

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' MEETING

Tuesday, July 8, 1986

Present: Commissioner George R. Aud, President
Commissioner Ford L. Dean
Commissioner David F. Sayre
Edward V. Cox, County Administrator
Judith A. Spalding, Recording Secretary

(Commissioners Arnold and Millison were not present due to illness.)

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to approve the minutes of the Commissioners' meeting of Tuesday, July 1, 1986.

APPROVAL OF BILLS

Commissioner Aud moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to approve payment of the bills as submitted. Motion carried.

INTRODUCTION OF PLANNER

Present: Frank Gerred, Director, Office of Planning & Zoning
Jeffrey Jackman, Planner, OPZ

Mr. Gerred introduced Jeffrey Jackman, the new Planner in the Office of Planning and Zoning, who will be assisting with the update of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

OFFICE OF COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Present: Edward V. Cox, County Administrator

1) ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
SCHEDULE OF FEES

The County Administrator presented correspondence dated June 18 from Dr. William Marek, County Health Department setting forth the revised rates for Environmental Health Services as provided by the Maryland General Assembly to be effective August 1, 1986.

The Commissioner concurred to express no disagreement with the fee schedule as presented.

2) ST. MARY'S COUNTY SELF-INSURANCE FUND
AMENDMENT TO BY-LAWS

The County Administrator presented a memorandum dated July 8, 1986 from the Risk Management Committee of the St. Mary's County Self-Insurance Fund recommending that Article VIII of the By-Laws be amended to include a Section 7, covering automobile physical damage losses.

Commissioner Sayre moved, seconded by Commissioner Dean, to accept the Committee's recommendation to amend the self-insurance fund by-laws to include automobile physical damage losses. Motion carried.

3) VEHICLE REPLACEMENT FOR WALDEN CENTER

Relative to last week's discussion concerning the Walden Counseling Center's fifteen passenger van that was stolen and destroyed, the County Administrator presented a memorandum dated July 8, 1986 from the Risk Management Committee recommending the replacement of the vehicle.

The replacement cost for the vehicle would be reimbursed to the County under the St. Mary's County Self-Insurance fund By-Laws, Article VIII, Section 7, Automobile Physical Damage clause.

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to accept the Risk Management Committee's recommendation to replace the vehicle. Motion carried.

4) CORRESPONDENCE TO CONGRESSMAN DYSON
REVENUE SHARING

The County Administrator presented correspondence addressed to Congressman Dyson endorsing his position with regard to House Resolution 1400 which calls for the extension of Revenue Sharing beyond fiscal year 1986.

The Commissioners agreed to sign and forward said letter.

5) BOARD OF EDUCATION BUDGET
CERTIFICATION

The County Administrator presented correspondence from the State Department of Education requesting certification by the County of the 1986-87 Budget from the Board of Education.

Commissioner Sayre moved, seconded by Commissioner Dean, to authorize Commissioner President Aud to sign the Certification Statement. Motion carried.

6) ORDINANCE NO. 86-17
MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BONDS
FIRST ISSUE, NINTH SERIES

The Commissioners conducted a public hearing on June 24, 1986 on a proposed Ordinance authorizing St. Mary's County to enter into a Participation Agreement with Maryland Department of Transportation in the amount of \$1,000,000 for the purpose of securing payment of principal and interest on bonds to be issued by DOT; and to authorize St. Mary's County to participate in the proceeds of the Bonds; and to authorize the Commissioners to take such further action to consummate the execution and delivery of the Participation Agreement and the issuance of the sale of the Bonds. Therefore, the County Administrator presented the proposed Ordinance and Participation Agreement for approval by the Board.

Commissioner Sayre moved, seconded by Commissioner Dean, to adopt and sign Ordinance No. 86-17 and further to authorize Commissioner President Aud to sign the attached Participation Agreement. Motion carried.

7) APPOINTMENT OF HEARING OFFICER

The County Administrator reminded the Commissioners of the recommendation of the Assistant County Attorney, Joseph Densford, that he be appointed as Hearing Officer on those occasions seen fit by the Board.

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to appoint Mr. Densford as Hearing Officer for those circumstances warranting such action. Motion carried.

8) PERSONNEL
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
MOTOR EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I, II, III
HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE WORKERS

The County Administrator presented a memorandum dated July 8, 1986 from the Personnel Officer recommending promotions/appointments as follows with effective dates to be established:

Motor Equipment Operator III, Grade 7

Leon Daye, promotion to Grade 7-6
Joseph Lumpkins, appointment to Grade 7-1

Motor Equipment Operator II, Grade 6

Sandra Bean, promotion to Grade 6-1
Joseph Payne, promotion to Grade 6-1
Bobby Carter, promotion to Grade 6-1

Motor Equipment Operator I, Grade 5

Karen Parham, promotion to Grade 5-1
John E. Hall, reassignment to Grade 5-0

Highway Maintenance Worker, Grade 4

Anthony Johnson, conversion to Grade 4-0
William Hayden, conversion to Grade 4-0

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to accept the recommendations of the Personnel Officer. Motion carried.

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

Present: John Baggett, Director

1) ST. CLEMENTS ISLAND INTERPRETIVE CENTER
POTOMAC RIVER MUSEUM

Also Present: Jean Chandler, Chairperson, Museum Board

Mr. Baggett presented a bid tally sheet for the construction of a storage building addition at the St. Clements Museum and recommended awarding the project to J.J.K. Enterprises in the amount of \$19,800.

Commissioner Sayre moved, seconded by Commissioner Dean, to accept Mr. Baggett's recommendation. Motion carried.

2) BOAT SERVICE TO ST. CLEMENTS MUSEUM

Also Present: Jean Chandler, Chairperson, Museum Board

Mr. Baggett appeared before the Board to advise that the State has agreed to cost share the cost of a boat to and from St. Clements Island on a 50-50 basis up to \$4,000, and will put funds in the DNR budget for next year for a boat concessionaire to the Island on a larger boat.

In addition, Mr. Baggett advised that there was one response to a local solicitation for boat service; i.e., Capt. Doyle, who was Master of the Dove at St. Mary's City. Capt. Doyle has agreed to be available on weekends at \$100 per day from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The County would set a charge for those using the service. Mr. Baggett further advised that Capt. Doyle would get \$300,000 liability insurance and name the County as co-insurer. Therefore, Mr. Baggett requested concurrence from the Board to proceed to have the Agreement with Capt. Doyle executed and to start the boat service in mid-July.

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to authorize Mr. Baggett to have the Agreement prepared, to authorize Commissioner President Aud to sign the Agreement, upon review of the insurance coverage by Capt. Doyle. Motion carried.

COUNTRY WESTERN FESTIVAL

Also Present: Claude Clark, Ken Sothern, Gary Reed,
Art Shepard, Karen Settle, Kathy Tennison

Mr. Baggett appeared before the Board to present a status report on the Second Annual Country/Western Festival which has held June 7 and 8 at the St. Mary's County Fairgrounds.

Mr. Baggett distributed information giving attendance, ticket sales, income and expenses of the Festival and stated that there was a profit of \$3,068.62. Mr. Baggett reported that from all indications and comments he has received that the Festival was a success.

The Commissioners complimented Mr. Baggett and the Recreation and Parks staff on their efforts in making the the Country/Western Festival such a success this year.

In closing Mr. Baggett advised the Commissioners that he is looking into the possibility of a Christmas House for a future project of Recreation and Parks.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Present: John Norris, Director

1) ST. MARY'S COUNTY AIRPORT PROJECT

Mr. Norris requested the Board's concurrence in two items relative to the construction project at the County Airport which he will try to obtain grant funds from FAA.

a) additional grading to create a temporary tie-down area to relocate the aircraft from the existing grass tie-down area. Cost - approximately \$1500;

b) For site preparation and installation of lighted wind tee which is being given to the County from the State. Cost - approximately \$5,000.

Mr. Norris advised that if grant funds are not available, there are funds in the project account to take care of these two items.

Commissioner Sayre moved, seconded by Commissioner Dean, to give the Board's concurrence in the two referenced projects. Motion carried.

In addition, Mr. Norris advised the Commissioners that the State has a program whereby St. Mary's County could be classified as a terminal facility and the County would receive an allocation of \$960,000 over fiscal years 1988 - 1990. One of the requirements of this program is that there be a scheduled commuter service on line for one year. Mr. Norris indicated that he would look into the rules and regulations to determine whether having a plane on call during the scheduled time and not flying unless needed.

2) ROAD PROJECT STATUS

Mr. Norris reviewed the status of the following asphalt overlay road projects with the Commissioners:

Chingville Road, Blackistone Road, and Camp Calvert Rd.

3) STATE OFFICE BUILDING/CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Mr. Norris presented a proposal dated July 7, 1986 from McCrone in the amount of \$24,800 for survey and engineering services for the proposed Town run gravity sewer line from an existing manhole on the south side of Rte. 5 to the Governmental Center property line to accommodate the State Office Building and Correctional facility. Mr. Norris recommended that the Board accept the proposals with the exception of two provisions of the General Conditions: (1) ownership of the documents and (2) assignment of documents.

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to accept the proposal from McCrone as set forth above with the exception as noted. Motion carried.

4) COUNTY OFFICE SPACE/MASTER PLAN

With regard to the construction of the new nursing home and proposed consequent county office relocations, Mr. Norris presented a proposal dated June 30, 1986 from F.S. I. in the amount of \$29,110 for architectural/engineering services for county office space programming and Master Plan. Mr. Norris indicated that it was 1976 since the Master Plan for the Courthouse and Governmental Center had been done, and there is a need for a comprehensive study of future needs and how to solve space problems.

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to accept the proposal from F.S.I. as presented by Mr. Norris. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
B.A. LOFTIS MINOR SUBDIVISION

Commissioners present: George Aud, Ford Dean, and David Sayre. Commissioners Larry Millison and Richard Arnold were absent, both due to illness. Staff present included: Frank J. Gerred, Director, Robin Guyther, Planner, and Anita M. Meridith, Recording Secretary.

FSUB # 86-0809: B. A. LOFTIS MINOR SUBDIVISION

Appealing the Planning Commission's decision which denied the application. Mr. Loftis, applicant, was seeking approval for two single family lots on a private right-of-way off Old Rolling Road, California. The properties contain 4.6 acres and are in the Eighth Election District, shown on Tax Map 42, Block 5 as Parcels 41 and 143, zoned R-2, Low Density Urban Residential.

This matter was originally scheduled for June 24, 1986, however, due to lack of a quorum on that date, the matter was rescheduled and readvertised.

Mr. Guyther, Planner, Office of Planning and Zoning, distributed two documents and explained that the first page was a plat of the existing subdivision, page two the proposed subdivision which would create one (1) additional lot. Providing a visual explanation, staff noted that the lot was already situated on the existing road, that the applicant owned the contiguous property and wished to add some of that land to the existing parcel. Mr. Guyther urged that the problem arose in that the property was located in an R-2 zone, where minor subdivisions are no longer allowed. This is an existing minor subdivision road. While the proposal would technically meet the standards (if it were in a R-1 district), the Planning Commission denied the subdivision simply because it was located in an R-2 district, as they lacked the authority to approve same under the existing regulations. Mr. Guyther emphasized that when the Planning Commission denied the application, they included in their motion the notation that there was no physical problem with the subdivision, that their denial was based on their lack of authority.

Mr. Guyther noted that the applicant had also provided a copy of the Road Maintenance Agreement which had been signed by all of the lot owners. Staff testified that the road was being adequately maintained. From a planning point of view, staff noted that there were no real problems with the request and that if the Board of Commissioners chose to approve the applicant's request, it would require a waiver of both the Zoning Ordinance and Minor Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Loftis, applicant, noted that when he constructed the road, up to eight lots were allowed. However, only when he made recent application, was he made aware of the fact that the regulations had been changed, which now prohibited him from any further subdivision of this property. He urged that if this request were approved, it would effect a total of five lots being served by this 50 ft. right-of-way, which was more than adequate to service this property.

Commissioner Dean commented that it was apparent that the creation of this one additional lot would not cause detriment to anyone, however, he questioned whether the County Commissioners had the authority to waive this requirement, as contained in both the Zoning Ordinance and Minor Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Guyther reflected that the Board certainly had the authority to waive the Minor Subdivision Regulations, however, this same question had arisen in another recent case (Underwood), i.e. whether the Commissioners could grant authority to allow a permitted use, under the Zoning Ordinance, that was not listed. The County Attorney has not responded, at this point, to that legal issue.

Mr. Aud questioned whether anyone wished to speak either in favor or opposed. There was no audience response.

Discussion ensued and Commissioner Dean questioned whether staff could provide the rationale behind the limitation of minor subdivisions to the AR and R-1 District. Mr. Guyther responded that the rationale was to remove those types of development out of the Eighth Election District, which was envisioned as becoming a much more urbanized area. Mr. Gerred added that because of the higher density, the private road concept was viewed as an inappropriate use in that category. However, with respect to the issue before the Board, Mr. Gerred reflected that the private road was already in existence, having been created some years previously. Given all the particulars of this request, staff was of the opinion that one more lot would not adversely impact this existing situation.

Commissioner Dean reflected that he did not believe that the Board of County Commissioners could exceed its authority and must abide by the Ordinances, the same as everyone else. He urged that this was a legal issue which needed to be reviewed and addressed by the County Attorney, given that this was an existing minor subdivision and existing road. All Commissioners concurred and the matter was deferred to the County Attorney for legal opinion.

The Chair closed the hearing, noting that the matter would be taken under advisement and decision would be forthcoming.

SPEC # 85-1095: DESIGN STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

The proposed changes to the St. Mary's County Zoning Ordinance will prohibit building within 25 feet of any water course and will establish a buffer area around all water courses in which impervious areas will be limited to ten percent (10%).

Mr. Guyther distributed copies of the Design Standards for New Land Development, Revised 6-18-86, and noted that a new paragraph had been added (third paragraph on page 2) which hopefully would clarify some of the previous confusion. Previously, Section 1 contained the technical criteria and Section 2 spoke to the manner in which those technical requirement could be met. The confusion arose over whether an applicant must accomplish both, hence, the addition of the following paragraph:

"These design standards are intended to provide the applicant a maximum of flexibility in site design consistent with good environmental practice. Section two of these standards provides for simplified application of the performance criteria. Should the applicant choose to follow the standards given in section two, no additional environmental analysis would be required. The applicant has the discretion to modify the standards for simplified application, provided he can successfully demonstrate through environmental analysis that he meets the performance criteria given in section one. In this manner, these performance criteria provide for flexibility and innovation in site design."

Staff advised the simplified requirements included a 25 ft. set-back from any water course and would establish a buffer area around all water courses in which impervious areas would be limited to ten percent (10%). Mr. Guyther reiterated that these proposed criteria would only apply to new lots/development, NOT existing properties. Staff explained that the 25 ft. set-back would not apply to piers, bulkheads or small sheds, only to main structures. The 150 ft. buffer would apply to paved parking areas and all major construction.

The County Commissioners having held a public hearing on this issue on April 1, 1986 and having held subsequent discussion on the matter on June 3, 1986, now appears before the Board for decision.

Commissioner Aud moved, seconded by Commissioner Dean, and unanimously passed, to adopt the Design Standards for New Development, as provided in the Revised Draft, dated June 18, 1986.

SPEC # 85-1551: REGULATIONS FOR MINOR SUBDIVISIONS

Changes are proposed to the St. Mary's County Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations regarding the definitions and/or regulations of: "Farmsteads", "Access" Points, "Parcels of Record", Minor Subdivisions" and "Roadway Standards".

Following review of the revised proposal, and lengthy exercise of the Commissioners, the following changes were derived to said document:

A. The farmstead exemption is eliminated. Any conveyance counts as a lot for minor subdivision lot counting purposes. Lots of 15 acres or greater may be created by the recording of a deed. Such deeds must be approved by the Office of Planning and Zoning, prior to recording.

B. There shall be as few access points as possible from a public road to any parcel being subdivided. On any public road classified as a minor collector or higher road classification, driveway entrances shall be 750 ft. apart on the parcel being reviewed. These driveways may be multiple use drives, and, in fact, multiple use driveway entrances are encouraged. Roads classified below minor collector may be used for unlimited lot access so long as lots meet current regulations. The Planning Commission may modify this 750 ft. standard. In cases where a hardship is demonstrated, the Planning Commission may modify the 750 ft. separation, provided that any modification does not create a safety hazard.

D. Roadway Standards

1. 3 - Lot minor subdivision (3 lots, total)

No change to existing procedures.

2. Minor Subdivision (4 to 8 lots, total)

3. If all 8 lots are 15 acres or greater, there

E. Policy Change: Staff review of plats; currently, the Planning staff can sign plats creating 2 new lots. As long as only 2 new lots are shown on the plat, it may be approved by staff regardless of how many lots were previously approved. This policy should be modified to allow staff to approve only the first 3 new lots from a parent parcel. The fourth lot and all succeeding lots must be approved by the Planning Commission.

The Commissioners concurred to have staff prepare the appropriate Ordinance text and concurrently requested that the Assistant County Attorney be instructed to prepare the resolution, adopting those changes.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, and unanimously passed, to approve Zoning Resolution No. 85-1682 for Lewie Aldridge, Et Al/EM Investments, upon obtaining the signature of the applicant (Application for C-1 zoning was approved.) As several of the Commissioners had already signed the resolution, Commissioner Sayre will refrain from signing same, until the applicant's signature has been obtained.

PUBLIC HEARING

11:00 A.M.

ZONE # 85-0156: TEXT AMENDMENT TO ZONING ORDINANCE

Amendment regarding the definitions and regulations of slaughterhouses, meatpacking plants and livestock auctions.

Mr. Gerred read the public hearing notice aloud into the record, as published in the "Enterprise" Newspaper, a publication of general county-wide circulation, in the Wednesday, June 18, 1986 issue, providing legal notification of the following.

The history of this proposed amendment was provided. Mr. Gerred related that the Planning Commission originally held a public hearing, considering an amendment prepared by the OPZ which would have permitted slaughterhouses. At that time, a number of citizens voiced objections to the regulations, as presented, which led to the formulation of a subcommittee comprised of some of those concerned citizens, who after a great deal of effort, and meetings with the Cooperative Extension Service, Metropolitan Commission, Health Department, worked out details of an acceptable proposal, which was subsequently reviewed by the Planning Commission, who endorsed the Slaughterhouse Ordinance, which now appears before the County Commissioners.

Mr. Gerred explained that essentially, the proposal set definite standards for what would be required for various types of slaughterhouses and would note in the Ordinance the Health Department requirements and also sets up minimums for feed lots and set-backs where the operation might infringe upon contiguous neighbors. Mr. Gerred stated, "We believe we have a good ordinance here, which will simplify the allowance of slaughterhouses and still protect the adjoining neighbors."

Testimony was opened for public comment.

Mr. Gerred read the proposed text aloud and offered further explanation, as follows:

A. AR and R-1 ZONING DISTRICTS

1. No slaughterhouses shall be constructed or established within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of any neighborhood of 20 lots or more in which the average density is one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) acres or more.

As an example, Mr. Gerred noted that if an individual had one dwelling unit, 20 lots, and the average was less than 5 acres, a slaughterhouse was not allowed in that neighborhood.

2. A minimum of 20 acres is required for any slaughterhouse operation. If the slaughterhouse includes a feedlot, a minimum of 100 acres is required.
3. Stock pens or buildings associated with the slaughterhouse operation not meeting the 25 SLR requirements must be at least 300 ft. from any public right-of-way and must be at least 500 ft. from any other property line.

This 25 SLR (Sound Level Reduction) was given as the normal insulation required for heating efficiency in the Energy Code adopted by the County.

B. I-1 and C-2 ZONING DISTRICTS

1. A minimum of five (5) acres is required.
2. No structure may be located closer than 200 feet from the nearest public or private boundary, except that if the facility includes a retail sales outlet, the front of the retail sales outlet may be as close as 50 ft. from the right-of-way boundary of a major public road.

C. AGRICULTURAL OR RESOURCE CONSERVATION ZONING DISTRICT

1. A minimum of 20 acres is required. If the operation contains a feedlot, a minimum of 100 acres is required.
2. No structure may be located closer than 200 feet from any public or private boundary, except, if the facility includes a retail sales outlet, the front of the retail sales outlet may be as close as 50 ft. of a public right-of-way.

Mr. Gerred explained that while the Resource Conservation District did not actually exist at this time, it was, however, included in the text of the Ordinance.

D. ARTICLE 5 (SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS)

1. Waste or any decomposable residue from the slaughterhouse operation may not be disposed of by spreading on and/or plowing under on a farm, unless the farm contains at least 100 acres and Health Department approval is obtained.
2. Adequate measures must be developed, as per Section 53.09 of the St. Mary's County Zoning Ordinance for the abatement of offensive and obnoxious odors, dust, smoke, or similar nuisances to the degree that such odors, dust, smoke, or similar nuisances will be confined within the boundaries of the slaughterhouse site operation.

Staff explained that this section was the Industrial Performance Requirements of the Ordinance.

3. Adequate measures meeting the SLR 25 construction code requirements must be installed for the abatement of animal noises to the degree that such noises cannot be heard 100 feet away from any boundary of the slaughterhouse lot.

This would require that the pens be enclosed.

4. Design, construction, and operation of the facility must meet or exceed the requirements of all relevant State and Federal regulations. Specifically, the operation must conform to the requirements of "Agricultural Handbook 570, U.S. Inspected Meat and Poultry Packing Plants, A Guide To Construction and Layout", published by the U.S.D.A. in February, 1981, as amended.
5. Waste, by-products or any decomposable residue which results from the slaughtering of animals must be refrigerated while on the premises.
6. There must be provided adequate off-street parking and loading and unloading facilities for customers and employees.
7. The site must have direct access to a major public road.
8. The site plan must be approved by the Planning Commission.
9. Holding of live animals is not to exceed 24 hours in C-2 or I-1, except as may be required by the Department of Agriculture or Health regulations.
10. There will be no construction in a flood plain, even with flood proofing.
11. Construction and earthmoving will not be done within 25 feet of slopes over 20%.
12. Construction and earthmoving will not be done within 25 feet of tidal or non-tidal wetlands which cover at least one-quarter acre.
13. Sediment Control shall be required in accordance with Article 40.03 of the Zoning Ordinance.
14. When required, stormwater management will be provided according to the standards and specifications set down in Article 52.03 of the Zoning Ordinance.
15. Screening will be required in accordance with Article 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Gerred emphasized that while these last fifteen conditions were redundant in some ways in the Ordinance, the committee felt, and staff agreed, that they should be recited to assure conformance.

Mr. Floyd Owens asked whether the site plan requirements, as contained under D, Article 5 of the aforereferenced document, must be satisfied for all zoning districts. Staff responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Dean asked how the requirement for a 50 ft. set-back from a public road for a retail outlet in an Agricultural or Resource Conservation District corresponded to other set-back requirements for commercial/retail uses. Mr. Gerred advised the the existing setbacks within those districts was 50 ft. from a minor road and 75 ft. from a major road. Commissioner Dean suggested that the set-back should be whatever was currently required under the Ordinance and that this specific use should not require anything different. Commissioner Dean emphasized, "Just let the Zoning Ordinance rule, as it does with any other commercial establishment."

Commissioner Dean felt that the requirement, as listed under D, Article 5, No. 3, relative to the SLR 25 requirement was somewhat stringent.

Chairman of the Slaughterhouse Review Committee, Mr. Jerry Brown, asked staff to elaborate on No. 7 of D, Article 5 (site must have direct access to a major public road), as there had been concern raised during former discussions, as to what constituted a major public road. Mr. Gerred responded that this issue had been addressed via adoption of the map, included in the Comprehensive Plan, marked 17 - Existing functional Highway System - 1973. Mr. Gerred noted that an amendment was expected in the near future which would further address the definition of a major/minor public road.

Given the particular requirements of this Ordinance and the accessibility to a major county highway, staff noted that there were approximately several dozen possible sites throughout the County which could be denoted for establishment of a slaughterhouse operation. Mr. Gerred added that the essence of the intent was to remove this type of operation from residential/neighborhood locations.

Commissioner Aud thanked the committee for its efforts in developing these regulations.

The public hearing was closed.

CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Gerred distributed copies, for the Commissioners' consideration, of a list formulated by staff, which he explained was a derivative of the Planning Commission's thoughts regarding those individuals and groups which they hoped would be sought to participate in the Citizens' Advisory Committee with regard to the update of the County's Comprehensive Plan.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Commissioner Dean moved, seconded by Commissioner Sayre, to meet in Executive Session in order to discuss matters of personnel. Motion carried. The Session was held from 11:30 a.m. to 12:35 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Approved,



George R. Aud
President