

**MARIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING MINUTES**  
**August 30, 2004**  
**Marin County Civic Center, Room #328 - San Rafael, California**

*Commissioners Present:* Allan Berland, Chairman  
Steve Thompson, Vice Chairman  
Hank Barner  
Don Dickenson  
Randy Greenberg  
Wade Holland  
Jo Julin

*Commissioners Absent:*

*Staff Present:* Alex Hinds, Director, Community Development Agency  
Michele Rodriguez, Principal Planner  
Dan Dawson, Senior Planner  
Jessica Woods, Recording Secretary

*Minutes Approved on:* **September 27, 2004**

Convened at 11:30 a.m. (Workshop in CDA Planning Division conference room)

Adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Reconvened at 1:20 p.m. (Countywide Plan Meeting in Planning Commission Chambers)

Readjourned at 6:15 p.m.

1. WORKSHOP: Planning Commission luncheon workshop on meeting procedures and protocol.

Director Hinds began the workshop by explaining the government code provisions for Planning Commission responsibilities as well as the roles and responsibilities of the Director and staff.

Staff explained that the draft Countywide Plan update (draft CWP) was largely a product of input received from the working groups, the Board of Supervisors approved work plan, and the trends and issues report. The three working groups represented the major constituencies involved in land use matters. The Planning Commission has the opportunity to recommend changes to the draft CWP by adding or making changes to policies and programs. The Board of Supervisors are the final deciding body on the Plan.

Staff pointed out that many, but not all of the recommendations in the Community Marin document were included in the draft CWP, and that other sources of information, such as position papers from the League of Women Voters, were also considered in preparing the draft CWP. The first Community Marin document was developed in response to a suggestion from the former Community Development Director. Commissioner Dickenson pointed out that many of the recommendations contained in Community Marin have become more mainstream ideas in land use planning since the document was initially released, and therefore are more likely to become commonly accepted in planning regulations.

Staff discussed the process for developing the buildout projections in the draft CWP by explaining that for the most part the existing land use designations were used. However, density on environmentally-sensitive lands has been reduced and recycled for employee and affordable housing on other infill properties well-suited to mixed use, transit oriented development. Criteria for allocating these units will be developed with the possibility of a housing overlay district or designation. In response to a question from Commissioner Berland about a projected 50% increase in the existing number of dwelling units in West Marin, staff indicated that the draft CWP projections actually reduces the number of units in West Marin from what was projected in the current 1994 CWP. Commissioner Berland pointed out that although the projected buildout is reduced as compared to the 1994 CWP, the draft CWP still reflects an increase in existing development. Commissioner Berland questioned whether the 1800 "floating units" were an apparition in terms of the reality or feasibility of actual future development. Staff reiterated the need to have carefully crafted criteria that will facilitate the strategic location of affordable and employee housing and to develop specific plans to ensure that the floating units are located and designed in an appropriate manner.

Allan Scotch stated that he has no complaints about public outreach associated with the draft CWP updated process, although he has been a lone voice.

With respect to the issue of how much weight different constituencies have been given in the update process, Commissioner Holland commented that the environmental groups have been well organized and diligent about attending the hearings, as compared with other groups that have not submitted written comments or attended as many meetings. Staff pointed out that the Economic Commission also had a direct hand in drafting a section of the draft CWP.

Commissioner Berland stated that the overarching theme of the draft CWP, as directed by the Board of Supervisors, is sustainability and that concept includes not only the environment but also a balance of the economy and equity.

David Coury expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to provide input to the draft CWP update process, but some interest groups, namely those associated with affordable and special needs housing, don't have enough access to the process. He suggested that the County could be more receptive to these groups. Josie Sanchez voiced similar concerns about the lack of representation in the draft CWP for disadvantaged groups, but she said she just recently became involved and wasn't familiar with the history.

Commissioner Barner commented that the Planning Commission does not receive input from chambers of commerce, other than San Rafael's. Some groups may be well organized, but do not take part in the process. Commissioner Greenberg stated that staff and working group committees did seek input from the business

community in preparing the draft CWP. Staff pointed out that they did send letters to various homeowners associations and groups and have as a result made quite a few presentations on the draft plan.

Staff pointed out that updating the CWP is a sequential process: the Planning Commission has the opportunity to review and recommend changes to the document, and then staff will first and foremost advance the Commission's recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Board, however, would like to have a very transparent review process that should be also inclusive of staff recommendations as well as input from the public.

Commissioner Julin cautioned against categorizing individuals or groups (e.g., environmentalists versus housing advocates) since it tends to create separateness and is antithetical to the goal of creating a community vision. Commissioner Berland commented that interest groups can be aggressive in their lobbying and the Commission needs to consider all interests in making their recommendations.

Chairman Berland raised a question about the applicability of the 868 floating units at St. Vincents/Silvera and the apparent resistance from staff to consider allocating units for this property. Staff responded that they are not proposing the banked units for St. Vincents/Silvera given its agricultural land use designation. However, the Planning Commission will make their own recommendation to the Board on this and other issues.

Commissioner Berland expressed concern about the manner in which policy positions were being advocated late into the meetings when the quality of deliberations may not be up to the task and those issues which were not in the draft Countywide Plan or proposed by the Planning Commission (the no net increase in total water use policy discussion was given as an example). He suggested that key decisions should not be made at the end of the meetings and only after careful consideration, with staff reports presented with at least a week before the issue is considered by the Commission. Commissioner Greenberg commented on the challenges of making decisions late in the evening, but also appreciates the need to stay on schedule.

Staff concurred with the need to distribute staff reports to the Planning Commission in a timely manner; however, late submittals from the public and staff responses are difficult to avoid. Chairman Berland suggested setting a deadline for submittal of information from the public as well as from staff prior to a hearing, and staff responded that this issue was currently being considered although it may be difficult to prevent the submittal of information. Staff also suggested that if late submittals contribute to a key decision, the Commission should consider allowing staff to review and respond prior to taking action.

Chairman Berland expressed his concern about the appearance of a conflict of interest or at least the sense of fairness in the Planning Commission's hearing process being called into question as a result of individual Planning Commissioners affiliation with interest groups that are advocating formal positions on policy matters before the entire Commission. Commissioner Dickenson responded that his affiliations were well known at the time the Board of Supervisors appointed him to the Commission. He then pointed out that his votes on development projects have not always reflected the position taken by the Marin Conservation League. Commissioner Barner commented that it can be difficult to know the specific source of positions set out in written correspondence from interest groups (board of directors, executive committee, etc.).

Commissioner Greenberg stated that she represents the public interest at large and not the Marin Conservation League, although she may at times agree with their positions. She does not, however, feel bound to follow their recommendations. Commissioner Berland responded that his main concern is the potential vulnerability from a legal standpoint to allegations of unfairness. Staff concluded by indicating they would consult with County Counsel and perhaps outside counsel. However, since the draft CWP is a legislative action, there is not a legal concern with previously stating one's position on individual topics included in the plan. It is nonetheless always a good idea for commissioners to state for the record their independence and that they acted on the basis of the evidence in the record.

2. ROUTINE TRANSACTIONS:

- a. *M/s, Holland/Barner, and passed unanimously of those present, to incorporate the staff reports into the Minutes. Motion passed 6/0 (Commissioner Julin absent).*
- b. Continuances: None
- c. Minutes: April 16, 2004, July 12, 2004 and July 19, 2004 – Continued

August 9, 2004

*M/s, Barner/Thompson, to approve the August 9, 2004 Minutes as amended. Motion passed 6/0 (Commissioner Holland abstained).*

3. COMMUNICATIONS - The Commission acknowledged several pieces of correspondence for their review.

4. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION (LIMITED TO THREE MINUTES PER SPEAKER) - None

Commissioner Barner asked staff to comment on Mr. Stark's letter in regard to the sphere of influence. Alex Hinds, Agency Director, responded that it is up to LAFCO to determine the location of the sphere of influence.

## 5. DRAFT MARIN COUNTYWIDE PLAN

Public hearing on the Draft Countywide Plan (review of initial recommendations to be included in the project description for analysis in the environmental impact report for the draft Countywide Plan update.)

Agency Director Hinds summarized the staff report and recommended that the Commission review the initial recommendations to be included in the project description for analysis in the environmental impact report for the draft Countywide Plan update.

Chairman Berland asked staff when the strike out version would be presented to the Commission for their review. Agency Director Hinds responded that it would be provided with the EIR, which would likely be in March 2005.

Commissioner Dickenson noted that he talked with Bob Berman the Environmental Consultant for the EIR and he indicated that all work has stopped on the draft EIR until after the meeting of September 28<sup>th</sup> with the Board. Agency Director Hinds responded in the affirmative.

The hearing was open to the public.

Hank Levin, Santa Venetia resident, submitted a letter to staff and the Commission for their consideration, which he read into the record that suggested a Stewardship Program for Gallinas Creek.

Commissioner Julin recommended that Mr. Levin work with the Open Space District in regard to the Stewardship Program. Mr. Levin agreed.

Commissioner Julin believed there is a lot of misunderstanding in regard to the revised Countywide Plan that is different from the rules in existence to date.

Commissioner Dickenson believed the rules and regulations should be consistently designed. Commissioner Julin believed the regulations should be clarified as soon as possible. Agency Director Hinds responded that staff would be responding to the Santa Venetia residents. Staff stated that the EIR should address the three options for the proposed Baylands Corridor boundary and small, developed lots with little habitat value should not be subject to as rigid environmental policy requirements as larger or undeveloped lots. Staff further noted that it was not determined to what extent small, undeveloped parcels within the Bayfront Conservation Zone should be removed from the proposed Baylands Corridor.

Leslie Solmes Grunau, Strawberry resident, objected to the designation of Richardson Bay and it did not appear to have any real criteria or baseline for which this Plan would restore that troubled environment and how would it relate to an already existing built environment. She believed the process is reverse and felt the entire Plan should be the result of the environmental impact statement. She also added that to approve or add any further staff editing before specific data, goals and criteria are established for implementing those goals would be a wasted effort. She further desired to know the problems and the specific solutions in order to address the concerns.

Dave Coury, representing, Housing Council, stated that the EIR should review the policies on a disaggregated socioeconomic basis, and in particular, the Overlay Zone. Also, the 1994 build-out versus the build-out with affordable and special needs housing under the revised 2004 Plan with an Overlay Zone would be different and he hoped would be documented as much less of an environmental impact. He discussed public involvement and suggested having public meetings on Saturdays in order to receive more community participation to discuss specific issue by those representing the areas of interest that the Plan is focusing on. He then recommended an Environmental Outreach Coordinator to discuss the issues from all perspectives, which would be a very constructive way to encourage additional public comment.

Patsy White, representing, League of Women Voters, favored St. Vincent properties being developed at the highest and best use with a pedestrian friendly environment, as preserving open space land and is pleased that the Commission is considering a senior facility. They recommended that the floating units be placed on this property

and not continue to float. She added that it is important to remember that St. Vincent's/Silveira property deserves a fair return for their valuable land.

Catherine Dunlap, Strawberry resident, submitted a letter for the Commission's consideration, which she read into the record that discussed the following: Wetland Acquisition; Addition to Wetlands; Down Zoning; and Costs.

Agency Director Hinds discussed acquisition and pointed out that the Commission decided to very carefully clarify that public acquisition was not intended for small developed lots.

Kris Richardson Brewer, Strawberry resident, expressed concern for the wetlands permit process and concurred with several comments made by Ms. Dunlap. She then proposed working together in order to resolve issues. She further noted that a buffer is very important to the residents.

Agency Director Hinds clarified that staff is not proposing to add any duplicate permit. Staff also noted that the issue had to do with establishing clear boundaries for the Baylands Corridor.

Mirian Doody, Strawberry resident, objected to a group of individuals making decisions in her neighborhood.

Ray Kaliski, Jr., representing, Harbor Point Club, stated that the boaters have been sadly neglected in Marin County. He added that when discussing consistency, docks should be evaluated and allowed in the Lagoon area. He then asked the Commission to respect boaters of Marin County and to allow boat launching.

Margaret Jones, concerned resident, discussed the definition of sustainability and expressed concern for not being balanced in regard to the three E's. She pointed out that to be sustainable a community has to have infrastructure, roads, sewer lines schools and a tax base in the County sufficient to keep all those items working properly. She added that before all business is off limits, the Commission must think about all matters collectively. She then discussed the Natural Systems & Agriculture Element under Item H that included the Baylands Corridor and desired to know who would ask the San Francisco Estuary Institute to revise its study. Also, in terms of extending the Baylands Corridor line to Highway 101, how would that determination be made. She then discussed the railroad boundary and believed the Bayfront conservation zone is a natural feature related to the tide and natural terrain and stated that the railroad boundary was an agreement reached by members of the Taskforce. She discussed Agricultural and is not sure if organically grown produce is economically viable because it is extremely difficult to maintain and believed farmers should advise the Commission in that regard. She also expressed concern for affordable housing and the cost of permits. She believed SMART and GGNRA should report on the transit programs. She also hoped that St. Vincent's/Silveira is not developed with one kind of housing, but a diverse community with affordable housing along with a grocery store and a place for all different kinds of individuals to live in order to make it a viable community.

The public hearing was closed.

The Commission then discussed the August 30 memo, entitled Summary of the Initial Countywide Plan Recommendations and Unresolved Issues as follows:

### ***Planning Area #1***

Agency Director Hinds discussed the banked units and noted that they would be taken off environmentally sensitive lands and placed near transportation and jobs. Staff also indicated that there is no mention about adding the banked units back under agricultural designations.

Commissioner Dickenson agreed with staff's interpretation of the intent of the banked units, but it is up to the Commission to decide in that regard.

### ***Planning Area #2***

Agency Director Hinds stated that the St. Vincent/Silveira property was intended to be an urban reserve for the City of San Rafael and a better description about that potential change is needed. Staff suggested adding additional language that if annexed to the City of San Rafael that an urban reserve should be considered, but if left in the County there should be an urban separator.

Commissioner Greenberg believed it was not appropriate for the County's Plan to suggest land uses or densities for St. Vincent/Silveira if and when it is annexed to San Rafael. She also agreed that spelling out the number of units allowed for the parcel under the County's jurisdiction would be appropriate as well as explaining the ramifications in regard to floating units.

Commissioner Dickenson noted that the San Rafael General Plan has a policy stating urban development should not occur on urban land outside of the urban limits in regard to development at St. Vincent's/Silveira. He also pointed out that the City of San Rafael recommended certification of the environmental impact report with an Attorney reviewing all arguments and it was a unanimous vote that the City has no interest in annexing the property.

Commissioner Barner expressed concern in regard to a 350-unit retirement community like "*The Redwoods*" if there is not a critical mass for that type of facility. He believed the Taskforce Report is all based on the notion that the property would be annexed to the City of San Rafael. He then discussed the idea of receiving smaller units as part of the solution, but until critical mass is established, he did not believe a Redwoods facility would make much sense.

Chairman Berland wondered whether floating units would be precluded from being located at St. Vincent's/Silveira. He believed a distinction could be made between the agricultural zoning in West Marin and the agricultural zone in the City-Centered corridor.

Commissioner Thompson discussed critical mass and believed densities should be developed by excellent environmental documentation and analysis.

Commissioner Dickenson believed it is premature to make a decision that a senior care facility is an appropriate use. He is not convinced that this is an appropriate location for senior housing and preferred to leave the AGC2 density designation.

Commissioner Barner stated that a real advantage to the Redwoods is that the facility is located in an area of life as opposed to an isolated area with no activity or youth, which is an essential ingredient to senior citizens. Commissioner Julin concurred with Commissioner Barner's comments.

Commissioner Greenberg believed that this senior care facility would be a low to moderate affordable senior care facility. In addition, she agreed that it is not an ideal place, but many individuals desired the ability to add such a facility and she believed it should be included as an example. She also desired to include the unit number, which indicates the maximum limit.

Chairman Berland stated that the idea was to allow a sponsor to receive some market rate units in order for the facility to be viable.

Agency Director Hinds stated that "primarily affordable" is the idea and to allow either a small market rate project or a project the size of the Redwoods if it were primarily affordable. Staff added that an ideal senior facility would be located where individuals could walk to the drug store, but there is a struggling shopping center across the highway at the Marinwood Center. Staff further stated that it is along the City Centered Corridor and all of those items support the idea for a Redwoods type facility.

Agency Director Hinds asked the Commission if they agreed that banked units were not intended to go in an agricultural designation.

Commissioner Dickenson asked staff to discuss the location of the banked units. Michele Rodriguez, Principal Planner, responded that 3-31 and 3-36 discussed banked units. Staff stated that by implication under CD-8.8 it should also be added. Staff also noted that it should be clarified. Chairman Berland stated that it would be possible to add banked units in the City-Centered Corridor. Staff responded in the affirmative.

***Should St. Vincent's/Silveira or any area with an Agricultural land use category be eligible for floating units?  
By a 2:5 vote.***

Agency Director Hinds recommended establishing language of senior housing ranging from small numbers to larger numbers. Chairman Berland suggested using the word, "*predominantly*" rather than "*primarily*."

#### ***Planning Area #4***

Agency Director Hinds explained that the old Ross Hospital site would be used for an affordable housing project because Old Ross Hospital site was given to the County as part of the inclusionary ordinance. Staff reminded the Commission that the recommendation was to not limit development only to senior housing due to its close proximity of the College of Marin.

Chairman Berland recommended adding the word "*affordable*." Commissioner Greenberg recommended stating, "*college or workforce housing*."

Commissioner Dickenson recommended stating, "*affordable housing, including senior housing*." The Commission and staff agreed.

#### ***Planning Area #5***

Commissioner Dickenson did not agree that the San Quentin Prison land use diagram should be included in the Plan.

Commissioner Thompson asked staff how impacts on transportation traffic would be set if left as a constraints document. Agency Director Hinds responded that part of the criteria would be that project impacts could not worsen existing traffic levels of service. The idea is that it could not result in worsening the levels of service that currently existed.

Chairman Berland asked staff to provide the Commission with cost estimates before decisions are made.

Commissioner Greenberg noted that an EIR analysis would be problematic, because of the very specific and detailed nature of the San Quentin Vision plan. Agency Director Hinds noted that staff is proposing a conceptual plan. Staff agreed that if the Commission's requests and recommendations would result in a very costly circumstance, staff would inform the Commission. Although he also noted this would not apply to every request or recommendation since agency financial responsibility is not the role of the Commission.

Staff further explained that if the budget did not allow a request, then staff would inform the Commission in that regard.

Commissioner Dickenson recommended adding only the goals regarding San Quentin reuse, and if policies are added, then problems could occur with an environmental review challenge.

Staff believed the good work developed by the San Quentin Reuse Advisory Committee should at least be included in the appendix.

Chairman Berland recommended having a written letter from County Counsel that it would not require an environmental review.

Commissioner Greenberg did not believe the land use map belonged with the more general approach. The Commission agreed.

Agency Director Hinds clarified that the Commission desired the land use diagram to be deleted and the entire vision plan removed from the appendix. The Commission concurred.

### ***Planning Area #6***

Commissioner Dickenson suggested adding the phrase, “*mixed-use including housing in the Junction Area.*”

The Commission recommended describing, “Tam Junction” as a gateway to *West Marin*.

### ***Socioeconomic Element #12a***

Commissioner Dickenson asked staff who would define “*minor projects.*” Agency Director Hinds agreed to come back with additional language.

Commissioner Barner expressed concern for the first statement in regard to the exemption requirements. Agency Director Hinds explained that staff is not proposing to exempt, but streamlining is to move along quicker and this is not intended to avoid requirements, but to move along more efficiently. Principal Planner Rodriguez discussed Program EC-2.1 that applied to larger businesses.

Agency Director Hinds believed the Commission agreed to streamline the processing of minor permits. Staff agreed to confirm the validity of what is being counted. Commissioner Greenberg recommended stating, “*majority*” rather than “*89%.*” Staff agreed to verify.

### ***#12b***

No change.

### ***#12c***

No change.

### ***#12d***

No change.

### ***What's Next?***

Commissioner Holland asked if the Commission would have an opportunity to review the recommendations before the joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors. Staff responded that it was not their intent. Staff explained that they would summarize what is included in the Plan as well as several of the Commission’s recommended initial modifications.

Chairman Berland requested that any document provided to the Board to be provided to the Commission before the joint meeting in order to be reviewed. Staff agreed.

Commissioner Julin discussed privatization of community resources and provided the Commission with material in that regard for their review, which she read into the record as follows: “*Privatization is the idea of taking common functions or resources out of the hands of elected governments responsible to their voters and handing the management or ownership of them over to private enterprise answerable to shareholders.*”

Staff noted that the consensus of the Commission is to have a policy or program to discourage privatization of public utilities and address naming practices for public facilities as well.

The hearing was open to the public.

Margaret Zegart, Mill Valley resident, agreed with Commissioner Julin's comments regarding privatization because the public good is often sacrificed. She discussed the accelerated permitting processing in regard to small business and believed the small businesses should contribute toward a fund such as a fund for housing in order to receive any enticements, and in return they should also contribute to the community. She added that the Bayfront Conservation Zone is designed to include Richardson Bay and should be considered as part of this program. She then discussed her letter that was submitted to the Commission for their consideration.

The public hearing was closed.

### ***Introduction***

No changes.

### ***Initial Direction #2: Improve the Organization of the Plan.***

Commissioner Holland recommended calling the element, "*Natural Systems and Agriculture.*" The Commission and staff agreed.

### ***Agriculture***

Commissioner Dickenson expressed concern over total non-agricultural building size and recommended stating, "*limiting the total amount of non agricultural buildings in agricultural districts.*" He also recommended a maximum of 7,000 sq. ft. of total non-agricultural building area.

Commissioner Thompson recommended a 6,000-square-foot primary residential cap and a 2,000-square-foot cap for family residences. Commissioner Greenberg concurred.

Commissioner Holland believed clustering should be defined.

Commissioner Barner asked staff if the number would require design review. Agency Director Hinds responded that if the home was less than 4000 square feet, then it would depend on the zoning districts.

Chairman Berland recommended a 3,000-square-foot maximum cap.

Agency Director Hinds stated that sooner or later some agricultural properties would be bought by an individual that did not have background or interest in farming or ranching.

Commissioner Greenberg recommended a cap of 3,000 square feet on a parcel.

Commissioner Julin asked staff the approaches that other cities and towns in different States have used in this regard. Commissioner Greenberg indicated that MALT has investigated that aspect and she considered MALT very informed in that regard. Commissioner Julin believed this issue should be set as a priority. Staff agreed to review.

Commissioner Dickenson reminded the Commission that the MALT Board objected to the 3,000 square feet maximum. He stated that in many cases, the house subsidizes continued agricultural use of the property. He recommended not being short sighted in regard to allowing individuals to have some non agricultural uses to subsidize retention of the agriculture heritage.

***M/s, Holland/Greenberg, to set a, “6,000-square-foot residential cap with no more than 3,000-square feet on a single residence.”***

Commissioner Julin suggested revisiting this matter after staff receives data in regard to other cities and towns.

Commissioner Holland amended the motion to allow one 540-square foot garage per residence. Commissioner Greenberg agreed with the amendment.

***Motion passed 6/1 (Commissioner Dickenson opposed).***

***Item b***

Chairman Berland announced that Item “b” would become moot, and it was deleted.

***Item d***

Commissioner Holland added the words, “*for agricultural or environmental purposes*” at the end of the sentence.

***Community Development***

Commissioner Thompson objected to the phrase, “*control growth.*” Staff recommended stating, “*manage growth.*”

Commissioner Dickenson believed it should state, “*recognizing constraints*” rather than “*manage growth.*”

Commissioner Greenberg suggested stating, “*recognizing constraints over managed growth.*” The Commission and staff agreed.

Commissioner Barner expressed concern for the term “blanket” study. Staff recommended stating, “*comprehensive*” study. Commissioner Julin believed a fiscal impact analysis should be conducted in order for the public to understand the cost.

Agency Director Hinds recommended on removing the term “*blanket study*” and state, “*Affordable housing projects are exempt from the requirements for a case-by-case fiscal analysis.*”

Commissioner Holland recommended rewriting or deleting this item. Commissioner Julin believed the taxpayers have the right to know that they are paying for the exemption.

Agency Director Hinds recommended including a requirement that major housing projects should conduct a fiscal impact analysis in order to address Commissioner Julin’s concern. Staff also recommended defining a major housing project, but for individual homes it would be a burden.

Commissioner Holland favored one blanket study rather than burdening already over burdened projects with separate studies.

Commissioner Dickenson suggested reviewing the impact fees.

Chairman Berland announced that language on page 3b would satisfy the concerns as follows: “*Exclude affordable housing from the requirement to pay for the full cost of all services and require a study to determine fair share costs*” and delete Item A on page 4. The Commission and staff agreed.

Commissioner Thompson recommended deleting “*banked units*” to Item “*b*” on page 4. Commissioner Greenberg recommended stating, “*minimum density subject to site specific environmental constraints.*” The Commission and staff agreed.

***Green Building & Energy***

No changes.

***Environmental Hazards***

No changes.

***Housing***

Chairman Berland added the phrase, “*and other vehicles*” to Item “*b*” to read, “*community land trusts and other vehicles.*”

***Transportation***

No changes.

***Public Facilities***

No additional comments.

*Chairman Berland adjourned the Countywide Plan meeting at 6:15 p.m.*