

Chairperson Cary Johnson called the June 9, 2009, Clatsop County Planning Commission meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Planning Commissioners (PC) present: Christine Bridgens, Cary T. Johnson, and Marcia Harper-Vellutini, Brian Pogue and Clarke W. Powers. Excused: Mike Autio.

Staff present: Blair Henningsgaard, County Counsel; Ed Wegner, Director; Will Caplinger, Transportation and Development Services Manager; and Mike Weston and Jennifer Bunch, Planners, Transportation and Development Services.

Business from the Public

No one asked to speak.

Minutes

PC Pogue moved and PC Bridgens seconded the (May 12, 2009) minutes be approved. Motion approved unanimously.

Public Hearing

Request by Deborah Betron for 20-Foot Variance to 35-Foot Setback from Aquatic Vegetation Line and to Standards in Clatsop County Zoning Ordinance Section 5.610 § 2 (A and B), on Property Located in the Cullaby Lake Area

There were no conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts to report, and no one objected to the jurisdiction of the planning commission to hear the matter at this time.

Planner Mike Weston explained the variance request and described the area, including the vegetation, waterway system and setbacks. He entered into the record as exhibit 1 a letter from Ronald W. Powell, DO, and photographs of the subject property. Mr. Weston defined the criteria and goals that would apply and noted the lot is smaller than most in the subdivision, clarifying the variance was to the 50-foot setback, not the 35-foot one. A number of houses in the subdivision encroach on their lots' setbacks, he added. Mr. Weston said this variance could be construed as encroaching on the riparian zone, but he didn't find it doing so more than others in the neighborhood.

Mr. Weston said granting a variance requires proof of hardship that is not self-imposed, and he said the hardship in this case seemed more to do with the owners' health than with the property. The owners cannot use stairs, he said, and have presented written documentation from a physician to this effect. Because of this, the home must be on one level, and the property's small size contributes to the problem. Also, the additional square footage would increase the lot coverage to more than is permitted normally, so a variance is needed for this as well, he said, explaining the 1,500-square foot house would be increased in size by about 900 square feet, or about 60%. He noted a number of homes are in the 50-foot setback already.

Mr. Weston recommended approval with conditions.

1 In response to a questions from planning commissioners, Mr. Weston said he anticipated the
2 bind would be the nature of the hardship being health-related rather than land-related if the
3 decision were appealed. The hardship technically must be suffered by the property, he
4 explained, emphasizing again the small lot size contributed to the problem and adding the
5 addition would be in line with the rest of the structure and not closer to the canal.

6
7 Chairperson Johnson opened public testimony. No one from a public agency requested to
8 speak.

9
10 Applicant Deborah Betron spoke, stating her love of the area and noting her active participation
11 in the neighborhood association. Ms. Betron said she cannot use stairs and the home would be
12 unusable to her soon if she is not able to construct the addition.

13
14 In response to a question from PC Powers, Ms. Betron said she had not really considered what
15 would happen if the variance were not granted. She said she did not want to consider not living
16 there.

17
18 PC Pogue asked about a letter appearing in the packet, asking if the people who wrote it were
19 immediate neighbors. Ms. Betron said they were not. Planning commissioners noted other
20 dwellings in the immediate neighborhood were built closer to the canal already.

21
22 No other proponents wished to speak, and there were no opponents. Chairperson Johnson
23 closed public testimony.

24
25 **PC Powers moved and PC Bridgens seconded to accept the applicant's**
26 **request for a variance as recommended by staff with conditions (adopting**
27 **staff findings). Motion approved unanimously.**
28

29 **J&S Reserve Zoning Map Amendment, Text Amendment and Goal 14 Exception Request**
30 **to Rezone Approximately 121.59 acres from OPR to RA-1 (21.85 acres) RA1 to LW (47.35**
31 **acres) and OPR to LW (52.39 acres), near the River Ranch Subdivision**
32

33 There were no conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts to report, and no one objected to the
34 jurisdiction of the planning commission to hear the matter at this time.

35
36 Planner Jennifer Bunch began her presentation by entering exhibits 5, 7, 8, and 9, additional
37 public comment, the applicant's agent's response to public comment, copies of the definitions of
38 the applicable zoning, and a hard copy of the PowerPoint presentation into the record.

39
40 Using a series of PowerPoint slides, Ms. Bunch outlined the request and explained what would
41 be changed if the request were approved. She characterized the request as a land swap that
42 would rezone land with a "conservation other resources" designation more suitable for rural land
43 and rezone RA1 property to Lake and Wetlands, decreasing the rural lands RA1 zoning by 33.5
44 acres overall.

45
46 Ms. Bunch briefly reviewed the criteria to be addressed. She then addressed several issues
47 raised in the public comment received:

- 48
49
- Setbacks: The applicant has agreed to maintain the setbacks currently in place between his property and the River Ranch subdivision.
 - Access: The applicant, Mr. Karamanos, does not intend to access the site through his property within the River Ranch subdivision; instead, he intends to use a private road
- 50
51
52

1 that has an easement though his property and by which River Ranch residents access
2 the subdivision.

- 3 • Water and sewer demand: The applicant's proposal reduces to 14 the number of
4 homes that could be built on the site, reducing the demand for water and sewer.
- 5 • Duck hunting/use of firearms: The applicant is an avid duck hunter, and the current
6 zoning would permit commercial hunting activities; however, the Lake and Wetlands
7 zoning would allow only private hunting by owners and their guests.
- 8 • LNG/pipelines: The proposal doesn't include application for a pipeline and was not
9 evaluated as such.

10
11 Ms. Bunch concluded by recommending approval of the request.

12
13 Chairperson Johnson called for a stand at ease, from 19:46 a.m. to 10:58 a.m., to permit
14 planning commissioners time to read the materials just distributed.

15
16 Chairperson Johnson reconvened the hearing and asked commissioners if they had questions
17 of staff.

18
19 In response to a question from PC Bridgens, Ms. Bunch explained there had been concern
20 about the access to the remaining home sites being through the River Ranch subdivision. The
21 only time access would become an issue, she said, is if the potential subdivision is developed,
22 at which time access must be legally supplied in order to subdivide.

23
24 In response to a question from Chairperson Johnson, Ms. Bunch said Clatsop Plains is the only
25 area in the county where density transfers may be made.

26
27 In response to a question from PC Bridgens, Ms. Bunch said affirmed proposal's overall impact
28 on water and sewer service requirements would be to reduce them.

29
30 Chairperson Johnson opened public testimony, asking speakers to limit their remarks to three
31 minutes each.

32
33 Marilyn Putman, 91553 Overlook Drive, Clatskanie, spoke as president of the River Ranch
34 Homeowners Association Board of Governors, 47089 River Ranch Lane, Clatskanie. Ms.
35 Putman read from a letter she entered into the record, opposing the request. Ms. Putman said
36 the homeowners association's concerns included access and an increase in traffic. She said
37 the homeowners association was not required to provide an easement would not do so if
38 requested. She stated the Goal 14 statement was inaccurate.

39
40 Mark Barnes, P.O. Box 469, Astoria, representing the applicant, Sam Karamanos, spoke next,
41 saying the proposal reduces the number of potential home sites is reduced from about 27 to 14,
42 and Ms. Bunch had stated; however, the actual number of home sites the applicant wants is
43 four, and those four are quite a way off in the future. He thought the number of home sites
44 would be locked in via a deed restriction. Mr. Barnes said the proposal would change the
45 configuration of property's zoning to a layout more suitable with the actual circumstances of the
46 property.

47
48 Mr. Barnes noted both zones allow hunting, which is regulated by the Oregon Department of
49 Fish and Wildlife. He noted the OPR zone allows more intensive hunting. Water, he continued,
50 is available from a well on Mr. Karamanos' other property, less than a mile away, and he
51 believed the issue of sand ownership and submerged lands can be worked out with the
52 Department of State Lands. He said there was a host of LNG and pipeline issues, to which he
53 could not respond, saying neither he nor his client were officers, owners, shareholders or

1 employees of an LNG company. He said if there were anything specific that he could address
2 about an LNG issue he would do so if possible, but he noted it didn't have anything to do with
3 the criteria applicable to the proposal. He offered to answer questions and said Mr. Karamanos
4 also was present to answer questions.

5
6 Chairperson Johnson requested comments from proponents.

7
8 Bernie Bjork, 36292 Bartoldus Loop, Astoria, spoke in favor, saying the request was a zone
9 change on private property, it met criteria, and staff had recommended approval. He suggested
10 moving it forward.

11
12 As there were no other proponents, Chairperson Johnson asked for opponents.

13
14 Lori Durheim, 398 Atlantic Street, Astoria, read from a letter, entered into the record as exhibit
15 10, stating the zone change was favorable to Bradwood Landing and ignored the will of the
16 voters, who voted to exclude pipelines from OPR-zoned lands. She asked if the results of the
17 vote were meaningless.

18
19 A. Joan Daniels, 47061 River Ranch Lane, Clatskanie, stated Mr. Karamanos had approached
20 the River Ranch Homeowners Association about granting an easement. The issue was
21 discussed at a meeting of the homeowners association, which Mr. Karamanos was invited to
22 attend but did not, she reported. The homeowners association determined granting an
23 easement would increase traffic and possibly heavy equipment, creating a financial burden on
24 River Ranch members. She emphasized River Ranch's separate identity from Mr. Karamanos'
25 proposal.

26
27 Leoann Duoma, 47006 River Ranch Lane, Clatskanie, spoke in opposition, stating she had no
28 problem with the additional homes, but she was concerned about and wanted to protect the
29 road into River Ranch.

30
31 Don West, 3361 Harrison Avenue, Astoria, stated planning commissioners had "an incredible
32 opportunity to do the right thing," by combining the will of the people, demonstrated through the
33 September vote to exclude pipelines through OPR-zoned lands, and their duties here today. He
34 speculated that 99% of the people present at today's hearing knew how the property would
35 actually be used, alleging the property would be used to carry a pipeline. He said he was
36 surprised by the narrow view and said the larger picture should be examined.

37
38 George Sickles, 47034 River Ranch Lane, Clatskanie, stated he lives directly behind the RA1-
39 proposal encouraged commissioners to keep the zoning as it is.

40
41 Cheryl Johnson, 44183 Peterson Lane, Brownsmead, stated the applicant, Bradwood Landing
42 and NorthernStar wanted everyone to believe this was a relatively simple zone change. She
43 said the truth was the decision would have an impact on the river and the community far greater
44 than anything experienced before. She reviewed the ballot measure and subsequent vote on
45 issue of permitting pipelines through OPR-zoned lands and state an overwhelming majority of
46 the county's voters decided to reject pipelines. Ms. Johnson said the county could only approve
47 the zone change if it would not result in an over-intensive use of the land. She considered the
48 use to be intensive and said the planning commission has the authority to leave the land zoned
49 OPR, which she requested it do. She also requested an open and honest discussion of the
50 above issues before voting on the matter. She submitted her written statement into the record
51 as exhibit 11.

1 Carl Dominey, 3647 Duane Street, Astoria, provided testimony on the law of majority, reviewing
2 the results of the September ballot measure. The majority of the voters, he said, stated lawfully
3 and loudly a preference for keeping pipelines out.
4

5 LaRee Johnson, P.O. Box 601, Astoria, stated she was opposed to changing the zoning from
6 OPR to lands, wetlands and residential. She also reviewed the September ballot results and
7 pointed out the requirements that the proposed zone change not result in an over-intensive use
8 of the land, will encourage the most appropriate use of the land, and will not be detrimental to
9 the community. She stated an LNG pipeline is not the most appropriate use of the land and has
10 been shown to be detrimental to the populace, citing Dr. Jerry Havens' presentation about the
11 risk to population zones, environmental compromise, degradation of quality of life, reduction of
12 salmon runs, fire and life safety issues, and overbuilding. She asked where the pay-off was and
13 who was getting it.
14

15 Pamela Mattson McDonald, 687 14th Street, No. C, Astoria, stated the issue of access should
16 have been more prominent and instead the zoning was, raising in her mind the issue of a ruse
17 and causing her to question what the zoning was for really. She requested the zoning remain
18 the same.
19

20 Jocelyn Heller, 3892 Franklin Avenue, Astoria, asked how the zoning change could be
21 requested without acknowledgement of what the issue really was, saying she could not imagine
22 not grasping the real issue. She asked the zoning remain the same as it is.
23

24 Don Edwards, 47135 River Ranch Lane, Westport, stated he was concerned about the hunting
25 in the back and the possibility of up to 14 homes. He was concerned about noise, safety and
26 the white tailed deer and potential access through River Ranch.
27

28 Jan Mitchell, 362 Duane, Astoria, stated she opposes LNG pipelines in the OPR zone and
29 understood the applicant wants to protect his wetlands through a change to the more restrictive
30 LW zoning, though it appears there is no threat currently. She said it might be incidental the LW
31 zoning allows pipelines, which OPR no longer does. She thought the more restrictive LW
32 zoning would be a strange place to put a pipeline, and she asked the planning commission to
33 initiate a change that would restrict pipelines from the LW zone. She also suggested the
34 planning commissioners ask the applicant if such a change would be of concern to him. She
35 said she did not want to see the process manipulated to get around the public will, which would
36 a mockery of the democratic and planning processes.
37

38 Brett VandenHeuvel, 724 Oak Street, Hood River, representing Columbia Riverkeepers,
39 Columbia Pacific Common Sense, and Cheryl Johnson and Ted Messing, stated if the zone
40 change request had nothing to do with LNG pipelines, there were some easy solutions, such as
41 approving with a condition to not build a pipeline on the property. He agreed with Ms. Mitchell's
42 requests to ask the applicant if building a pipeline is something he would allow in the future. Mr.
43 Vandenheuvel said approval was not appropriate because no access or easement was included
44 and road construction is not permitted in the LW or OPR zones. More importantly, he said, staff
45 had indicated the LNG pipeline had not been evaluated as part of this process because it was
46 not part of the application. He said this approach was both inappropriate and illegal and is
47 called "piecemealing." He explained if a large project is broken into enough small pieces, or
48 piecemealed, its impact is lost. Mr. VandenHeuvel asserted an LNG pipeline application that
49 includes this property is pending before the county at this time, and the planning commission is
50 being asked to circumvent the will of the voters to permit the pipeline's route. He requested the
51 application be reviewed as a whole, not piecemealed. He stated the commission had the
52 authority to deny the application and asked if this truly was the highest and best use of the land,
53 or if in fact it was an over-intensive use of the land. If the planning commission approves this,
54 LNG would follow, he concluded, and there would not be a second chance to review it.

1 Donna Quinn, 1684 Franklin Avenue, Astoria, stated there is the law, and there is the spirit of
2 the law and interpretation, and the question of what the intention is. She believed there are
3 other factors at work here that have bearing, and she said there would be repercussions far
4 beyond Clatsop County. She asked the change not be made.
5

6 Jean Dominey, 3647 Duane, Astoria, requested the record on this item remain open the legal
7 number of days permitted. She said the document had errors in it and thus was flawed, and the
8 public announcement also was flawed, explaining a reference to Puget Island was in error. Her
9 third point, she said, under Applicable Criteria, had to do with Oregon Administrative Rule
10 660.00.0020(b), referring to "long-term environmental." She did not believe Goal 16 was well
11 addressed in the findings. She thought the water table and local wells would be affected, but
12 the consideration was not mentioned in the document. She stated open space doesn't have to
13 be built on to be considered "used." She concluded by saying the planning commission did not
14 have to decide on the matter today.
15

16 Peter Huhtala, 937 14th Street, Astoria, began by noting no one had denied the matter dealt
17 with LNG and by agreeing with comments by Brett VandenHeuvel and LaRee Johnson. He
18 stated the planning commission would need to determine if the zone change would be
19 detrimental to the people of Clatsop County and that the application had no urgency. He noted
20 the neighbors had objected and believed Goal 14 was not addressed adequately. He
21 commented on the long-term effects on the economy and the environment and of removing land
22 from the resource base for a pipeline and recommended denial of the request, saying the
23 planning commission did not have all the information necessary to properly evaluate the long-
24 term impacts of running an LNG pipeline through the site.
25

26 Hobe Kytr, 5253 Ash Street, Astoria, said he was astonished to see in both the staff report and
27 the applicant's submission a statement asserting that because the upper end of the Columbia
28 River Estuary is defined as the eastern end of Puget Island, the subject property did not have to
29 conform to Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources). He presented chart 18523, the official navigation
30 chart for this section of the river. Using the chart, he explained he researched the definition in
31 the OARs and found the definition states the western end of the island as the boundary. He
32 noted this was a technicality, but he wondered why this was not caught at the staff level and
33 asked what other errors were included in the document.
34

35 Vicki Baker, 3015 Harrison, Astoria, asked what it is the applicant could not do under the current
36 zoning. She asked planning commissioners to examine that question before changing the
37 zoning, saying it didn't seem to her the zoning needed to be changed for what the applicant
38 stated he wanted to do. She said though not addressed, the pipeline was an issue, and it was
39 something that would be permitted through the zone change. She asked the planning
40 commission to ask staff what would happen if a pipeline were to go through the property.
41

42 John Orr, 88824 Dawson Road, Gearhart, stated he found a common thread and flaw in the
43 process, which he thought related to the piecemeal approach taken to the project. He believed
44 an illegal decision had been made previously on a Goal 16 issue and saw the same problem
45 resurfacing, saying the Goal 16 finding in this application was infirm. The whole estuary is a
46 hydrological system, he said, and a "systems" approach was necessary. He further said Goal 5
47 is to protect natural resource and the OPR zone is to provide open space and scenic natural
48 resources and didn't believe the application was consistent with either. He also disagreed with
49 the finding the application would not increase the burdens on county public services. He
50 suggested a condition be placed on any approval that states an LNG pipeline was not a
51 contemplated use. If an LNG pipeline is an intended use, then the matter should be re-
52 submitted, he said. He concluded by commenting that it seemed very clear that the public
53 opposes the LNG pipeline, citing Goal 1, Citizen Involvement, requirements.
54

1 Josie Peper, 5334 Alder, Astoria, said her comments would be specific to zone change criteria
2 8. She said everyone present knew if the zone change went through, a pipeline would be
3 permitted through some of this property. She said the planning commission's responsibilities
4 included the health, safety and well being of Clatsop County and its citizens, and LNG and its
5 pipelines have not been shown to be safe. She said they have been identified by the federal
6 government as terrorist targets and would produce a variety of types of pollution, all
7 contradicting criteria 8. Therefore, she concluded, she requested the planning commission
8 "exercise integrity" and vote no on the zone change.
9

10 Ted Thomas, 398 Atlantic, Astoria, stated he considered the application could be considered to
11 be a subterfuge if or ruse, saying everyone had been led to believe the proposal had nothing to
12 do with LNG. Why then, he asked, had the proposal not been put forth that the potential for a
13 liquefied natural gas pipeline be specifically excluded from this application, accommodating both
14 parties? He believed the reason no one had proposed excluding a pipeline was because the
15 whole idea was to get around the recent vote excluding pipelines from OPR zoning.
16

17 Chairperson Johnson asked Mr. Barnes if he would like to rebut testimony. Mr. Barnes, noting
18 the commission had heard more than 30 minutes of testimony on a variety of topics, requested
19 that if the commission chose to grant Jean Dominey's request to keep the hearing open, he be
20 given the opportunity to rebut in writing. Mr. Barnes said rather than trying to rebut all the
21 comments today, he would prefer to respond in writing after the hearing was closed, adding he
22 would have to decline to try responding today in three minutes because he couldn't do it.
23

24 Chairperson Johnson commented the planning commission's role today was purely advisory
25 and he was inclined to finish the item today and send it on if county counsel found that a
26 reasonable option.
27

28 County Counsel Blair Henningsgaard said the commission could follow this course.
29

30 PC Bridgens asked if there were some reason the commission could not hear a more in-depth
31 rebuttal from Mr. Barnes at this time. Planning commissioners agreed to ask Mr. Barnes
32 questions, and Mr. Barnes said he would respond to a few of the topics raised in testimony.
33

34 The road access issue is resolved, he said, by taking access through the Karamanos property
35 to the south of the River Ranch subdivision and east to the larger access road. The 50-foot strip
36 that protects the lots from being required to have the larger setback also can be an area where
37 the access road is sited. He suggested requiring access taken that way, though he thought it
38 was redundant. He said it was the applicant's intent to use his own road to access the property,
39 not go through the subdivision, and he thought the 50-foot strip accommodated this.
40

41 In response to a question from PC Pogue, Mr. Barnes described the control of the private road
42 and clarified there is no intent to use any of the River Ranch homeowners' property.
43

44 PC Pogue asked if Mr. Barnes anticipated a problem with water supply. Mr. Barnes did not,
45 based on the experience of other homeowners in the area and noting the number of homes
46 being proposed (four) is pretty small, and there is no indication of problems in the area. Mr.
47 Karamanos added he has wells on his other property in the area and pumps 150 gallons per
48 minute from 100 feet down. Ms. Bunch clarified that when someone makes application for a
49 subdivision, water availability must be proven, but not for a partition.
50

51 In response to a question from PC Bridgens, Mr. Barnes said it seemed the commission was
52 supposed to consider the impact of the decision on the future of the area, and he thought the
53 application looked pretty good, given the number of homes being proposed is several times
54 smaller than what the zoning allowed.

1
2 Mr. Barnes also responded to those asking why the pipeline was not part of the application and
3 alleging the project was "piecemealed," explaining Mr. Karamanos was not building a pipeline.
4 Mr. Barnes stated neither Mr. Karamanos nor he was an agent of nor employed by a liquefied
5 natural gas firm. He said one of those testifying had said there is a pipeline application before
6 the county already, and Mr. Barnes stated even if the pipeline proposal crossed this property, it
7 was not the subject of this application and it wouldn't be appropriate for Mr. Karamanos to make
8 an application for a small section of it. Mr. Barnes added his statement assumed the speaker
9 had been correct and stated he, himself, did not have any knowledge of such an application.

10
11 Mr. Barnes said some who testified suggested the planning commission recommend rejecting
12 the application; he noted it is difficult to find people to do habitat restoration, let alone
13 enthusiastically and with support from state and federal wildlife agencies.

14
15 Addressing the typographical error in the staff report that misidentified the end of the estuary
16 and asserted Goal 16 criteria are not met, Mr. Barnes said typos are not uncommon and
17 typically are not grounds for denial.

18
19 He went on, saying his initial response to the suggestion of conditioning approval based on not
20 permitting a pipeline in Lake and Wetlands-zoned areas was, "We don't care." However, he
21 cautioned commissioners that when an application is before them, the applicant is entitled to
22 have the application evaluated under the rules in place at the time of the application.

23
24 He concluded by reiterating his request to be able to respond in writing should the commission
25 keep the hearing open.

26
27 In response to questions from PC Powers and PC Bridgens, Mr. Karamanos provided detailed
28 information about his plans for his property and the legacy he hopes to leave for his heirs. He
29 stated he has been an avid duck hunter since he was 12 years old.

30
31 Mr. Barnes noted the LW zoning is less intense than the OPR zoning and said OPR zoning
32 would permit a recreational vehicle park, for example.

33
34 Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any further comments from agencies. Ms. Putman,
35 representing the River Ranch Homeowners Association, said maintenance of the road from the
36 from the gate to tract C, which Mr. Karamanos owns and proposes to use for access, is the
37 responsibility of the homeowners association and would be impacted. She asked that the
38 financial obligation of the homeowners be considered in the final decision.

39
40 Ms. Bunch provided staff's rebuttal. She said the proposal reduces the potential number of
41 homes that could be built, which would reduce wear and tear on the road. She and Ms. Putman
42 clarified for commissioners which sections of road were the responsibility of the homeowners.
43 PC Powers noted if the application were denied and the potential 27 homes were built instead,
44 the road would still be impacted. Ms. Bunch said the impact would be higher with 27 homes.

45
46 Mr. Karamanos responded to questions from PC Pogue about who would occupy the four
47 homes identified in his proposal. He said the homes, which he did not think would be built in his
48 lifetime, would go to his trust fund, J&S Reserve, established for his blood heirs. It would only
49 be able to be sold in its entirety and only to some sort of conservation organization, he said.

50
51 Mr. Barnes thought something could be drafted that would require beneficiaries of the trust fund
52 lots to pay proportionate fees for road maintenance.

1 In response to a question from Chairperson Johnson, Ms. Bunch said she had spoken with
2 Laren Woolley, the county's DLCDC representative, about the application, and DLCDC had not
3 provided written response. She thought it safe to assume the state would have responded had
4 there been concerns about the application. She confirmed for Chairperson Johnson the
5 application met all the applicable criteria in her opinion.

6
7 PC Pogue commented the proposal seemed to reduce impact and had staff's support.

8
9 Chairperson Johnson said the proposal seemed to fit the criteria the planning commission was
10 required to use to evaluate it. He emphasized there was not way to tell what might come in the
11 future, and the commission's role was advisory.

12
13 In response to a question from Chairperson Johnson, Mr. Henningsgaard said the planning
14 commission could close the record.

15
16 PC Pogue agreed the commission could look only at the very specific nature of the application.
17 PC Powers agreed with PC Pogue and commented commissioners could only consider what
18 was in the document. He stated he appreciated the public testimony about LNG, but the
19 application and testimony by the applicant didn't include anything about a pipeline.

20
21 Chairperson Johnson closed public testimony and, hearing no procedural motions, requested a
22 motion.

23
24 **PC Bridgens moved and PC Harper-Vellutini seconded to adopt the**
25 **findings of fact of the staff report and recommend approval of the zoning**
26 **map amendment detailed in Exhibit 6, Goal 14 exception, and text**
27 **amendment and recommend this to the Clatsop County Board of**
28 **Commissioners. Motion approved unanimously via roll call vote, with**
29 **Bridgens, Johnson, Harper-Vellutini, Pogue and Powers voting yes and**
30 **none opposed.**

31
32 Chairperson Johnson recessed meeting momentarily at 12:25 p.m., then reconvened and asked
33 if there were any other business before the planning commission. Hearing none, he asked for a
34 motion to adjourn.

35
36 **PC Pogue moved and PC Powers seconded to adjourn. Motion approved**
37 **unanimously.**

38
39 **Adjournment**

40
41 Chairperson Johnson adjourned the meeting at 12:26 p.m.

42
43 Respectfully submitted,

44
45 **SIGNED ORIGINAL ON FILE**

46
47 _____
48 Cary T. Johnson
49 Chairperson, Planning Commission
50
51