

**ST. MARY'S COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' MEETING
February 23, 1999**

Present: Commissioner President Julie B. Randall
Commissioner Joseph F. Anderson
Commissioner Shelby P. Guazzo
Commissioner Thomas A. Mattingly, Sr.
Commissioner Daniel H. Raley
Mortimer L. Smedley, Acting County Administrator
Judith A. Spalding, Recorder

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Commissioner Anderson moved, seconded by Commissioner Mattingly to accept the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF CHECK REGISTER

Commissioner Anderson moved, seconded by Commissioner Raley, to authorize Commissioner Randall to sign the check register, as presented. Motion carried.

(Commissioner Raley questioned the following bills: Rte Evaluation Study; Solar Salt; mapping services/mapping for County; and Wm. E. Davis for Courthouse.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Mattingly moved, seconded by Commissioner Raley, to approve the minutes of the Commissioners' meeting of Tuesday, February 16, 1999 as corrected. Motion carried.

- Draft Agendas for March 2, 1999 and March 9, 1999
(There was discussion as to the addition of legal issues (real estate and pending legal) and continuation of boards and committees)

1. Department of Public Works Items

Also present: George Erichsen, Director, DPW

- a) Public Works Agreement Addendum extending the completion date from March 1, 1999 to March 1, 2000 for Cedar Cove Subdivision, Section 4, located in the Eighth Election District; backed by a Letter of Credit provided by Maryland Bank and Trust Company in the amount of \$51,000.
- b) Public Works Agreement for Aberdeen Subdivision, located in the Second Election Districts backed by a Letter of Credit provided by Cedar Point Federal Credit Union in the amount of \$175,400.
- c) Road Deed from Michael and Michelle Morris for Aberdeen Lane located in the Aberdeen Subdivisions.
- d) Road deed from Elizabeth Hewitt for Aberdeen Lane located in the Aberdeen Subdivision.
- e) Permanent Drainage Easement Agreement from Frank Damson at the intersection of Aberdeen Lane and Flat Iron Road.

- f) Public Works Agreement for Hidden Acres Subdivision, located in the Fourth Election Districts backed by a Letter of Credit provided by Cedar Point Federal Credit Union in the amount of \$175,400.

Commissioner Anderson moved, seconded by Commissioner Raley, to authorize Commissioner Randall to sign the referenced documents. Motion carried.

2. Walden/Sierra, Inc. Grant Agreement
Domestic Violence Program – State Funding \$1,232 for additional shelter nights

Also Present: Kathy O'Brien, Director, Walden Sierra

Commissioner Anderson moved, seconded by Commissioner Raley, to authorize Commissioner Randall to sign the Grant Agreement. Motion carried.

3. Information Release
Announcing results of water sample analysis of properties downstream of St. Andrews Landfill.

Commissioner Anderson moved, seconded by Commissioner Raley, to authorize the distribution of the Information Release as presented. Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSURANCE TRUST

Present: Jon Burrell, Executive Director, LGIT
Fitzroy Smith, Director of Property Liability Services
Mary Balducci, Director of Health Pool
Elizabeth McDonald, Director of Claims
Mary O'Brien (County's Risk Manager)

The referenced individuals appeared before the Board to provide a briefing relative to the county's various insurance coverages under the Local Government Insurance Trust (LGIT), a nonprofit risk pool formed in 1987 in reaction to private companies pulling out of the local government. LGIT, which is owned and managed by its local government members, was established by its sponsoring agencies—the Maryland Municipal League and the Maryland Association of Counties and provides joint self-insured programs for jurisdictions in the State of Maryland.

Areas of discussion included LGIT's Mission Statement, types of coverage provided by LGIT; e.g., primary liability, property, property/equipment breakdown, premium rate formula, and health benefits services (dental, vision, short and long term disability, life insurance and employee assistance program).

CHRISTMAS IN APRIL PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE TO COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Present: Mary Ann Chasen
Dirk Griffith

The referenced representatives from the *Christmas in April* program appeared before the Board to present a plaque to St. Mary's County Government, Public Works Department for assistance provided in the 1998 program.

PROCLAMATION ARC OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND

The Commissioners presented a Proclamation designating March as Mental Retardation Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month.

**PROCLAMATION
BLACK HISTORY MONTH**

The Commissioners presented a Proclamation designating February as Black History Month in St. Mary's County.

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING
PUBLIC HEARINGS**

All Commissioners were present. DPZ staff present were Director Jon Grimm and Peggy Childs, Recording Secretary.

CDSP #98-2120 – TUDOR HALL VILLAGE

Requesting approval for design competition category of Growth Allocation to change the Critical Area overlay zone from LDA to IDA to accommodate a Mixed-Use PUD within the corporate limits of Leonardtown; Tax Map 133, Block 9, Parcel 228.

Owner/Applicant: KAAV, LLC
Present: Attorney Chris Foley of Dorsey & Foley, P.C.
Robin Guyther, Administrator, Town of Leonardtown
Shawn Day, of Day & Associates, Inc., Agent
Keith Allston, of KAAV, Inc.

- #S-1 Legal Ad published in The Enterprise on 2/5/99 & 2/12/99
- #S-2 Photo - Proof of posting by staff on 2/5/99
- #S-3 February 16, 1999 Staff Report
- #A-1 Certified Receipts of notification to property owners within 200 ft.

Applicant requests approval of 31.64 acres of the county's growth allocation to accommodate a Mixed-Use Planned Unit Development located entirely within the limits of the Town of Leonardtown. Because the Town has allocated its entire 4 acres of growth allocation to this project, Section §38.2.17.b of the Ordinance allows it to apply for a portion of the county's growth allocation. The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on this request on 11/23/98 and, on 12/14/98, by unanimous vote, recommended approval with the condition that no development occur within the Critical Area Expanded 100 ft. Buffer.

Because of the amount of impervious surface being constructed within the Critical Area for roofs, roads, parking lots, etc., the Critical Area Commission has "suggested" that 35 acres of growth allocation be zoned IDA to support the project. The Town's 4 acres has been allocated to the hotel and conference center, which, if this project is approved, will be purchased and operated by Leonardtown Recreation, Inc., a non-profit entity of the Town of Leonardtown.

The 35 acres total is all of the growth allocation that will be needed for this project. Mr. Grimm will provide the remaining balance of the county's growth allocation allotment at the next meeting.

The applicant in this request is KAAV, LLC, which has a contract of sale for this entire 400-acre property. The Commissioners suggested the residential portion of the development be excluded from the growth allocation request, which would then be for the conference center only and which would require fewer acres of growth allocation. Mr. Guyther replied he doesn't think the applicant would be willing to do that, because he will be making his money from the residential development.

Commissioner Guazzo stated she would be concerned about approving growth allocation to someone who does not own the property and asked to see the legal documents: 1) Applicant's contract of sale to purchase the property; 2) the Town contract for the hotel and conference center, to be executed a minute after KAAV acquires ownership of the property. Commissioner Anderson asked if the County has ever approved a growth allocation request in a situation where there was no contract or a firm owner of the property? Mr. Grimm responded he

thinks we have, but will provide the answer next time, adding that it would be easy to impose that kind of consideration as a condition of approval. The contract of sale is in the DPZ file.

Keith Allston, who, with his partner Andy Colevas is KAAV, confirmed that they have an agreement with the Town but said he and Mr. Colevas will build this project even if the Town is not involved. He said the growth allocation doesn't just include the hotel/conference center, but impacts some townhouse density, parking for the hotel that the Town's four acres doesn't include, and the restaurant, which is located on steep slopes. Mr. Day added the growth allocation is not being requested for additional density; it is to set the design parameters and allow the applicant to design the project as it is laid out. The Zoning Ordinance allows the Commissioners to deny an extension of growth allocation approval if it is not used in 3 years.

Ms. Guazzo stated she feels the conference center and golf course are needed by the county, and her first concern in making sure they happen. Mr. Guyther replied, if everything happens as scheduled, they will break ground in June for the hotel, the golf course, and the main road. Mr. Allston added the only holdup is that his attorneys have told him not to enter into the agreement with the Town until he owns the property. The only thing they are waiting for is to "close" on the property, which is scheduled for the middle of March, and they feel that everything is in place to do that. Mr. Guyther said the applicant has all of his State approvals; the Town has approved the Concept Development Plan and applicant is now submitting his engineering plans – the road plans have been submitted, the plans for the golf course are 90% completed and will be submitted within 30 days.

Ms. Guazzo asked whether SHA has signed off on the entrance to Route 5? Mr. Allston replied that SHA has the traffic study, which indicates there is no justification for a traffic light at the entrance to this project. Ms. Guazzo stated she would be interested in seeing SHA's comments on this.

Commissioner Raley stressed the importance of this project and the conference center, not only to Leonardtown but also to the county and the Navy Base. Mr. Anderson said the project allows us to take advantage of our land and water resources in the right way and promotes the policy of Smart Growth. Ms. Guazzo agreed but emphasized the importance of the legal documents. Commissioner Randall stated she thinks a copy of applicant's contract of sale is all the Commissioners need for approval of growth allocation, although we may need the other documents down the line. Ms. Guazzo said this is the first of many requests for this parcel of land and she wants the applicant to understand that the Commissioners need to look at everything. Commissioner Mattingly encouraged the entire community to stop by the Town Commissioners office and look at this proposal, commending the developer on the excellence of the project.

Ms. Guazzo suggested the growth allocation approval be contingent upon the hotel and conference center being built. Mr. Guyther replied, without the hotel and conference center, there is no need for growth allocation; it is design-specific. Mr. Grimm agreed, adding, if the plan which the growth allocation is based on changes, it will have to come back before the County Commissioners for an amendment. This is separate and distinct from access and other site plan approvals for this project, which are the province of the Town.

Ms. Randall opened the hearing to public comment. There were no comments.

Following discussion, Mr. Anderson moved to direct staff to prepare an Ordinance and a letter of transmittal to the Critical Area Commission recommending approval of the growth allocation as requested, contingent upon the hotel/conference center and golf course being constructed and subject to the KAAV contract of sale being provided for the Commissioners' review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mattingly and passed by a vote of 5-0. The documents will be provided by next Tuesday for the Commissioners' action in two weeks.

Final approval is the province of the Critical Area Commission, which may either hold its own public hearing at the local level and make a decision or review the request as a "refinement" to the County program, a more streamlined process. Mr. Guyther noted the CAC has already approved the Town's 4-acre growth allocation as a "refinement."

Ms. Guazzo clarified for Mr. Day that the proposed size should be included in the approving document in accordance with the concept plan; e.g., "an 18-hole golf course and '#-room' hotel."

ZONE #98-1151 – St. Mary's Industrial Park, Lot 500-1, Section 1

Requesting zoning change from RTC (Residential Town Center) to Industrial (I) to correct an alleged error in the split zoning of Lot 500-1 as RTC/I. The property contains 3.2 acres, is zoned RTC, and is located on Commerce Street in the Industrial Park; Tax Map 34, Block 1, part of Parcel 548.

Owner/Applicant: St. Mary's County Metropolitan Commission
Present: Joe Mitchell, Esq., Attorney for MetComm

Legal Ad published in The Enterprise on 2/5/99 & /12/99

Property posted by staff with notice of this public hearing

#S-1 Legal Ad published in The Enterprise on 2/5/99 & 2/12/99

#S-2 Photo – Proof of posting of property by staff on 2/5/99

#S-3- February 10, 1999 Staff Report

#A-1 Certified Receipts of notification to property owners within 200 ft.

The RTC/I zoning boundary was established on zoning maps in 1974. Section 1 of the Industrial Park was originally subdivided in 1975. In the 1990 comprehensive rezoning process, all I-1 zoning boundaries were carried forward, and the RTC/I split boundary established for this property on its resubdivision to Lot 500-1 in 1994. Prior Boards of County Commissioners have found the split boundary to be in error and rezoned two similar lots to Industrial, the most recent being #95-2591, the J. J. Mailing Expansion. Applicant requests a similar finding of error and rezoning for this lot. Staff believes this to be the last of the split-boundary lots in the Industrial Park.

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the rezoning request on January 11, 1999, recommending approval by its Resolution #99-01, dated January 25, 1999.

Mr. Mitchell stated that MetComm, which is using this site as its central facility, wants to use the rear RTC-zoned portion of the property to expand the parking area and for storage of equipment; hence this rezoning request.

Commissioner Randall opened the hearing to public comment.

Hearing none, she closed the public hearing at 2:35 p.m., announcing that the record would remain open for 10 days for written comment, with decision scheduled for the next meeting following the 10-day open record period.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Proposed Regional Community College Proposal

Commissioner Mattingly advised that a meeting was held with the three Commissioner boards regarding the regional college legislative proposal. Calvert County offered solutions in response to concerns and those concerns/suggested solutions will be submitted to the Charles County Community College Board of Trustees for review. Discussion ensued as to whether the proposal would or would not go forward as a two-county board if Calvert decided not to participate.

Tudor Hall Village Project

Commissioner Anderson advised that he attended a briefing in Annapolis on Friday relative to the Tudor Hall Village project in Leonardtown. It was indicated at this meeting that the project would be an asset and that it has significant support from the State of Maryland.

Board of Barbers

Commissioner Raley requested that a letter be drafted for next week supporting the reappointment of John Gatton Sr., to the Maryland State Board of Barbers. The Commissioners gave their concurrence.

Legislative Bills

Commissioner Guazzo referred to three bills in the legislature that will have an impact on St. Mary's County: HB392 – Truth in Taxation. St. Mary's County residents are taxed at 40% of the house's assessment, but some surrounding states are taxed at 100% and have a lower tax rate. This bill would change it to 100% for all jurisdictions in Maryland to make it revenue neutral. SB 342 – Income Tax Bill – this bill will change the calculation method for the counties' piggyback tax; counties will be able to raise the piggyback tax by 1% to make up the loss in revenue. She requested Mr. Welkos to look at the impact this bill would have on the county's budget. SB363 – Pension System Bill – Allowing county's participation in the Employees' Contributory Pension System. If the bill passes, the Commissioners will have until December 31, 1999 to decide whether or not to participate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Commissioner Mattingly moved, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to meet in Executive Session to discuss matters of Personnel (Sheriff's Department; Consideration of Appointments to Boards, Committees, and Commissions; Vacant Positions and Other Personnel Matters), as provided for in Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1. Motion carried.

Personnel (Sheriff's Department)

Present: Commissioner President Julie B. Randall
Commissioner Joseph F. Anderson
Commissioner Shelby P Guazzo
Commissioner Thomas A. Mattingly, Sr.
Commissioner Daniel H. Raley
Mortimer L. Smedley, Acting County Administrator
Capt. Jamie Raley, Sheriff's Dept.
Judith A. Spalding, Recorder

Authority: Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1
Time Held: 3:15 p.m. – 3:44 p.m.

Action Taken: The Commissioners reviewed the request for waiver of the Personnel Manual requirement relative to hiring at entrance level of pay and agreed to take action in open session.

Personnel (Boards and Committees)

Present: Commissioner President Julie B. Randall
Commissioner Joseph F. Anderson
Commissioner Shelby P Guazzo
Commissioner Thomas A. Mattingly, Sr.
Commissioner Daniel H. Raley
Mortimer L. Smedley, Acting County Administrator (attended from 3:50 to 4:10 p.m.)
Delores Lacey, Appointments Secretary (attended from 4:12 – 4:50)
Kim Shearin, Assistant County Attorney (attended from 3:50 to 4:10 p.m.)
Judith A. Spalding, Recorder

Authority: Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1
Time Held: 3:50 p.m. – 5:50 p.m.

Action Taken: The Commissioners reviewed the current status sheet, made nominations, and gave direction to staff; and further discussed the status and membership of one of the committees.

Personnel Issues

Present: Commissioner President Julie B. Randall
 Commissioner Joseph F. Anderson
 Commissioner Shelby P Guazzo
 Commissioner Thomas A. Mattingly, Sr.
 Commissioner Daniel H. Raley
 Mortimer L. Smedley, Acting County Administrator
 Melvin "Mac" McClintock, Dir. DHR (attended from 5:06 p.m. - 5:20 p.m.)
 Judith A. Spalding, Recorder (attended from 5:06 p.m. - 5:20 p.m.)

Authority: Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1

Time Held: 5:06 p.m. - 6:15 p.m.

Action Taken: The Commissioners discussed personnel issues and gave direction to staff.

FOLLOW UP TO EXECUTIVE SESSION (SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT)

Commissioner Anderson moved, seconded by Commissioner Guazzo, to approve the waiver of Chapter 12, Section 1211 of the manual of Personnel Policies and Procedures for the hiring of two currently certified police officers at Grace 10, Step 3 to fill existing entry-level positions. Motion carried.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS / PLANNING COMMISSION
 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN WORK SESSION COMMISSIONERS CONFERENCE ROOM
 * GOVT CTR * LEONARDTOWN, MARYLAND**

County Commissioners present were President Julie Randall and Commissioners Anderson, Guazzo, Mattingly and Raley. Planning Commission members present were Frank Taylor, Hal Willard, Bill Donaldson, Jim Dexter and John F. Taylor. DPZ staff present were Jon Grimm, Director; Planners Jeffrey Jackman and Mary Hayden, and Peggy Childs, Recording Secretary.

A list of attendees is on file in DPZ.

Commissioner Randall called the session to order at 6:40 p.m.

CORRECTION TO 2/1/99 "MINUTES"

Commissioner Randall noted two omissions in the notes of the February 1st work session - 1) A provision for new developments not yet built out to be developed under the new Comp Plan; 2) The specified goal for the preservation of agricultural land, in number of acres. Even though they were omitted in the minutes, Ms. Randall asked if these two items are included in staff's revisions? Mr. Grimm replied there is nothing specific in the drafts that changes the way developments are approved under the current regulations. Site plans are valid for one year. Subdivision plans require two approvals - preliminary and final. Preliminary approval is valid for two years. Final approvals protect the plan from changes in regulations for one year and must be recorded in that one-year time frame or they lose their approval. Once recorded, the approval is good until the project is built out.

Ms. Randall said at the last meeting she asked whether the county knows how many approved developments exist today that have not yet been built out, and the answer she received was no, the county has no way of tracking that data. She said the county could have approved but undeveloped subdivisions throughout the RPD, so we have no way of knowing if what we are doing today will preserve what we want to preserve. Because we don't have that data, Ms. Randall said she thought we agreed that, if the developments have not been built out, they would have to be reviewed under the new plan when they are ready to be built out.

Mr. Grimm replied staff was trying to run a query on the data base that would cross-reference building permits against recorded lots of record, but that work

has not been concluded and we have no conclusive answer. We did try attempt to plot their location and to quantify them but, not having an automated building permit data base beyond January 1997, there is a gap previous to that date when lots may have been recorded.

Ms. Randall stated she thought that was an issue the Commissioners had given direction on, and asked that it remain on the table for further discussion. She said she doesn't have a problem with the validity to the plans, her problem is with recorded lots that are not yet built out, and which are approved for development under the old regulations. She said she feels, if recorded lots are not built out in a certain number of years, they should have to comply with the new regulations. Mr. Grimm suggested a variance process, similar to existing recorded lots which cannot meet the Critical Area requirements.

Mr. Dexter stated there may already be as many approved lots in the RPD as what we intended to approve with TDRs. If we take away those rights to build, it may constitute an illegal "taking." We need to know if there is a legal method to disqualify those lots as approved building lots that is not a taking of the property. Mr. Anderson said it would not be a matter of taking away their building rights, but whether we can require them to comply with the new regulations. Mr. Grimm said, if we're not talking about deplating the lots but making them conform to the new regulations he doesn't think we have an issue, because that's what was done in 1990. Many lots now have additional setbacks, resource protection standards and other requirements applied to them based on the new regulations, and except for the platted density, they must perform to the criteria set out in the law.

CCRS/PC CP Work Session - February 23, 1999

Ms. Guazzo asked about "grandfathering" in the revised plan. Mr. Grimm stated there is no change from the January draft, which sought to promote the use of the TDR as a technique to provide some economic return for a substandard lot, in exchange for not building on it. Under the existing grandfathering provision, phases of developments which do not have preliminary plan or final plat approval would have to conform to the new regulations in their entirety. Short of any different direction, this grandfathering provision will continue and will be included in the Unified Development Code. Regarding the goal, in number of acres, for preservation of agricultural land, Mr. Grimm said this is contained on page 24. The annual goal is 1,700 acres with 17,000 acres to be protected by 2010, and a long-term goal of 70,000 acres.

Finally, referring to item 6) on page 4 of the February 1S' minutes, Ms. Randall asked how and when we will know if TDRs work, and whether we have made sure that the increased density in development districts meets Smart Growth? Mr. Grimm replied Mike Paone, of the Maryland Office of Planning, states in no uncertain terms that the draft meets the requirements of the Priority Funding Areas and Smart Growth. Mr. Grimm noted the comment made several times by Mr. Dyett that he opposes the downzoning of the development district base density rights, and said it really is not a downzoning. Today you have one development right per acre, by right, in the development districts. Under the draft plan, you would have one development right, by right, per acre. Today, by providing public sewer, you can increase to two units per acre; under the draft plan we trade the sewer bonus for a TDR bonus, so it's not a downzoning. It is using a different technique to increase density. MOP says that will conform to the PFA requirements.

Mr. Grimm walked through the revisions resulting from the work sessions of 1/19/99 and 2/1/99, provided under his memo of 2/12/99. The Commissioners directed as follows:

Volume I - Comprehensive Plan
Page 78-79 Page 81

Remove specific standards and response times for law enforcement and health and public safety services.

iii) Go back to School Board to identify percentage of students who go on to continuing education; set higher goal. (Ms. Randall says 50% now)

Volume II - Implementation Strategies

Page 3 3) Delete "Consider." Revise, per Jim Dexter's summarization based on value of farm, not just appraised value of land.

Referring to Action 6, Commissioner Mattingly brought up the possible "downzoning" of commercial properties, including one parcel in the McIntosh Run area of MD 5, just outside the corporate limits of Leonardtown. Some downzonings were recommended by the Planning Commission as part of the January draft, although Mr. Grimm said he believed the Commission had agreed to carry forward all commercially designated parcels unless they were undeveloped and did not conform to the Plan. Commissioner Mattingly stated he thinks that is wrong and that he would not vote to downzone someone's property to put it in an Ag Overlay. Mr. Raley stated Mr. Mattingly wouldn't be alone in that. Ms. Guazzo said she generally feels that those who have commercial zoning and wish to keep it, should be able to keep it. Planner Jeffrey Jackman stated the only areas at risk are on Point Lookout Road on the west side of Leonardtown in the stretch of land by Bussler's, and possibly a couple of parcels in between the Ragan Building and the Shah Clinic. Commissioner Raley responded, if there's not that many, let's leave them alone. Staff will quantify those properties for the Commissioners. If there are a lot of these properties, Ms. Randall said, there might be another way of compensating them.

Page 4 Action 10, 1) b)- Designate where fees-in-lieu will be applied.

Page 13 Action ~3, Zoning Map Revisions 1) - Include language that excludes lands in Critical Area from Ag Overlay; revise map and provide revised acreage. Provide county Critical Area acreage.

Page 16 Action 38, 2)a) - Remove identification of specific report (Special Report #209); leave "current edition" of highway capacity manual. 3) - Define new Level of Services in Unified Land Code.

Ms. Guazzo stated she will probably have more questions, as she has not had a chance to really read the revisions.

Regarding Mr. Dyett's memo of February 19, 1999, Mr. Grimm said Mr. Dyett has made three principal recommendations which he agrees with, and they are presented in such a way that, if the Commissioners agree, they can take those renumbered pages and substitute them for what we just went over. The three components are: 1) Preface language; 2) Recommended changes to Density and Intensity Provisions; 3) Minor changes to revised scheme for rural-residential subdivisions (scoring and performance criteria - page 31 of Vol. I and Page 5 of Vol. II).

Ms. Guazzo asked if there is anything in the additional language that talks about seeking to assess factors for the successful ultimate buildout of the county to maintain the quality of life we have today? That study needs to be done, based on road capacity, water capacity, etc. Mr. Grimm responded there are references within the policies on the land use element and the action items relating to watershed planning that would put in place follow-up studies that would, within various watersheds in the county, assess what the most limiting factor would be for development or land capacity. Ms. Randall agreed that we

need that data for our long-range strategic plan. We need the language to allow us to do the studies, and then we need to go ahead and do them fairly soon. Mr. Grimm responded that DPZ has requested funds to begin that process in this year's budget.

Mr. Anderson commented on the need for an annual review of our progress in achieving our goals, and maybe a bi-annual review analyzing our successes or failures to date and adjusting the Plan accordingly. Ms. Randall agreed that this should be a living document. Ms. Guazzo suggested a Planning Commission assessment of areas that aren't working every two years. Mr. Dexter said we should start sooner than that.

The next work session will be held on Monday, March 1", at 6:30 p.m., in the Russell Conference Room of the Carter Building. Ms. Randall stated the Commissioners now have a conflict on March 29", and cannot meet on that date.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Minutes Approved by the
Board of County Commissioners on 3/6/99
Judith A. Spalding
Judith A. Spalding, Recorder