

1 **SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2020**
2 **COUNTYWIDE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #10**
3 **ELECTRONIC MEETING**
4

5 **The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Andy Davis, CCAC Chair.**
6

<u>CCAC Members Present</u>	<u>CCAC Commissioners Absent</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Public Present</u>
Jim Alegria	Andrea Mazarella	Gail Henrikson	Chris Farrar
Andrew Davis		Dean Keranen	Doug Thompson
Patrick Corcoran		Monica Steele	Nancy Ferber
Cheryl Johnson		Ted Mclean	Comm. Pamela Wev
Robert Stricklin			Suzette (no last name)
Tod Lundy			
Harold Gable			
Jan Mitchell			

7 **Welcome and Introductions**

8 The CCAC members, staff and members of the public introduced themselves.
9

10 **Review of Meeting Summaries:**

11 There were no corrections, additions or deletions to either the July 16, 2020, or the August 20, 2020, meeting
12 summaries.
13

14 **CAC Liaison Reports:**

15 Mr. Davis asked Ms. Henrikson if she would provide summaries for the CAC representatives that were not in
16 attendance at today's meeting.
17

18 **Clatsop Plains (CPCAC):** Mr. Stricklin provided an overview of the discussion that had occurred at the CPCAC
19 meeting regarding the correct name to use for people of the Chinook Indian Nation. He stated that the preferred
20 nomenclature is "Clatsop Chinook". Mr. Stricklin also stated that no progress had been made by the CPCAC in
21 reviewing the county-owned wetland parcels.
22

23 **Lewis & Clark Olney Wallooskee (LCOWCAC):** Ms. Henrikson stated that the last LCOWCAC meeting had
24 been held on July 27. She stated that there was significant discussion about why the county utilized the National
25 Wetlands Inventory and the Statewide Wetlands Inventory if the only way to truly identify the wetlands boundary
26 was through a delineation.
27

28 **Northeast (NECAC):** Ms. Johnson stated that committee members had voted to retain Historic Resources
29 Policies 4 and 6 and had supported the language proposed by the Clatsop Nation regarding historic and cultural
30 resources. She added that the NECAC committee had also supported further research on Bradwood, Clifton, and
31 the Svensen Cemetery for possible includes on the Goal 5 Historic Resources Inventory. Ms. Johnson noted that
32 the comprehensive plan did not contain any references to either Scandinavian or Chinese culture. Ms. Johnson
33 also expressed concerns about adding six months to the update process in order to break Goal 5 into smaller
34 pieces.
35

36 **Southwest Coastal (SWCCAC):** Tod Lundy stated that the SWCCAC had met on September 9 and had prepared
37 the following list of recommendations:

38 **Historic Resource Policies**

- 39
- 40 • Policy 1: retain and re-word to refer to the existing master plan for Ecola State Park
 - 41 • Policy 2: delete. Policy 3: retain
 - 42 • Policy 4: retain.
 - 43 • Policy 5: delete
 - Policy 6: broaden to include all inventoried resources rather than a select few.

- Policy 7: re-word to “Clatsop County will work with the Clatsop County Historical Society and the State Historic Preservation Office to evaluate the historical significance of sites and buildings. The Goal 5 Administrative Rule evaluation process will also be applied at that time. The County will take appropriate action to protect any sites that are placed on the State of Oregon Inventory of Historic Sites and Buildings.”

Cultural Resources Policies

- Policy 1: use language recommended by Clatsop Plains CAC but evaluate whether more inclusive language should be used when referring to Native American groups.
- Policy 2: retain and evaluate whether more inclusive language should be used when referring to Native American groups.

Elsie-Jewell / Seaside Rural (EJSRCAC): Ms. Henrikson stated that the EJSRCAC would be meeting at 5PM, immediately following the Countywide CAC meeting.

Resiliency Project Presentation:

Monica Steele, Assistant County Manager, addressed the committee. She presented information regarding the proposed Resiliency Project which was focused on relocating the County’s Public Works facility outside of the tsunami inundation zone and creating alternate emergency routes. Ms. Steele provided details about specific sites, possible development timeframes, and budget.

Mr. Stricklin asked who drafted the questions on the questionnaire. Ms. Steele identified the staff members who are part of the resiliency project team.

Ms. Mitchell stated that it’s not a matter of “if” the county experiences a Cascadia event, but “when”. She discussed her experience working on a bypass around Astoria. She stated that alternate routes are needed.

Mr. Lundy asked whether the questionnaire was mailed to every resident or every residence in the county. He also asked what percentage of the questionnaires was returned. Ms. Steele stated that it was mailed to every resident, but that some had been returned. She urged people who had not received the questionnaire to contact the county. She stated that the return rate on the questionnaires that the county had received approximately 1,000 returned documents.

Mr. Corcoran stated that with regard to resiliency it was important to focus on immediate response and recovery. He discussed that a majority of land on the Oregon coast that is in the tsunami inundation zone is in Clatsop County. He stated that many of these issues, although relevant to the work of the Countywide CAC, could be addressed during the review of Goal 7. He added that it was important to keep development out of the most vulnerable places.

Mr. Davis asked if any members of the public had any questions. No members of the public spoke.

Mr. Davis asked about the source of funding for the proposed resiliency project. He stated that it appeared that capital improvement funds had been set aside for this work. Ms. Steele confirmed that funds had been set aside for both the purchase of property and the construction of facilities. She added that additional funds would be acquired through the sale of the current public works facility. She stated that all that is being considered at this time is the acquisition of property. She stated that the county does not want to go out for a bond for this project.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification about the due diligence period for the purchase of the sort yard. Ms. Steele stated that the six-month due diligence period began on July 30, 2020, with the option for two 90-day extensions. She added that the due diligence period for the mainline is 20 months. Ms. Steele and Mr. Davis continued to discuss the due diligence process. She stated that a Phase 2 environmental assessment would need to be conducted and that the county would need to apply for a Goal 4 exception. Other studies would include a traffic impact analysis and a geological hazard review.

1 Mr. Alegria asked about the process used to identify potential sites. Ms. Steele stated that staff had reviewed
2 different potential sites. She stated that the county-owned property in the North Coast Business Park had been
3 studied and eliminated from the list for a number of reasons, including the county’s stated intent to return that
4 property back to the tax roll and the significant expense that would be incurred to mitigate wetlands. She added
5 that the county had also looked at purchasing the Crown Camp property as a possible emergency staging area, but
6 that property had also been eliminated due to accessibility. Ms. Steele discussed other factors that were used to
7 identify potential sites. Mr. Alegria stated that it sounded as though the county was only looking at pre-
8 determined sites instead of first taking a broad-brush view.
9

10 **Public Comment and Input:**

11 None.

12
13 **Review of Goal 5 Polices – Historic and Cultural Resources:**

14 Ms. Henrikson provided an overview of the Goal 5 historic and cultural resources inventory and policies. She
15 discussed the three tasks that staff was requesting the committee complete. She reviewed the inventory of
16 existing historic resources that had been compiled from existing national and state lists. She requested that the
17 committee identify sites from this list that committee believed might be worthy of additional research and
18 possible inclusion in the county’s Goal 5 historic resource inventory. Ms. Henrikson continued to review the
19 process that would be required if it was determined that a site should be added to the inventory.
20

21 Mr. Davis asked where the definition of “cultural” resources in the comprehensive plan came from. Ms.
22 Henrikson stated that she did not know the source of that definition. Mr. Davis and Ms. Henrikson continued to
23 discuss the state’s requirements regarding resource inventories and whether the current definition in the
24 comprehensive plan should be retained. Ms. Henrikson stated that there would be value in retaining that
25 definition. Mr. Alegria suggested reviewing other jurisdictions plans to determine whether they had a definition of
26 cultural resources.
27

28 Mr. Davis stated that as a former archaeologist, he did not agree with the concept that cultural resources only
29 pertained to Native American villages and activity centers. He asked staff if they would look for a definition from
30 other state materials or elsewhere in ORS. Ms. Henrikson stated that staff would be able to do that. **[FOLLOW-
31 UP: Per information on the [National Preservation Institute](#) website, the term “cultural resource” is not
32 defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or any other Federal law. The [National Park
33 Service](#) defines “cultural resources” as “physical evidence or place of past human activity: site, object,
34 landscape, structure; or a site, structure, landscape, object or natural feature of significance to a group of
35 people traditionally associated with it.”]**
36

37 Mr. Davis asked whether owners of properties with archaeological sites were also allowed to opt out of
38 designation as were owners of historic structures. Ms. Henrikson stated that she would verify that. **[FOLLOW-
39 UP: Including an archaeological site in the county’s Goal 5 cultural resource inventory would follow the
40 same procedure outlined in ORS 660-023 for including historic sites. This would include the owner opt-out
41 provision.]**
42

43 Ms. Mitchell stated that she was thinking about other cultural groups. She stated that she liked the idea of
44 recognizing the contributions of the Scandinavians and the Chinese, but added that much of that recognition was
45 happening in the cities. She stated that she would like to at least see it addressed in the county’s comprehensive
46 plan narrative.
47

48 Mr. Corcoran stated that he was struck by the lack of Native American cultural resources in any of the lists. He
49 stated that those areas would be more likely to be found in unincorporated areas.
50

51 Mr. Davis asked for clarification about the action items to be completed by the committee. Ms. Henrikson offered
52 options to the committee about how they could proceed with the first task. She explained how the inventories
53 were displayed and identified certain listed resources that did not have sufficient information to warrant further
54 research.

1
2 Mr. Stricklin stated that he was fascinated about the concept of cultural in Clatsop County. asked whether the
3 Scandinavian Festival was a racist event. He stated that the county should not gloss over the bad cultural history,
4 but should include reflections of attitudes. He discussed previous prejudice against Catholics in Clatsop County.
5

6 Ms. Mitchell asked staff whether it would be possible to include narrative in the comprehensive plan regarding
7 the county's history. She particularly emphasized including previous exclusionary and segregation practices
8 within the county. She stated that at one time, Astoria was a "sunset town". She added that it would make more
9 interesting reading if the narrative included both native peoples and how they were impacted by the waves of
10 immigrants that came in. She stated that policies would not be needed for that narrative.
11

12 Mr. Corcoran stated that the perhaps the comprehensive plan could be winnowed a bit by focusing more on
13 narrowly-identified specific places rather than identifying broad geographic areas such as Youngs Bay as a
14 cultural resource unless there was some way to document that.
15

16 Mr. Alegria stated that the inventories provided by staff include a lot of duplication and that many of the sites do
17 not have enough information available for anyone to really make a fair assessment of its historical significance.
18 He stated that he would like to see the county become a certified local government. He said that doing so would
19 allow the county to make a distinction between what is important at a county level versus a state or federal level.
20 He stated that going through each individual site listed on the inventory might be a bigger task than the committee
21 could possibly complete.
22

23 Mr. Alegria encouraged participation by the Lower Columbia Preservation Society and the Clatsop County
24 Historical Society. He also noted the need for the citizenry to become involved in the process of adding or
25 deleting historic resources to the inventory. He advocated for a longer-term approach.
26

27 Ms. Henrikson reminded the committee that the work of the committee tonight was not to edit the National
28 Register and state inventories. Instead the committee was tasked with identifying known sites that might be
29 significant enough to be included in Goal 5. She stated that staff only wanted the committee to identify those sites
30 for which they would like staff to conduct further research.
31

32 Mr. Davis asked how much of a burden it would be to research each site. Ms. Henrikson stated that any research
33 would not be completed within a month. She cited an example from the list and explained that because of the
34 location of information about even the basic location of that structure, staff would not be able to complete any
35 research for it.
36

37 Mr. Corcoran stated that the western culture in the county was fairly well documented. He stated that there were
38 opportunities to incorporate more Native culture, not just archaeological sites, but cultural things. He added that
39 that might be a category for further research. He also stated that recent culture should also be considered.
40

41 Ms. Johnson reminded the committee members that their directive was to focus on land use issues. She stated that
42 the Northeast CAC had reviewed the sites listed in the inventory and had recommended three additional sites for
43 further research. She discussed the additional six months that had been added to the process in order to break Goal
44 5 into smaller pieces and stated that at this rate, the burden may be too much in terms of a time commitment for
45 people to make. Ms. Henrikson discussed why and how historic and cultural resources related to land use.
46

47 Mr. Stricklin stated that the county has so much history. He discussed the number of forgotten places and history
48 in the county. He stated that he didn't think a slick, trimmed-down comprehensive plan best serves the future
49 generations of the county. He stated that he would be happy if the process outlived everyone in the meeting today.
50 He stated that it would be dumb and moronic not to look at the vast historical accounts accumulated over the past
51 200 years.
52

1 Mr. Davis discussed the Lane County Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the document is 89 pages in length, but
2 there is a 60-page appendix detailing historic sites. He stated that the process still needed to be followed, even if
3 all the background documentation was adopted as part of the comprehensive plan.
4

5 Mr. Alegria stated that it would be unwise to include specific historic sites within the comprehensive plan. He
6 stated that the committee should be focused on preparing general policies and the referring to another document
7 that could be updated over time so that the county would not have to wait another 40 years to update the
8 inventory.
9

10 Ms. Henrikson stated that the county did not need to wait 40 years to update the comprehensive plan, it had just
11 chosen to do so. She stated that the comprehensive plan could be updated at any time. She reminded the
12 committee members that their only task, with regard to the inventories, was to identify any site that might be
13 worthy of additional research to determine if those sites should be included in the county's Goal 5 historic
14 resources list.
15

16 Ms. Johnson reiterated the process that the Northeast CAC had used and stated that the committee had identified
17 three additional sites for further research.
18

19 Mr. Lundy stated that the Southwest Coastal CAC had identified four additional sites for further research. Those
20 sites are:

- 21 • Arch Cape Tunnel
 - 22 • Wagon trail that was blasted in around Hug Point
 - 23 • Hug Point
 - 24 • Geological sites around Hug Point
- 25

26 Commissioner Wev referenced the historic preservation workshop that had taken place prior to the pandemic
27 lockdown. She stated that she was accustomed to local comprehensive plans acknowledging National Register
28 and state register sites, but added that the county does not really have any control over those designations. She
29 stated that control at the local level is where historic resources can be best protected. She stated that the issue
30 should be what places are missing from the list that should be incorporated into the comprehensive plan. She
31 reminded the committee members that in Oregon, the comprehensive plan rules. If the county references the
32 other inventories in its plan, those places would then be protected.
33

34 **Motion by Jan Mitchell, seconded by Jim Alegria, to incorporate the inventory of National Register of**
35 **Historic Places, state inventoried sites, archaeological sites and historic cemeteries into the comprehensive**
36 **plan by reference. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.**
37

38 Mr. Lundy stated that the motion did not leave room for the addition of sites in the future. He suggested that the
39 committee should include language in the motion that also referenced sites to be included by the county in the
40 future. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Lundy if he was making an amendment to the motion, which Mr. Lundy confirmed.
41 Mr. Alegria stated that the amendment should allow both amendments and deletions in the future. Mr. Lundy
42 accepted Mr. Alegria's amendment.
43

44 Mr. Davis asked if there was any objection to adding language that would allow the inventories to amended
45 through the addition or deletion of sites. Ms. Henrikson stated that the committee could not amend the list of sites
46 on the National Register of Historic Places or the state inventory of historic sites. Mr. Davis clarified that he was
47 referring to the county's Goal 5 inventory, which included all of the sites listed.
48

49 Mr. Alegria suggested that the county propose changes to the state historic site inventory to the state. He stated
50 that he assumed the state would take the county's wishes seriously and that the county would have some input as
51 to whether something was added to or deleted from the state list.
52

53 Mr. Davis reminded the committee that there was still a motion and an amendment on the floor. He stated that the
54 committee needed to address the amendment first. Ms. Henrikson stated that she did not believe that the motion

1 needed to be amended to state that the comprehensive plan could be amended. She stated that the plan can be
2 amended at any time, subject to Board of Commissioner approval.

3
4 Ms. Mitchell stated that she was on the State Heritage Commission for eight years. She stated that her experience
5 with SHPO and the cemeteries organization is that they were open to working with local jurisdictions. She
6 suggested keeping the original motion as presented. Mr. Corcoran agreed with Ms. Mitchell.

7
8 Mr. Lundy asked to withdraw his amendment. Mr. Davis stated that it had not had a second and had therefore
9 died. The motion was passed unanimously.

10
11 Ms. Johnson asked whether becoming a certified local government would be a pathway for Clatsop County to be
12 able to add items to the inventory in the future. Mr. Davis noted that there was a proposed recommendation to the
13 effect on the following worksheet.

14
15 Mr. Alegria asked if there was any way to include additional considerations that would be general in nature and
16 that could be tailored for specific tiers of resources. Ms. Henrikson stated that those types of details could be
17 incorporated into the new policies that the committee would recommend.

18
19 Mr. Davis asked whether the committee should go through the worksheet policy-by-policy. Ms. Henrikson stated
20 that the Elsie-Jewell CAC would be meeting at 5PM and she would need to end this meeting in approximately 40
21 minutes.

22
23 Mr. Davis read Historic Resources Policy #1 and noted that there was a motion from the Clatsop Plains CAC. He
24 asked of the Countywide CAC members would like to make a motion. Mr. Alegria asked whether the state
25 already needed to acknowledge historical activities that had occurred. Mr. Davis asked Ms. Henrikson if she
26 knew the answer to Mr. Alegria's question. Ms. Henrikson stated that she did not know. Mr. Alegria stated that
27 he was asking because if it is already required at the state level there is no need to include that same requirement
28 in the county's comprehensive plan.

29
30 Mr. Davis asked if the committee members wanted to revise the policy to address updates to the master plan. He
31 asked if this could be done as a scrivener's error correction. Ms. Henrikson stated that it could just be included in
32 the overall update. **The committee agreed to the revised language.**

33
34 Mr. Davis asked the committee members if they were in favor of retaining the policy as amended. Ms. Mitchell
35 asked if the policy should only address Ecola State Park or if it should cover Fort Stevens as well. The committee
36 continued to discuss whether the policy should be revised to include more specific parks.

37
38 Commissioner Wev suggested drafting a broader policy that would state that the county wants to work with
39 federal and state parks to recognize the past cultural use of park properties by native peoples. She added that
40 because the parks are different from each other and in different locations, a more general policy might be
41 appropriate. She concluded that a general policy would still emphasize the county's desire to work with state,
42 federal and tribal leaders to properly recognize the existing of native history and culture on park lands.

43
44 Ms. Mitchell stated that the policy was important as it would allow future commissions to be more proactive in
45 obtaining state cooperation. She stated that she had prepared some language stating that **"Clatsop County shall
46 work cooperatively with cities, state and federal agencies, and organizations such as the Clatsop County
47 Historical Society to protect and enhance Chinook and Clatsop Nehalem Confederated Tribes sites within
48 the county."** She added that such a policy would allow county staff to bring issues of concern to the commission.

49
50 Mr. Stricklin asked whether Ms. Mitchell could alter her Clatsop Nehalem phraseology. Ms. Mitchell stated that
51 she would use the terms "Chinook Nation" and "Clatsop Nehalem Confederated Tribes". She added the two are
52 not one group, do not see themselves as one group, and were not one group even when Lewis and Clark were
53 here.

1 Mr. Davis asked for clarification as to what the committee members wanted to do with Policy 1. Ms. Mitchell
2 stated that she wanted to emphasize that the topic covered in Policy 1 was an issue for more than just one site and
3 that there is likely to be more than one agency involved. She recommended a broader policy that would include
4 all the state sites and the agencies and groups that would be involved.
5

6 Ms. Johnson asked to hear Ms. Mitchell's proposed policy language again. She stated she supported the revisions
7 proposed by the Clatsop Plains CAC. She added that not only did the Chinook Nation need to be identified in the
8 plan, but also the Nehalem tribes. Ms. Mitchell reread the proposed policy. Mr. Davis asked if Ms. Mitchell was
9 recommending that Policy 1 be replaced by this language. Ms. Mitchell confirmed that that was her intent.

10 **Motion by Jan Mitchell, seconded by Cheryl Johnson, to replace existing Historic Resources Policy #1 with**
11 **the revised language prepared by Ms. Mitchell.**
12

13 Mr. Davis asked if there was any discussion. Mr. Stricklin stated that he wished the committee had input from the
14 sovereign Chinook Indian Nation and the Clatsop Nehalem Confederated Tribes. **Ms. Johnson stated that she**
15 **wanted to amend the motion to change "protect and enhance" to "protect and recognize". The amendment**
16 **was seconded by Ms. Mitchell.**
17

18 **Mr. Corcoran stated that he would amend the amendment to change "protect and recognize" to "recognize**
19 **and protect". Ms. Mitchell seconded this amendment. Motion passed unanimously.**
20

21 **The motion to replace the word "enhance" with "recognize" passed unanimously.**
22

23 Mr. Alegria expressed his concern that the phrase "shall work" was too strong. He stated that it would make it
24 requirement for the county to work with other agencies, but there was no requirement that those agencies work
25 with the county. He questioned whether the current phrase would create legal issues for the county. **Mr.**
26 **Corcoran suggested the wording be changed to "shall seek to work cooperatively..." Motion was seconded**
27 **by Mr. Alegria. Motion passed unanimously.**
28

29 The committee and the public continued to discuss tribal nomenclature.
30

31 **The motion to replace Historic Resources Policy #1 with the proposed amended language passed 7-0, with**
32 **Mr. Stricklin abstaining due to lack of recent knowledge regarding the legal status of the tribes.**
33

34 Mr. Davis read Historic Resources Policy #2 and stated that staff is recommending that the policy be deleted as it
35 had been completed. **Motion by Mr. Corcoran, seconded by Mr. Lundy, to delete Historic Resources Policy**
36 **#2. Motion passed unanimously.**
37

38 The committee members began discussing Historic Resources Policy #3. Mr. Davis asked if any committee
39 member wanted to amend, change or delete this policy. **Mr. Stricklin recommended removing the wording "to**
40 **the extent funding permits,". Motion died for lack of a second. Mr. Davis asked if there was any opposition**
41 **to retaining Historic Resources Policy #3. No committee members objected.**
42

43 The committee began discussion of Historic Resources Policy #4. Ms. Johnson stated that the NECAC had
44 recommended the commemorative plaques should be placed at those sites, particularly at the Shepherd and Morse
45 sawmill, which was located in Westport. She added that if the committee felt that it was appropriate to keep these
46 types of site-specific policies in the comprehensive plan, she would recommend that the policy be retained.
47

48 Mr. Stricklin discussed the importance of the Falls Pulp Mill site to the Chinook Indian Nation and that they
49 would likely be involved in drafting the language for the plaque. Mr. Davis asked if Mr. Stricklin would like to
50 insert language to that effect in the policy. Mr. Stricklin stated that someone else should wordsmith the language.
51 The committee decided to not draft the language at this meeting.
52

53 Mr. Corcoran discussed Mr. Stricklin's previous motion to remove the phrase "to the extent funding permits,"
54 from Historic Resources Policy #3. He stated that the phrase could apply to almost every policy in the

1 comprehensive plan. He asked for guidance about whether that caveat needed to be included in every policy and
2 how that might make a difference between “shall” or “may”. He stated that it did not need to be addressed this
3 evening, but it should be at some point, as it has budgetary implications.
4

5 Ms. Henrikson provided additional background information regarding the Lindgren Cabin to clarify why the
6 phrase might have been included with that specific policy. Mr. Davis requested that the committee return to
7 Historic Resources Policy #4 at a different time.
8

9 The committee discussed Historic Resources Policy #5. **Motion by Mr. Alegria, seconded by Ms. Johnson, to
10 delete Historic Resources Policy #5. Motion passed unanimously.** Mr. Alegria discussed his concern that this
11 policy provided more protection to the Clatsop Plains cemetery than to other historic cemeteries in the county. He
12 asked why that was. Mr. Stricklin stated that it was an obvious choice due to its highly visible location on
13 Highway 101. Mr. Davis suggested that if the committee wanted to protect all historic cemeteries in the county,
14 they might want to change Historic Resources Policy #5 or create a new policy. He recommended that if that was
15 the committee’s desire, they should do so at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Davis asked Ms. Henrikson to add historic
16 cemeteries to the new policies worksheet so the committee would remember to return to it at a future date.
17

18 **Public Comment and Input:**

19 Doug Thompson, Lower Columbia Preservation Society, addressed the committee. He stated that LCPS has some
20 comments to share with the committee, but in the interest of time, he would save those for the next meeting.
21

22 **Closing Comments and Adjournment:**

23 Ms. Henrikson stated that the Elsie-Jewell / Seaside Rural CAC members had moved their meeting date and time
24 to 5:00 p.m., immediately following the Countywide CAC. She asked if the committee could adjust their meeting
25 time by 15-30 minutes so staff would have time between meetings to prepare. The committee members agreed to
26 move their meeting time to 1:00 p.m.
27

28 *There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:48pm.*
29
30