

**Technical Advisory Group**  
**Process Sub-Committee**  
5/12/08 Meeting Minutes  
5PM to 7PM

Page 1 of 2

ATTENDEES: Chuck Courtney, Derek Doughty, Scott Emery, Tim Neldner,

EPC ATTENDEES: Bob Stetler, Kim Tapley

HANDOUTS: Derek Doughty's white paper draft  
Scott Emery's Strawman paper  
Setback document (Applicant's Handbook Section & minutes from EPC and Natural Resources meeting)

A TAG member noted that anywhere the white paper says suggested, that it should be changed to recommended. At the last meeting the Sub-committee requested that Scott Emery draft a strawman paper, which he did. Derek Doughty also drafted a paper in which he compiled many other position papers (that had previously been posted) into one document. The sub-committee members went over Derek's paper, as it will be the Process white paper draft (draft 5-8-08).

It was suggested that the rezoning letters be an attachment to the white paper.

**Process and Timing (PGMD/Municipalities) Section:**

A TAG member recommended that the EPC have inter-local agreements with the municipalities for construction plan approvals.

**Process and Timing (Planning Commission) Section:**

A TAG member noted there are many places where EPC is involved, however it was recommended that EPC's involvement should be reduced except where it is related to their expertise or where it is related to wetland impacts.

Another TAG member noted if the applicant isn't charged for the review, and it doesn't waste any time, why is there an issue that EPC is involved?

A TAG member stated that the recommendation should be made that the Wetlands director reviews the involvement of the division and the staff technical abilities and seek changes to their involvement in the Comprehensive Plan. It was agreed that it could go both ways, EPC Wetlands could seek to be added or removed from the Comprehensive Plan.

**Other Fees Section:**

A portion of Scott's paper will be added in this section.

**Reasonable Use Section:**

The rule was regurgitated in the paper as it was provided to the sub-committee. Bob Stetler noted that it was treated like a workshop with the TAG group. Scott's paper changed current to future for land use changes and added an "l" (net environmental benefit) and "m" (future land uses) sections.

**Technical Advisory Group**  
**Process Sub-Committee**  
5/12/08 Meeting Minutes  
5PM to 7PM

Page 2 of 2

Bob Stetler noted that the Basis of Review will be referenced in the rule but the Applicants Handbook would be a “how to” for applying for permits and the applications. The Applicants Handbook will not be referenced in the rule.

Sub-committee reviewed their earlier comments and past meeting minutes to compile all the comments for this section.

A TAG member noted that second generation farm families with large tracts of lands that may want to subdivide in the future may not be able to because of the Land definition. Sub-committee recommends the land definition be removed. A TAG member noted that if it was necessary to have self-imposed hardships, then it should be in one of the Reasonable Use factors.

A TAG member noted that the Land definition should read “The entire parcel/property under common ownership at the effective date of this rule.” Then remove the rest of the definition.

Other members suggested that the entire definition be removed and the hardship noted in one of the factors. It was agreed that the land definition be deleted entirely.

**Setbacks Section:**

A TAG member noted that plantings in the setback had to be done at the toe of slope of the stormwater pond even though the entire setback had been pasture grasses. Another TAG member noted that a wall could be built 5 feet or even 1 foot from the wetland line, because the water would be re-routed to a treatment system and be cleaner than if the development was 30 feet away. Bob Stetler noted that protecting the setback was not just for stormwater purposes. TAG members noted that the rule states where EPC should be involved with setbacks in the section that refers to secondary impacts.

The paper will be structured with pros and cons sections, like the Agricultural paper. Then, on Friday (May 16<sup>th</sup>) the white paper can be presented to the full TAG.

A TAG member suggested that for the boat ramp section, it currently says 10 feet, A boat ramp should be larger than 10 feet.

Meeting adjourned.