

MINUTES
UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting of Thursday, March 24, 2016
6:30 p.m., Stafford Hansell Government Center
Hermiston, Oregon

** ** ** **

COMMISSIONERS

PRESENT: Randy Randall, Chair, Gary Rhinhart, Vice Chair, Suni Danforth,
Don Marlatt, Don Wysocki, Cecil Thorne

ABSENT: Tammie Williams, Tami Green

STAFF: Tamra Mabbott, Bob Waldher, Brandon Seitz, Tierney Dutcher

** ** **

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE MEETING. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT OFFICE.

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice Chair Gary Rhinhart called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and read the opening statement.

NEW HEARING

TEXT AMENDMENT, #T-16-065, PLAN AMENDMENT #P-116-16, ZONE MAP AMENDMENT, #Z-307-16 and CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST, #C-1254-16 application submitted by Pioneer Asphalt Inc. The applicant requests to add an expansion of an existing quarry to the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan list of Goal 5 protected Significant Sites and apply the Aggregate Resource (AR) Overlay Zone to the entire quarry site. The applicant is also requesting approval of Conditional Use Request to operate an asphalt batch plant and concrete manufacturing plant in the existing quarry. The property is located north of NW Livestock Road, described as Township 4 North, Range 28 East, Sections 30, 31, Tax Lot 300, 2200, 2202, 2203. The existing quarry is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) with Aggregate Resource Overlay. The proposed expansion area is currently zoned EFU. The criteria of approval are found in Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-023-040 – 050, 660-023-0180 (3), (5) and (7), and Umatilla County Development Code 152.487 – 488, 152.615 and 152.617(I)(A).

Vice Chair Rhinhart called for declarations of ex-parte` contact, biases, conflicts of interest or abstentions from any member of the Planning Commission. There were none. He called for the Staff Report.

Staff Report: Brandon Seitz, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report. He stated that the applicant is requesting to amend the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan to add Tax Lots 2200, 2202 and 2203 to the Counties Goal 5 inventory as a significant aggregate

resource and apply the Aggregate Resource Overlay Zone to the expansion area. There is an existing Goal 5 significant site on Tax Lot 300 protected by the AR overlay. The Application is a Plan Amendment #P-116-16, Text Amendment #T-16-065 and Zone Map Amendment #Z-307-16. The applicant is also requesting a Conditional Use Permit #C-1254-16 to allow operation of an asphalt and concrete batch plant in the existing quarry located on Tax Lot 300.

Mr. Seitz made a change to the memo he had included in the Commissioner's packets and wanted to make clear to the Planning Commission that they will be making a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners on the Plan Amendment, Text Amendment and the Zone Map Amendment. The Planning Commission will be voting to approve or deny the Conditional Use Permit because it can be approved as an existing quarry, as it's located in the AR Overlay Zone. The Form 1 Notice of a Proposed Change to a Comprehensive Plan or Land Use Regulation was sent to Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCDD) on February 18th. Notice for tonight's hearing, as well as the Board of Commissioners hearing, was mailed on March 3rd. The Board of Commissioners hearing is tentatively scheduled for April 6th in room 130 at the Umatilla County Courthouse in Pendleton, Oregon. He asked the Commissioners if they had any questions.

Commissioner Danforth asked if the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was notified about the application, and if they responded. Mr. Seitz said both the LaGrande and Pendleton offices were notified and did not provide comment. The only response the Planning Staff received was from Granite Construction. Commissioner Danforth said she would assume since they did not respond, they have no problem with the increased truck traffic. Mr. Seitz said he would assume that is correct.

Applicant Testimony: Leslie Ann Hauer, 6100 Collins Rd, West Richland, WA and Terry Clarke, Vice President, Pioneer Asphalt Inc., 1325 NW Horn, Pendleton, OR. Ms. Hauer stated that they have the quality and quantity required by the county's Comprehensive Plan. The discussion should center on the question of whether mining should be allowed at the site. Mr. Clarke has been in the mining business for over 40 years. He knows how to meet the requirements and has a good track record of complying with the regulations. He has met with nearly all the neighbors surrounding the site, both businesses and residences, and nobody identified any issues of concern with the precedent operation or what has been proposed. With the previous application, ODOT indicated they were a little concerned about dust. She assumed that normal mitigating measures, similar to those outlined in the application, have taken care of their concerns because they did not have a response with this application.

Ms. Hauer wanted to address issues mentioned in the letter submitted for comment by Granite Construction. They allege Pioneer Asphalt has not proposed appropriate mitigating measures to deal with the significant impacts, and she claims this is simply not true. She has acknowledged that there could be dust and noise, and there are regulations and common sense measures which address those things. Mr. Clarke is quite aware of how to deal with those issues. Regarding noise, (she referred to the Granite Construction

letter, page 2), it is asserted that, “without any noise analysis it is difficult to support the finding that there are no noise sensitive uses in the vicinity.” She argued that it is actually quite easy to make that claim. Noise sensitive uses are most commonly identified as residents and schools. She found 2 residences in the vicinity, and Planning Staff identified an additional residence. They are all preexisting and located at some distance from the site. It’s fairly unlikely that any new residence or businesses will relocate to the area since its zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU). She does not believe that noise is an impact. The existing pit had not created any impacts that they were aware of and continuing similar operations in the future would also not cause any serious impacts. This is why they decided not to do a noise analysis study. Mr. Clarke has had conversations with the Umatilla County Road Department Road Master, Tom Fellows, and he said there were no issues or concern with sight restriction or the access road. As mining progresses to the north of the property they plan to establish another access point on to the north part of Livestock Road. If there are concerns when they go to obtain the permit for the road, they will address those at that time. They spoke with JR Cook from the Westland Irrigation District and he expressed some interest in using the site for a recharge area. She said they are most willing to accommodate any proposal by the Irrigation District going forward and feels that the Planning Staff has provided an adequate summary of the details.

Commissioner Rhinhart asked if they had received any comments from Westland Irrigation District. Mr. Clarke said Westland Irrigation District has criteria on distance from the canal they are required to maintain. Those offsets are noted on the plans they submitted. They are required to meet minimum slope requirements set by the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI). Commissioner Rhinhart stated that he is concerned about the site growing from 14 acres to almost 80 acres. He thinks that is a lot of acreage to add. He asked Mr. Clarke how he would justify needing to expand to a point of almost tripling the site of the pit. Ms. Hauer stated that they meet the quality and quantity criteria stated in the OAR. She said the Planning Commission could approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, approving the site as a resource and put a restriction on the permit by limiting the area allowed for mining, if that is a concern. Mr. Clarke could come back in the future to request more mining area. She stated that Mr. Clarke currently estimates that there is a 25-30 year supply, so a portion of the property would keep him busy for a few years. Commissioner Rhinhart said his concern is protecting EFU ground for future generations. Ms. Hauer said she believes the particular area will contain mostly business and industrial uses in the future. Commissioner Rhinhart said it depends on whether they get water, and reiterated that he feels we need to protect the ground. He asked if the site would join up to an abandon pit that never got restored, she affirmed that is correct but said they do not own that property. Commissioner Rhinhart said that is a concern for him. He doesn’t want to see another abandoned pit. Mr. Clarke stated that DOGAMI has funds set aside to deal with those issues. If the property owner and governing body make a request, they might be willing to assist. Commissioner Rhinhart said he feels it should be the responsibility of those who extracted the rock, and other industry folks should hold those people accountable.

Commissioner Marlatt asked what the purpose of the expansion is. He asked if they were running low on the available resource at the location they are currently using, or have experienced an increase in business. Mr. Clarke said both factors are true. Hermiston is growing and there is an operation in the area for asphalt. They are hauling rock back to Pendleton and buying rock to go to Boardman. They would like to do more work in the area instead of buying rock and trucking it from Pendleton. The area is growing and the 25 year outlook shows this sort of volume is needed to allow an operation to complete the projects and aide in growth.

Ms. Hauer wanted to address the questions surrounding the request for 24 hour operation. The state is working all night and needs product to be available at night. This would not be a 24 hour, 6 day a week operation, but they would like the ability to operate 24 hours a day in the times they would need to. Mr. Clarke agreed and said ODOT is moving toward night work to avoid traffic conflicts. These are multimillion dollar projects that require they be available with product throughout the night. He also wanted to comment on the issue Granite Construction raised in their letter regarding air and water quality. He pointed out that they are required to have permits issued by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) which have set standards concerning wastewater contaminate discharge. When they set a plant in a new location the first thing they do is conduct tests to measure the emissions. DEQ has set criteria for water quality issues as well and they are confident they will meet those standards.

Commissioner Marlatt asked if he currently has a concrete plant. Mr. Clarke said he has operations in Pendleton and a small one in Milton Freewater. Commissioner Rhinhart asked if the crushing plant is located at the bottom of the hole. Mr. Clarke confirmed that everything located is at the bottom of the hole which helps reduce dust. Commissioner Danforth asked what factors they use to make the determination that there is about 20-25 years of product available. Ms. Hauer said the quantity they estimated was based on test holes and Mr. Clarke's experience. Mr. Clarke said they are making a projection on what their market share will be. It will likely be a shared market somehow between the existing operators and him, ramping up over several years. There is no indicator that the market would support a 24 hour operation. They are asking for 6 days a week so they won't be restricted and put at a disadvantage. Commissioner Danforth asked about the plans for two crossings of the canal. She noted that the Canal District can be strict about those things and asked if they have discussed this with them. Mr. Clarke said they have consulted with the Canal District and they are aware of their criteria. Ms. Hauer added that they have an alternative access point through NW Livestock Road to the north end of the property if things fall through with the plans for crossing the canal.

Commissioner Danforth pointed out that the intensity of operation will increase substantially, and asked how they can argue that noise will not increase as a result. She said there would be more trucks coming in and out of the facility, with a possibility of up to 200 a day. This would cause more traffic and more wear and tear on the road. She also has concern for the residence that will be located 700 feet away. Ms. Hauer said the trucks will come straight on to Livestock Road and the house is on Cottonwood Bend Road, located quite a ways to the east. They will not go anywhere close to the house and

their access would not be affected. The house that sits behind the livestock sales yard will be closest to additional mining operation and potential crushing will be somewhere in the vicinity but the distance should mitigate that. The experience they have had with other operations and other permits tells them that once they get below ground level, the noise tends to be channeled straight up instead of out. Commissioner Marlatt asked if the material was mostly river rock and cobble, therefore they wouldn't be doing any blasting. Mr. Clarke confirmed that is true.

Commissioner Marlatt asked if there were any buildings on the site, or if they intend to put buildings on the site. Mr. Clarke said there are no buildings right now but they may have something in the future. They also have a scale. Ms. Hauer stated that if he chooses to put a building at some point they would return to the County Planning Office to request a Zoning Permit for that. Commissioner Marlatt asked about the potential plans for an Aquifer Recharge Project and if it would be located in the existing pit. Mr. Clarke said it could be in either pit. He has done similar projects over on Stateline Road where they took an existing mine site and turned it into what is similar to a canal. The Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council was active in getting funding for the project. Commissioner Rhinhart asked when they are finished excavating, if the pit will be the same depth as the existing pit is now or if it will be shallower. Mr. Clarke said it will be about the same. There is a layer of clay in the area about 30 feet deep and they do not want to penetrate that layer because they will get wet.

Applicant Testimony: Jayne Clarke, Pioneer Asphalt Inc., 1325 NW Horn, Pendleton, OR 97801. Mrs. Clarke stated that at two sites they have reclaimed, they have done well and received awards for their work. The first is a pond that they turned into one of the first wetlands, before it was popular. She said they often reference Mission Ponds, in the Pendleton Bird Club newsletters. The CTUIR has identified over 107 different species of birds located there. When it comes to reclaiming the land they take it very seriously. They consider themselves to be good stewards of the land.

Opponent Testimony: James Essig, Resource Manager, Granite Construction Company, 81500 Lind Rd., Hermiston, OR 97838. Mr. Essig provided a letter to the Commissioners outlining details he feels have been overlooked. Allowing a gravel mine, asphalt plant and concrete plant to operate 24 hours a day without implementing appropriate mitigation measures results in significant impacts on residences and businesses located in the vicinity of these operations. The applicant has not proposed or offered any throughput limitations. At this time, Umatilla County has not imposed any production limit conditions for the aggregate crusher, asphalt plant and concrete plant. If you take a close look at the Staff Report there are very few conditions on the operation parameters and this is important to consider when looking at potential impacts. To appropriately mitigate noise, dust and traffic impacts from this proposal, each environmental impact must be quantified and analyzed to be appropriately mitigated. Without production limitations, it is assumed the site will operate 24 hours a day, 6 days a week. The proposal should be modeled and analyzed as such, to determine the actual environmental impacts. When they look at modeling they should consider the total potential to emit with a 6 day, 24 hour operation. The Particulate Matter (PM) emissions

need to be calculated appropriately to mitigate operational impacts. Dust emissions have potential to be significant health and safety hazards. Windblown dust could pose a significant visual obstruction to the traveling public on I-84. PM emissions are already a concern for the Umatilla Basin. This project will add to those existing concerns if not appropriately analyzed and mitigated.

Regarding the noise issue, the applicant narrative states, "Noise from mining operations will generally be a minimal problem because there are no noise sensitive issues in the vicinity..." Without any noise analysis, it is difficult to support this finding. The applicant also says, "Noise will be minimized by having operations within the existing pit, below grade..." How much will the noise be minimized? What impact does the pit elevation have on reducing sound waves? Is the pit floor elevation enough to reduce noise impacts to off-site receptors?

Page 15 of the County's Findings states, "No conflicts have been identified that are not adequately mitigated." It is difficult to comprehend how Umatilla County can find that no conflicts have been identified, without a noise analysis. It is understood that the distance sound will travel is reduced by the pit floor elevation, but there is no scientific analysis to support the decibel level reduction. A noise study should be conducted to determine if increased noise impacts from the new asphalt and concrete plant operations are significant. If proposed operations are determined to increase noise levels to receptors in the vicinity, are the decibel levels within the noise standards found in the OAR? Subsequent Condition #9 states, "Adhere to DEQ Noise Standard as found in OAR 340-035-0035, Noise Control Regulations for Industry and Commerce." Without background information to support the proposed mitigation measures it is difficult to confirm that the operations will indeed fall below the thresholds identified in the industrial noise standards.

There is a concern of increased traffic in the area. The intersection with NW Livestock Road and Westland Road is only 200 feet from the Northbound Exit off Interstate 84. The access road to the property is not paved at this time. There is also limited site distance of approximately 600 feet from the intersection and the top of the overpass, when looking toward the west. He believes 200 trucks a day leaving the facility is a hazard to the traveling public. The staff report states that the applicant has spoken to Tom Fellows and no concerns were identified. However, the applicant anticipates complying with any reasonable mitigating measures identified by the County's Roadmaster. A detailed traffic investigation is necessary to determine if access roads have the capacity to handle increased truck traffic. A paved access road, additional turn pockets on Westland Road and appropriate traffic signage within 1,000 feet for the intersection may be necessary to allow for safe ingress and egress of the site.

The Pioneer Asphalt Westland Quarry expansion application should be revised to support the findings that increased dust, noise and traffic have been mitigated appropriately. A scientific noise study is needed to model the decibel levels from the proposed operations. The applicant needs to provide air emissions modeling to quantify the potential PM emissions. A traffic impact study should be required to determine the appropriate road

improvements necessary for safe ingress and egress to the site. They are requesting to add 2 additional operations to an existing crusher operation. There will be significantly more activity than what occurs at the site at this time. Without production limitations the quarry and plant operations have the potential to run 24 hours a day, 6 days a week at maximum production levels. They are only limited by the size and reliability of the equipment being used. The proposed asphalt plant needs to be limited to propane and natural gas fuel. Bunker and diesel fuel have the potential to significantly impact groundwater quality and air emissions. He thanked the Planning Commission for their time and asked them to consider the issues he presented.

Commissioner Rhinhart commented that he wished the county had the authority to enforce noise levels, but it's actually DEQ's job and they choose not to enforce the rules. He acknowledged that the Planning Commission often is presented with noise as an issue, but they have a hard time doing anything about it. Commissioner Wysocki asked about his suggestion of production limitations and what that might look like. Mr. Essig said he feels there should be a daily limitation as well as annual, based on the traffic counts and what the existing infrastructure can support for the project. If they cannot support it, there needs to be some analysis done on what type of improvements the project can consider minimizing them and allowing increasing production. He said he doesn't have an actual number, but there has been no analysis done. Commissioner Wysocki stated that these projects tend to spike when a project comes along requiring a large output, then when the project is over, if you don't have another, production slows down. Mr. Essig confirmed that is true. There is an ebb and flow to production in the aggregate industry, it's project and economy based. Commissioner Wysocki asked about the potential for diesel and bunker fuel to contaminate groundwater. He asked if he was concerned about spills. Mr. Essig said yes, and they would be storing then onsite.

Commissioner Rhinhart asked what kind of business is Granite Construction. Mr. Essig stated that they do aggregate, bridges and heavy civil construction. Mrs. Mabbott, Planning Director, asked about the suggestion of the throughput limitation. She asked if he was aware of any similar operations in the area that have a limitation on production. She doesn't recall ever having set a production limit on other quarries or aggregate operations. They have had limitations on hours of operation but not on tonnage. Mr. Essig said he does not know of any in the area, but it is common practice. Mrs. Mabbott said there are two levels; a small site and a large significant site, and they applied for the latter. In order to qualify for the large significant site they are required to meet a minimum standard of production. The rules and standards are designed to have a set of standards for large industrial sites and there is no limitation on output unless one has concrete evidence about impacts to infrastructure. Mr. Seitz and Senior Planner, Carol Johnson, evaluated that issue and addressed it in the findings. Mr. Seitz stated that the reason the traffic impact study was not required is because there will not be 200 new trucks adding to traffic on the road. Mrs. Mabbott clarified that in the future if they have 200 additional trucks, above and beyond the current activity, they will be required to complete a traffic impact analysis.

Mrs. Mabbott addressed the issue of regulating noise. She said the Planning Commission has struggled with the issue of the noise standard set by the state in the past. They handle it by stating that the applicant is required to comply with the noise standard. We enforce that by asking for a noise study if we have reason to believe they are exceeding the noise standard. The state Attorney General advised the state to stop enforcing noise standards and the county doesn't have the tools. If one has evidence to suggest they are in violation of the noise standard, the county could pursue enforcement at that time. There have been no complaints about noise from the existing operation.

Public Agencies: No comments.

Applicant Rebuttal: Leslie Ann Hauer, 6100 Collins Rd, West Richland, WA and Terry Clarke, Vice President, Pioneer Asphalt Inc., 1325 NW Horn, Pendleton, OR. Ms. Hauer stated there are several conditions placed on the permit by County Planning Staff, as well as DEQ, DOGAMI, and others. This is not Mr. Clarke's first time embarking on a mining operation. They can identify noise sensitive uses; residences, schools, churches and other places of assembly. The only sensitive uses identified in the vicinity are the 3 residences. They have been contacted and do not have a problem with the plans. The gravel business tends to be an up and down thing. If they have a contract to fulfill they could get all 200 trucks going per day for a short period of time. In an 8 hour day they could move a maximum of one truck every 2.5 minutes, or 25 per hour. That is well within the ability of the intersection of Livestock Road and Westland Road can handle. Mr. Fellows was consulted and did not indicate any problems. The concern about limiting production would be that the Planning Commission would set a precedent that they then would be obligated to enforce, which could be difficult. Regarding the matter of fuel limited to propane and natural gas, that's fine with them. Mr. Clarke said he does not intend to use any other fuel, other than propane. If you do require a limitation like that on this operation, then you will be required to apply the same terms to future operations to maintain continuity. The regulation by DEQ, Water Resources and others regulatory offices already cover many of those concerns. He said he used the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emission factors for a concrete plant crusher, mining and asphalt plant, using their potential to emit 24 hours a day 365 days a year, to measure the output of his operation. He said the numbers still fall into what is considered a minor source. They are still below the threshold set for big industry. Using those production rates, it is estimated that the site would have a life of less than 2 years, so it is not likely. Chair Randall asked the total site volume. Mr. Clarke said he approximates about 2.6 million tons.

Commissioner Rhinhart asked if they plan to do the expansion in phases. Mr. Clarke confirmed that is true. The first phase on the south side of the canal will likely take 10-12 years. Mr. Clarke said he is leasing the unused portion of the property and it's currently being used for livestock. A few years ago they had a crop on part of the land. Commissioner Wysocki asked if they had dust problems, what their mitigation measures would be. Mr. Clarke said they use water to mitigate dust, and they use dust oil on Livestock Road to cover the road during hauling.

Chair Randall closed the public hearing and moved to deliberation.

Commissioner Rhinhart said he thinks Mr. and Mrs. Clarke would do a good job in operating the facility, but he is concerned about putting too much ground into the aggregate operation. Chair Randall said his concern was the opposite of Commissioner Rhinhart's. He does not want to make them have to come back in 5 years to go through the same process. He feels that we need aggregate and there is no way around that. There are only so many sites around to operate this kind of business and he would rather enlarge the existing site than choose a new location someplace else.

Commissioner Danforth recognizes that asking for a large improvement to encompass more ground makes sense for the company. In today's society, who knows what kind of penalties and restrictions will be placed on the business operations as time progresses. She doesn't feel like further restrictions on production or operations are necessary. They have been operating businesses in the area for some time and completing award winning restoration after they are done at the sites. There are no complaints or concerning comments received from agencies. She sees this as a good thing because we are growing in this area. Chair Randall said he has firsthand knowledge in dealing with the Irrigation District on canal crossings. It is very difficult. They will have to meet strict standards to get that approved. Commissioner Danforth is pleased that they have an alternative route they could use to avoid the crossings entirely if they need to. Commissioner Wysocki stated that due to the fact that there is no water right on the property, it limits what the soils can be used for. In the future, if the land is reclaimed there are some potential uses for other activities. He feels they should not get into the business of restricting hours of operation and types of fuels a business can use. Commissioner Marlatt stated that he feels the issue is covered adequately in the Staff Report and the remarks provided were appropriate. Commissioner Thorne stated that they received no adverse comments from ODOT or other agencies so he assumes they have no problems.

Commissioner Marlatt moved to approve Conditional Use Request, #C-1254-16 with additional conditions set forth by planning staff. They recommend approval of Text Amendment, #T-16-065, Plan Amendment #P-116-16, Zone Map Amendment, #Z-307-16 to the Board of Commissioners. Commissioner Thorne seconded the motion. Motion passed 5:1.

Ms. Mabbott noted that the Board of Commissioners hearing is scheduled for Wednesday, April 6th at 9:00 a.m. in Room 130 of the Umatilla County Courthouse in Pendleton, Oregon.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Bob Waldher, Senior Planner, provided an update on the status of the proposed Idaho Power Boardman to Hemingway (B2H) Electric Transmission Line Project. On March 23, 2016 the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) issued a press release announcing the new agency preferred alternative route. It's the preliminary alternative based on the recommendation that the Umatilla and Morrow counties made in January 2016 for the Umatilla-Morrow south route. Mr. Waldher provided maps to the Planning Commission

which represents the Northern portion of the B2H Project. He pointed out the alternative routes that will be analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He explained the dark blue line shows the environmentally preferred alternative which was announced in December 2015. The red line on the map represents Idaho Power's original preferred route. The light blue line, south of Pilot Rock, is the agency preferred alternative route. Mr. Waldher met with Jeff Maffuccio, Project Manager with Idaho Power, and was told they are starting their spring surveys for the new route. They have already missed the window on some of their surveys so they plan to submit an amended application to the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council (EFSC) this spring, and will have to submit a second amendment to the application to look at the southern route, next spring. The agency preferred route will become Idaho Powers preferred route, moving forward. The agencies will receive the administrative Final EIS sometime in late summer. At that time, cooperating agencies will have an opportunity to comment. BLM stated that the announcement of the agency preferred alternative does not represent a final decision, nor does it constitute the start of a public comment period. The purpose of releasing this information at this time is for Idaho Power to notify land owners that they need to begin their spring surveys. Mrs. Mabbott said the land owners for the new agency preferred alternative route will receive a postcard notification in the mail next week. A list of land owners will be available soon. She said the southerly route is primarily range land and doesn't impact any high value farm land in the county. It also avoids a lot of other farm ground. There will be more updates to come.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Randall adjourned the meeting at 8:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tierney Dutcher
Administrative Assistant

(Minutes adopted by the Planning Commission on _____)