? How else can the People determine whether or not commissioner Olsen’s performance is acceptable? One major reason minutes are created is so that a complete and accurate record exists for both those that did not attend as well as those that did attend the meeting can each obtain a complete and accurate understanding of what transpired. The “sanitized” minutes clearly do not provide a complete and accurate record of what transpired and that is wrong and unacceptable to this CAC member. By Harold Carey 07/17/04)))

- b. Item #2, forth sentence, change the word “charter” to “charge”.
- c. Brad Carey brought up that the minutes did not include his comments last meeting pertaining to attending Port meetings. The following is added “Brad Carey discussed concerns over certain CAC members not attending Port meetings. He said that attendance is very important in order to understand the communities desires and values. The conduct of Commissioner’s Olson and Gilbert at the June 17th hearing and regular Port meeting and the publics’ response he felt would help the CAC understand the real problem the Port Commission is having.”
- d. Roz Woodhouse raised the fact that her response to Brad Carey also was missing from the minutes. The following is added “Committee member Woodhouse questioned the propriety (the quality or state of being proper By Harold Carey 07/17/04) of an admonishment (to give friendly earnest advice or

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

encouragement to By Harold Carey 07/17/04) of other members regarding level of participation in any public or private arena, activity, or enterprise other than in the CAC itself.” ((Left unanswered, Roz’s response would not provide the reader with an accurate understanding of either the intent of Brad’s comments or Roz’s response. Therefore, it is appropriate I now comment on Roz’s response. Please re-read Brad Carey’s statement and then Roz’s. **Fact 1.** The majority of the CAC members with the right to vote strongly support the Public Access Plan. **Fact 2.** Likewise, this same majority strongly supports Commissioners Gilbert and Olsen. **Fact 3.** Roz is a part of this majority. **Fact 4.** Except for Jerry Hofstatter, this same majority, during the past 12 months, has had the poorest attendance at Port of Tahuya Commissioner meetings, CAC meetings, POT Hearings, Legal hearings and trials. **Fact 5.** To not attend the Fact 4 events “cripples” this same majority’s ability to understand the justified causes of the ire of the People, to be able to empathize with the People and in the process to create effective solutions which will help prevent such Commissioner conduct and attitudes in the future. **Fact 6.** This same majority, has made no effort, continues to make no effort, to find out from knowledgeable minority CAC members Fact 4 information essential to CAC efforts and activities. **Fact 7.** In fact this same majority has gone, and continues to go, out of its way to avoid finding out from knowledgeable minority CAC members Fact 4 information important for CAC activities and efforts. **Fact 8.** Even worse, this same majority, has, for all intents and purposes, restricted minority disclosure and discussion of POT problems and potentially illegal activities and actions and censured and/or rebuked those minority CAC members who have attempted to bring forth Fact 4 information and related information for discussion. **Fact 9.** The attitudes of the majority of the CAC membership has made, and continues to make, the efforts of the minority of the CAC membership far more difficult than necessary and is resulting in the creation of a compromised updated Comprehensive Plan. **Fact 10.** Therefore, Brad Carey, President of “Residents for Preserving Quality of Life on Hood Canal”, who was the main catalyst behind the creation of the CAC in the first place, has every right “to give friendly earnest advice or encouragement to” the majority of the CAC who have not been attending, or have been only occasionally attending, Fact 4 POT related events. **Fact 11.**

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

*Therefore, one can only assume, that based on Roz's above comment, she recognizes the importance of doing what she, as a member of the CAC majority, was being encouraged to do.
By Harold Carey 07/17/04)))*

Discussions and Activities Conducted at the June 27, 2004 Meeting as Follows:

1. A motion was made to "allow alternates to participate in the discussions but not vote". The motion passed 5 to 1.
2. A second motion was made to "remove Chris Rhon from the alternate list since he had not attended the meeting". The motion was withdrawn.
3. The revised missions and goals were reviewed that Laverne had e-mailed.
 - 3.1 A question was brought up about adding "Quality of Life Values" as a mission and putting mission #4 under it as a goal and not a mission. After discussion it was decided to add a quality of life statement as a goal under mission statement 2.0 as a goal 2.2.
 - 3.2 Mission statement #1.0 was grammatically corrected and it was agreed at this time not to have any goals for the mission.
 - 3.3 Mission statement #4.0, goal 4.1 was changed add the concept of being proactive.
 - 3.4 Mission statement #5.0 was grammatically corrected.
 - 3.5 It was agreed to add a mission statement #6.0 with goals covering the testing and measurement of Port Commission effectiveness.
 - 3.6 All of the above changes will be made by Laverne and sent out by e-mail.
4. Discussed the concept that the current comprehensive plan may not have been properly adopted. A decision was made to add this concept to the recommendations section of the Report to the Commissioners.
5. Discussed the final draft of the Port District Community description. It appeared that there were a lot of error in the narrative and some language that did not belong. The bulk of the language and facts had been pulled out of the Public Access Plan. Since there were so many changes Jerry and Brad were going to get together and do a rewrite and e-mail it to the members for review for next meeting.
6. Continued discussions and review of Planning Methods section of the Comprehensive Plan as follows:

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

6.1. Comments:

- 6.1.1 It appeared there was some confusion as to what should go in this section.
- 6.1.2 It appeared that it would take a considerable degree of effort and time to do justice to this section.

6.2. Actions:

- 6.2.1 It was decided to leave this section blank with a recommendation to the Commissioners to appoint a specific citizens advisory committee to work on this section of the comprehensive plan before it is adopted. *
- 6.2.2 Doug Neyhart suggested we see what the WPPA has with regard to planning methods and pass them onto the Commissioners in the report.
- 6.2.3 With regard to the matrix that Gary has worked on it was decided to add it to the report with a reference and as an attachment. *

7. Definitions section and final edit. A draft of a definitions section for the comprehensive plan was handed out for review the next meeting. Linda Sollars will help with editing only this next week and then she will be gone and we will have to finish *

8. Discussion of the Quality of Life Values.

8.1 Comments:

- 8.1.1 It was decided that we would add a proposed list of quality of life values as a product in the report. *
- 8.1.2 It was agreed to make a recommendation to the Port Commissioners as to finalization of the quality of life values. *

8.2 Actions:

- 8.2.1 Harold Carey will take another attempt at coming up with a list of such values. * *((I object to this statement. This statement is misleading. These minutes are creating an inaccurate and misleading record. To anyone not familiar with the situation it sounds like Harold Carey has tried repeatedly to come up with a list of Quality of Life Values. And the implication is - repeatedly failed. The truth of the matter is that beginning more than two months ago I began creating and distributing Quality of Life Values to CAC members. To date, approximately 40 have been created and distributed. To date, [07/14/04] only 1 has been discussed; and it only partially. That Quality of Life Value dealt with "touch and feel" issues. I am sure you can all remember where that brief "touch and feel" discussion lead. By Harold Carey 07/17/04))*
- 8.2.2 Roz Woodhouse asked that the language be toned down. *((I object to this statement. Roz said that the language used in the Quality of Life Values*

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

was "in your face" type of language. Her big problem, as she so stated, was with the word "must" as used in each of the Quality of Live values I created. She just does not seem get it. I created these Quality of Life Values from the perspective of the People having told us these are, overall, their Quality of Life Values. Further, that the People have said these are the values the Commissioners must utilize in order to determine whether or not any given project or activity protects and enhances the People's Quality of Life Values or exposes them to risk and degrades them. If it turns out that what I have created are not the majority of the People's Quality of Life Values, then they will be replaced with the correct ones. The Commissioners must then utilize these in place of the ones I am supplying in The Comprehensive Plan. And they must utilize them in lieu of the ones I originally created. At the end of the day, if the People are doing their job, and the Commissioners are doing their job, the Commissioners will embrace and support The Will of the People. By Harold Carey 07/17/04)))

9. Discussion of the Report format and Content that will be given to the Commissioners:

- 9.1 Steve Griswold handed out a binder without tabs but a draft of most sections to each committee member with their name on it. Each member will be responsible for maintaining and updating their copy of the report as each section is finalized.
- 9.2 Laverne handed out updated comprehensive plan sections to insert into the report binders.
- 9.3 Steve Griswold will have printed tabs to insert in the binder by next meeting.
- 9.4 The following are comments and actions needed for each section of the "Report" as reviewed and discussed:
- 9.4.1 Cover letter:
- a.) Comments:
- A cover letter introducing the report needs to be inserted at the front of the report.
 - The cover letter needs to be written by the chairman of the committee, Jerry
- b.) Actions:
- Jerry will draft a letter for review by the committee for next meeting.
 - Jerry will send an advance copy by e-mail.
- 9.4.2 Index:
- a.) Comments/Changes:
- The Committee's Charter was changed to "Charge".

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

- It was agreed that the committee will include two products in the report. One being a “draft of a comprehensive plan” and the other a “potential list of quality of life values. *

b.) Actions:

- Steve to make changes to the index and e-mail to committee members.
-

9.4.3 Committee members:

a.) Comments/Changes

- Reference to Roz was changed to R. Y.
- Chris Rohn name was added as an alternate

b.) Actions:

- Steve to make changes to the index and e-mail to committee members.
-

9.4.4 CAC charge:

a.) Comments/Changes:

- Charter was changed to Charge
- Reasons for not doing a survey were discussed and agreed to.

b.) Actions:

- Jerry needs to give Steve the date of the meeting the charge was changed.
- Steve to make changes and e-mail to committee members.

9.4.5 Resources Used and Reference documents:

a.) Comments/Changes:

- Under resources “Port Attorney” was added.
- Under references several other resources were discussed and agreed to.

b.) Actions

- Steve to make changes and e-mail to committee members.
-

9.4.6 The process followed:

a.) Comments/Changes:

- The number of community members attending the meeting was added.
- Expenses for this citizen’s advisory effort were added.

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

b.) Actions:

- Steve to make changes and e-mail to committee members.
-

9.4.7 The recommendations:

a.) Comments/Changes:

- The recommendations were not reviewed this meeting and will be reviewed the next meeting.
- Some new recommendations were introduced around the Planning Methods and Processes section of the Comprehensive Plan, the current comprehensive plan possibly being adopted and an approach for getting public input on the a new comprehensive plan. *

b.) Actions:

- Steve to make changes and e-mail to committee members.
-

9.4.8 The Committees Products:

a.) Comments/Changes:

- The mission and goals of the Comprehensive Plan were reviewed.
- The community description of the Comprehensive Plan was reviewed and needed some major revisions.
- Planning methods and processes of the Comprehensive Plan are not going to be done but the section will be shown with a reference to the recommendation section. *
- Besides the Comprehensive Plan a second product was agreed to as a potential list of quality of life values. *

b.) Actions:

- Laverne will update missions and goals and send out.
- Jerry and Brad will revise the community description and send out.
- Steve will add a recommendation for the Planning Methods section.
- Harold will consolidate a list of Quality of Life values and tone down the language. * *(((I object to this statement. This statement is misleading. It implies, through innuendo, that the language used by me in the creation of the Quality of Life Values is something it is not. See section 8.2.2 of this document. By Harold Carey 07/17/04)))*

9.4.9 The turn over of Committee files:

a.) Comments:

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.

- This section has not been drafted yet.
-
- b.) Actions:
 - Steve will draft and send out to committee members for review.
 -

9.4.10 Attachments:

a.) Comments:

- We need to minimize the attachments that will go with each report.
- One of the extra copies should become a Port file and it should contain copies of all the reference documents.
- We will include as an attachment a copy of the matrix Gary has put together. *

b.) Actions:

- Decide next meeting which documents should become attachments for all the reports.
-

10. Comprehensive Plan Guidelines. Doug Neyhart will try and obtain a copy of the WPPA guidelines for a comprehensive plan to review and include in the report.

NEXT MEETING: July 10, 2004 at the Fire Hall beginning at 9:00 and running until 12:00

IMPORTANT!!!! – A decision will need to be made on the 17th if the report can be finalized and ready to give to the Commissioners on July 21st. Comments included that it might be a stretch, we should make a good effort, based on Commissioner Gilbert resigning the commissioners will not have the time and not want to look at this report until a new commissioner is selected, if we can not have it ready for the 21st then it was suggested we put it on hold until after the summer and complete it in the fall.

Views and opinions expressed and reported in Approved Minutes does not necessarily constitute agreement by all Committee members.