

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MINUTES OF THE BOARD SESSION – Regular Session

Wednesday, January 2, 2008  
Marion County Courthouse Square

9:00 a.m. Board Session  
Senator Hearing Room

**PRESENT:** Commissioner Janet Carlson, Commissioner Sam Brentano and Commissioner Patti Milne. Also present were John Lattimer as chief administrative officer, Jo Stonecipher as legal counsel and Kim Hulett as recorder.

Commissioner Carlson called the meeting to order.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jim Miller, 12485 Parrish Gap Rd SE, Turner, said he received notice of the vested interest waiver that was to be given to Mr. Ralls today. He stated there was not sufficient notice given to the surrounding property owners. Measure 49 states the notice has to be seven or more days. Mr. Miller requested that the item be pulled off of the consent calendar and be scheduled for a public hearing.

Commissioner Carlson confirmed that anyone could request a hearing and that was the reason for the notice. She confirmed with Jo Stonecipher that the request was sufficient to schedule a public hearing. Jo Stonecipher confirmed that was correct.

**CONSENT**

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Approve amendment #1 to add \$130,424 to the contract with MGT of America, Inc. and to include individual organizational assessments of the Parole and Probation and Institutions Divisions of the Sheriff's Office.

BUSINESS SERVICES – HUMAN RESOURCES

Approve recommendation to adjust the pay range of custodial worker 1 and uphold the custodial worker 2 pay range.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Approve two-year agreement with Catholic Community Services for \$1,810,159 to provide the 2007-09 Healthy Start program.

## DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Approve receipt of \$141,000 in grant funds from the Oregon Office of Homeland Security for a special prosecutor to prosecute drug dealers and manufacturers in federal court from the six county region of Lane, Marion, Benton, Linn, Polk and Yamhill.

## PUBLIC WORKS – PLANNING

Receive appeal of Planning Commission's decision denying subdivision and administrative review, case #SUB 07-15, Schipporeit, Clerk's File #5565.

Receive hearings officer's recommendation denying zone change/comprehensive plan amendment, case #ZC/CP 07-04, Manning, Clerk's File #5567, and schedule a public hearing for February 20, 2008.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Milne moved approval of the consent calendar. Commissioner Brentano seconded; motion carried. A voice vote was unanimous.

## **ACTION**

### BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

1. Consider approval of a proclamation recognizing the month of January 2008, as National Mentoring Month. – Kimberly Allain, St. Vincent de Paul Society, Sue Blayre, Marion County Sheriff's Office and Sarah Spinks, Youth Impact.

Kimberly Allain from the St. Vincent de Paul Society said she supports mentoring with her organization. They partner with various organizations and particularly the Sheriff's Office to train mentors and volunteers to work with people who have criminal histories so that they can assist families and individuals in rebuilding their lives when they re-enter the community. She said it is an intentional and organized focus with evidence-based training and support.

Sue Blayre said she is the program coordinator for the Marion County Sheriff's Office. Her major responsibility is ensuring that their clients are receiving evidence-based practice in all facets of their re-entry program. One of the reasons she is such a strong proponent of mentoring is the fact that she has seen the success of individuals coming out of prison who are assigned mentors prior to their release and who get assistance throughout the entire process of re-entering the community. It also provides an individual with that increased structure that they often have when they are incarcerated, but they often lack when they return to the community.

Sarah Spinks with Youth Impact said they offer mentoring through two different programs. One supports young adults with barriers to employment and provides them with a mentor who can come in and help them explore career options, get connections to employment and potentially find a job that they would otherwise not seek and be able to have the skills to maintain. The second program that has been operating for three years works primarily with juvenile offenders in the age group K-12, but primarily the 15-17 year old range. This program is partnered with the Juvenile Department. Ms. Spinks said they take offending youth with one-on-one support of a caring adult mentor. The mentors serve as a positive role model to provide guidance and support that the youth isn't getting elsewhere in his/her life. It is extremely important that these youth have support that can carry them over and teach them skills that they are not getting from home, school or from natural mentors in their life.

Page -2-

Sue Bloom said she is currently the mentor champion and is working with the commission and United Way in the newly launched volunteer and mentor center in the valley. She said they would be re-establishing the mentor network in our community to bring together the programs and help them build on their best practices by networking and with informational meetings. This is really to build awareness in the community about the need for mentors and support for the folks that have those extra needs.

Commissioner Carlson asked if someone is interested in becoming a mentor in one of the aforementioned programs what would they do. Ms. Bloom said they could contact any of them directly or contact the Volunteer and Mentor Center or via their website at [www.givebacktoday.org](http://www.givebacktoday.org). She said all three of the programs are on the website in addition to other mentoring opportunities.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Brentano moved to approve the proclamation recognizing the month of January 2008, as National Mentoring Month. Commissioner Milne seconded; motion carried. A voice vote was unanimous.

2. Consider approval of an order appointing Sterling Anderson as the Marion County Planning Director and Zoning Administrator. – John Lattimer

John Lattimer, chief administrator officer, stated that the director of Public Works was appointed in June of 2003 as the Planning Director and Zoning Administrator. It is required by statute that the board appoints that person. Due to the sad departure of Jim Sears, the director of Public Works, there is a need to appoint a new Planning Director and Zoning Administrator. Mr. Lattimer recommended that Sterling Anderson be appointed to this position. He has been working in that area for a long time and is an excellent staff person. He added that under the statute ORS 215.042 the board is required to appoint a Planning Director and Zoning Administrator and Sterling Anderson can handle that job quite well.

Sterling Anderson said he appreciated the respect and trust the board has given him in performing his duties in the past and appreciates the opportunity the board is giving him now.

The board concurred that due to Measure 37 and Measure 49, Sterling Anderson had become a household word for people that watch channel 21. They commented that Mr. Anderson and his staff had done an excellent job working with the board through these processes.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Milne moved to approve an order appointing Sterling Anderson as the Marion County Planning Director and Zoning Administrator. Commissioner Brentano seconded; motion carried. A voice vote was unanimous.

### BUSINESS SERVICES

3. Consider approval of an order appointing Terry Sol and Cozette Cooper and reappointing Kelly Walther to the Marion County Fair Board. – Glenis Chapin

Glenis Chapin, volunteer coordinator, introduced Kelly Walther who is being reappointed to the Marion County Fair Board and Cozette Cooper and Terry Sol (not present), who are the two new appointees.

The commissioners thanked Kelly Walther for her hard work and welcomed Cozette Cooper and Terry Sol to the Marion County Fair Board.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Brentano moved to approve an order appointing Terry Sol and Cozette Cooper and reappointing Kelly Walther to the Marion County Fair Board. Commissioner Milne seconded; motion carried. A voice vote was unanimous.

#### FINANCE

4. Consider approval of an ordinance amending the Marion County Public Contracting Rules, by emergency procedure. – Peggy Mitchell

John Lattimer, chief administrative officer, stated that the legislature had changed some of the laws to the contracting rules and this required the contracting rules be changed for Marion County. He said that the county's rules refer to the Business Services Department and delegates the authority for monitoring the oversight of those rules. The county now has a Finance Department and a chief financial officer. The contracting functions are in the Finance Department, so that designation will need to be changed. Mr. Lattimer noted that the county now has a deputy county administrative officer that needs the authority to sign contracts in Mr. Lattimer's absence and this has been changed.

Jo Stonecipher said in the board's materials there is an excellent analysis, section by section, of each change describing them generally as a housekeeping, statutory or process clarification. She added that none of these are major changes that would make a serious change in the county rules that would change the contracting process, but since these have been in effect since February 2005, there were things that needed to be changed.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Milne moved that the chair read the ordinance by title only twice. Commissioner Brentano seconded; motion carried. A voice vote was unanimous.

Commissioner Carlson read the ordinance by title only twice.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Milne moved approval of an ordinance amending the Marion County Public Contracting Rules, by emergency procedure. Seconded by Commissioner Brentano; motion carried. A voice vote was unanimous.

#### PUBLIC WORKS – PLANNING

5. Consider applicant's request to call up and schedule a public hearing, case #SUB 07-14, McKillip, Clerk's File #5566. – Sterling Anderson

Sterling Anderson, planning director, explained that this request was very unusual and unique. It requests that the board assume jurisdiction and call up a decision made by the Planning Commission approving phase I, of an eight lot portion of the subdivision, on the McKillip property, case #SUB 07-14. The Planning Commission issued the decision, the appeal period expired and no appeal was submitted. Mr. Anderson said the applicant apparently missed the appeal period. He said it appeared to be their intent to file an appeal, but did not meet the deadline. The county zoning ordinance allows the board to assume jurisdiction over any land

use case at anytime, but the way it is worded in the code is that the board needs to assume that jurisdiction at the time that it first appears on the regular meeting agenda. That would have been in the early part of December.

Mr. Anderson said there were some unique aspects to this decision. It involves a Measure 37 claim and the decision was made one day prior to Measure 49 taking effect and overriding those waivers that were granted under Measure 37. He added there is also the question in this case whether or not the criteria can be changed after an application is submitted. The Oregon Revised Statutes effectively state that the criteria in effect at the time of an application are the criteria that the application must be judged by. He said staff can't necessarily support the board taking action to call this up and schedule a public hearing, but they also recognize the unique aspects of this particular case. In their written statement, the applicant cites certain legal authority and historical aspects of the case in this decision. One of those points was the decision clearly approved eight lots (phase I) and the remaining portion was not granted. Another argument is that the decision itself did not clearly articulate that the rest of the subdivision (phase II) was denied, that no decision was made. Therefore, their argument is that the county could be exposed to a mandamus action after 150 days because they didn't take any definitive action on phase II. Mr. Anderson stated he didn't know legally if it was an issue or not.

Commissioner Milne clarified that the applicants were saying that phase II wasn't really addressed. Mr. Anderson said he felt the disapproval of phase II could have been more clearly stated. He said the decision identified what was approved. If it was not approved, then the consequence of non-approval is denial. Not taking any action ends up being a denial. Where part of the request is approved and the remainder is effectively denied by not taking action to approve it. He reiterated that lack of a decision is ultimately a denial just like a tie vote is a denial. There has to be an affirmative decision to approve something, otherwise it is denied. Mr. Anderson said there is that element of confusion that exists in this case.

Commissioner Milne said the applicants also assert that the Planning Commission improperly altered the subdivision application, basically separated the two phases versus keeping it as one application. She asked if that was a little unusual. Mr. Anderson said it was not unheard of and the Planning Commission can segment their decision and identify different phases. In this case the Planning Commission saw the eight-lot portion of the subdivision being between the Champeog Creek, the city limits and urban growth boundary of St. Paul as being compatible under the regulations they reviewed that were applicable under the Measure 37 waiver. The waiver at that time also had criteria regarding land divisions and dwelling development conflicting with farm use and not being consistent with the land use pattern. Mr. Anderson said that when the Planning Commission looked at the larger portion of the property east of Champeog Creek they concluded that the subdivision would conflict with farm uses in the surrounding area and was not consistent with the large farm parcel pattern that existed. He believes that was their reason for denying that other portion.

Commissioner Carlson asked if part of the issue was that this case was on the eve of Measure 49 taking effect. Mr. Anderson felt this definitely played into the decision. The Planning Commission was well aware that the next day Measure 49 would take effect and Measure 37 would be gone. The basis for the subdivision even being processed was no longer going to be valid the next day. The Planning Commission felt they could approve phase I, but not the remaining portion of the proposed development.

Commissioner Carlson stated that on December 5, 2007, letters were sent out to all Measure 37 waiver recipients informing them that they needed to stop any kind of work and determine whether they had a vested right. She asked if this lack of appeal at this point limits or gets in the way of this applicant coming forward and determining whether they have a vested right at all.

If the applicant does have a vested right they can move forward with what has been approved already. If they don't then the discussion at that point is moot.

Jo Stonecipher said that one of the issues that is creating a lot of contention and needs to be resolved is whether the statute 215.423 provides that a land use application and the standards that apply to the application remain the same even if they are changed later by changes in ordinances and statutes. The argument that was made to the Planning Commission was that because this application was filed before Measure 49 went into effect it was subject to a Measure 37 waiver that allowed application of different standards from the ones that became applicable on December 6, 2008. She said the effect of all of this was that the standards under the Measure 37 waiver need to be applied, and if the court or LUBA were to determine that pending applications that had Measure 37 waivers would be allowed to be processed being judged against the standards that were applicable with the waivers in place, those could be brought back and considered under the standards in effect earlier. She explained this is why the applicants believe they have an issue here. They believe that they could go forward and demonstrate that they are entitled to continue to develop in the manner that they were entitled under the Measure 37 waiver because they had an application filed before that waiver was nullified.

Jo Stonecipher added that there are also materials out now suggesting that under a Court of Appeals discussion, *Corey v. DLCD*, under the state waiver process people were in a contested case, i.e., needed to take their cases directly to the Court of Appeals rather than through the Circuit Court as required by the administrative rules because there was a property interest in the Measure 37 waiver.

Ms. Stonecipher said she is not suggesting that either of those things is correct, but she believes the idea of going forward is to preserve those rights assuming they are ultimately recognized. There is also the issue before the board that an appeal of this matter and the time for the appeal of this matter expired on December 17, 2007. She stated that she did research this and there is very little case law, but she did find one case out of Washington County where LUBA did indicate that even though a decision was final, the decision could subsequently be reconsidered. LUBA dismissed an appeal on the grounds that the reconsideration rendered the final decision, not a final decision. She said the best information she has is that it is within the board's authority to do this. She said it can be done, but doesn't know if this is necessary for the board to do it from the standpoint of winning a mandamus action.

Commissioner Carlson said the arguments about goal posts, vested rights and the authority of the legislature or of the people by an initiative or referendum to come in and change things midstream that are statutory was an issue when Measure 37 went before the Circuit and Supreme Court. She said there is a lot at stake for people here in these discussions and she is sympathetic to that on the one hand, but on the other hand she has a hard time with someone that says they didn't read it and it wasn't docketed because then anyone else can come in with the same argument. The board will then be asked to go around the process that they have put in place.

Commissioner Brentano asked if the main issue was that the public hearing would be on phase II. Ms. Stonecipher said when the board “calls up a matter,” it is considered a no vote, so once the matter is called up and a public meeting is held, the process would be the same as it was before the Planning Commission, with the opponents coming in and explaining to you why this should be denied. She said her advice to the Planning Commission was to deny this application and that is also her advice to the board based on the enactment of Measure 49. Ms. Stonecipher said that if the board “calls up” this matter, the applicants could then appeal to LUBA. If the board does not “call up” this matter, then they cannot appeal to LUBA.

Commissioner Milne said she thought they should approve it because Measure 49 complicates the process and this is an unusual matter. She felt the applicants had some legitimate issues that they raised. She said that the board doesn’t really have enough evidence until they have a hearing. She said if the board doesn’t call this up, the entire subdivision is dead for them.

Commissioner Brentano asked Ms. Stonecipher how the county is involved either way. He said he didn’t want to encourage lawsuits. Ms. Stonecipher said if the board calls this up, holds the hearing and changes the decision in any way, either approving or denying it, she would expect an appeal to LUBA by the opponents. It would put the county in the position of being a respondent in the LUBA case. If the board were to deny it in its entirety on the grounds of Measure 49, that appeal would be taken to LUBA and challenged under those statutes discussed earlier.

Commissioner Brentano summarized the county would be involved either way.

Commissioner Carlson asked if the appeal had been filed timely, it would have gone before the board and there would be no question that the board had the authority to hear it. If the board were to deny “calling it up” and the applicants take it to court, how are they going to argue that the secretary didn’t docket it and the attorney missed reading the deadline. She said these are the two main issues here. Two people made an error in a law office and it didn’t get filed timely and now they are asking the board to go around its regular process and allow them the appeal anyway. She asked what does that say to all the people in the past who have had those kinds of errors and all the people in the future, that you don’t have to follow the rules or the deadlines. People will think that they can just come to the board and make a clever legal argument and they’ll call it up anyway because of the issues. Commissioner Carlson said someone made a mistake and she was sorry for that, but she was not going to let the entire process fall on its face because of that.

Jo Stonecipher said there is one small part of this and the argument doesn’t relate to whether the rules were followed. She said that would not be before the court. The court would rule in favor of the county. The only issue before the court would be whether the county failed to make a final decision on phase II.

Commissioner Carlson asked if the court found that there should have been a final decision on phase II, would the court have the option to remand it back to the county or would they hold their own trial. Ms. Stonecipher said the court does not have the option to give it back to the county after the 150 days has expired. She said under the statute, the standards shift from the burden of proof being on the applicant to the burden of proof being on the county. She added that it would be a trial in the Circuit Court rather than a hearing before the commissioners.

Commissioner Carlson summarized that the trial would only be on the phase II portion. Ms. Stonecipher agreed that it would only be on the phase II portion and the eight lots that had been approved would remain in place. The only issue before the court would be that the county failed to issue a final order that covered the one question. Commissioner Carlson asked if Measure 49 vested rights play into it at all. Ms. Stonecipher said the county would put it forward as a basis for denial and argue there was no process. The criteria could not be met because the criteria would be those in place today. This is high-value farmland and there is no way that a subdivision would be approved under the standards that are applicable to it today. She added there would be arguments of vested rights under Measure 37, not the vested rights that the applicant has constructed so much he is allowed to go forward, but a property right in the waiver itself and the right to hold that and be allowed to develop under it regardless of changes that the legislature provided.

Commissioner Carlson asked if the board could call this case up and remand only the phase II portion back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Anderson said the board has the authority to remand any case back to the hearings officer or Planning Commission for further review on any question that arises on land use cases. He said this had been done on a number of cases. Commissioner Carlson summarized that instead of having a hearing in front of the board again, they remand the portion that could go to court anyway. Ms. Stonecipher said the board could remand this to the Planning Commission to issue a new order that specifically addressed phase II.

Commissioner Brentano asked what's different when the board does this and it comes back. Isn't it the same issue being discussed today and what makes it something that can be appealed? Ms. Stonecipher said if it were to go back to the Planning Commission they would have to issue a new order. That order would have a 12-day appeal period, the same as the original order did. If the applicants were dissatisfied with the Planning Commission's order, they would appeal it to the board and that order would be appealed in the usual way. Commissioner Brentano clarified that if the board didn't accept the appeal at that time they still had an order they could take to LUBA. Ms. Stonecipher agreed and said they have to go through the county's process before they can go to LUBA.

Commissioner Milne clarified that the approved eight lots would be left alone in regard to the Planning Commission level, but if they appeal the decision they can appeal the whole thing to the board. She asked Commissioner Carlson if her desire was to separate the two pieces of the case, but the effect would be leaving alone what was approved by the Planning Commission. The board would just deal with the unaddressed portion.

Commissioner Carlson reiterated she wanted to remand it back to the Planning Commission to basically create a new order, but the new order would leave the approved part of the property alone and only address the phase II portion. This would basically complete the order that wasn't completed previously, but would allow a 12-day appeal period. The appeal would then come back to the board and the appeal could be on the entirety of the order, but would be within the time frames that are allowed by law as opposed to circumventing the deadline on the phase I portion. She said that at that point the board would determine on the merits whether or not they accepted the appeal.

Commissioner Milne said that basically the board is asking this to be remanded back to the Planning Commission to address phase II and then the applicants would end up before the board. Ms. Stonecipher said that was correct.

Commissioner Carlson added that this would avoid the court pieces and avoid the board allowing someone to bring forward something on phase I when they missed the deadline.

Commissioner Brentano clarified this would still allow the applicants to pursue this further if they wanted to. He felt this addressed Commissioner Milne's concern.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Brentano moved to call up the decision from the Planning Commission in the McKillip case and remand it back to the Planning Commission to issue an order that properly states all terms of the decision that was previously made (no new public hearing). Seconded by Commissioner Milne; motion carried. A voice vote was unanimous.

## **MEASURE 49 VESTED INTEREST CONSENT CALENDAR 9:30 A.M.**

Approve case #M06-14, Ralls, to partition and place dwellings, Clerk's File #5169.

Commissioner Carlson stated that Mr. Miller, who attended during the public comment period, requested that this case be sent before the hearings officer. The board will not take action on this case as a consent item.

Commissioner Carlson asked Ms. Stonecipher to summarize what had happened earlier for the people that came in after the public comment period. Ms. Stonecipher said there was a request via email that a hearing be held on the Ralls vested rights determination. She added that the process under the Marion County ordinance is that if the hearing is requested by anyone prior to the time when the board considers this on its consent calendar, a hearing will be held before a hearings officer in Marion County. That decision will be brought before the Board of Commissioners to either consider it as an appeal, or simply brought forward if not an appeal, for a final order. Due to the fact that this case was brought to the board as a consent item and a hearing has been requested, it is now back as an administrative matter for the Planning Division to issue the proper hearing notices and set a hearing before the hearings officer. The hearings officer will issue a decision, which will then come back to the board as a recommendation.

Commissioner Carlson invited Jim Brown to come forward to speak. He advised he is the current owner of the property in question. The previous owners who complied with all facets of Measure 37 were also in the audience. Ms. Stonecipher suggested that the board defer this for another week.

Mr. Brown said he has invested close to \$200,000 in this property and is now being told he has to stop construction. He said he has contractors there and a deadline he has to meet. If this process is deferred another week this is not going to work. He said he understood there was to be 24-hour notice to request a public hearing and wanted to know what time the request came in. Commissioner Milne said the email came in at 6:45 p.m. the day before. Commissioner Carlson suggested that the meeting be recessed until they could get a copy of the Measure 49 ordinance.

Commissioner Carlson recessed the meeting at 10:25 a.m. while Ms. Stonecipher obtained a copy of the Measure 49 ordinance.

Commissioner Carlson resumed the meeting at 10:35 a.m.

Ms. Stonecipher provided a copy of the Measure 49 ordinance to the board and reviewed the portion of the Measure for requesting public hearings. Ms. Stonecipher stated that sections five and six pertain to bringing an application forward to the hearings officer and then the appeal to the board.

Section seven of the ordinance describes the consent process and says, “notwithstanding sections five and six of this ordinance, if the planning director determines an application establishes both compliance with the waiver and an invested right without the need for additional evidence or analysis, the application will be placed on the Board of Commissioners’ public meeting consent agenda for final action. If an applicant, any board member or any member of the public requests a hearing on the application, it will be set for public hearing before the hearings officer, pursuant to section six of this ordinance.”

The notice that was sent out on December 27, 2007, does provide a hearing will not be held on this case unless one is requested. “Anyone desiring to request a public hearing regarding this decision may do so in person or by representative at the Board of Commissioners regular weekly meeting. A written request for a public hearing may be filed prior to the public meeting with the Marion County Planning Division. Written request must be submitted to the Planning Division by 4:30 p.m. one day prior to the public meeting scheduled above.” Ms. Stonecipher said the email which came in yesterday at 6:45 p.m. would not qualify and is presumably why the gentleman came in this morning and requested the hearing. Under the ordinance and under the notice for hearing, Mr. Miller was entitled to request a public hearing. Ms. Stonecipher stated there is no requirement of 24 hours, but there is a requirement that it be at the Planning Division before the close of business, which is 4:30 p.m., the day before or alternatively, a person can show up at the board session and request a hearing. Under the ordinance, this is required to go to a hearing with the hearings officer.

Commissioner Carlson asked Mr. Anderson how quickly this case would go before the hearings officer. Mr. Anderson said he couldn’t guarantee because they have to give a couple of weeks notice. He estimated it would probably be before the end of the month. Commissioner Carlson said there are some things that the applicant can still do while waiting for the hearing. Mr. Anderson agreed and said for example, the applicant can still drill wells during this period. He said they couldn’t get building permits issued until the vested rights determination is made, but there are other site preparations that can be done. Ms. Stonecipher stated she could certainly work with the planning division and hearings officer’s schedules to see how soon a notice could be mailed out and find a time for the hearing. Land use hearings are historically held on Wednesdays although there is no requirement that they be held that day. She said as long as there is seven days notice it could be held anytime.

Commissioner Milne respectfully requested that this hearing be held as quickly as possible. There are people here that have a lot of money at stake. Commissioner Carlson agreed.

Mr. Brown said he was continually disenchanted and extremely frustrated with the continual changing of the rules as he moves forward on this process. He said he purchased the property knowing that he could build a building on the property. He said as soon as he purchased the property all the rules changed and he didn’t understand how one person could just stop the process. He said he is very frustrated and feels like he is being extorted.

Commissioner Carlson said she appreciated his frustration and apologized for the inconvenience.

Commissioner Milne said she was sorry that the applicants find themselves in this situation. She confirmed what Commissioner Carlson said that at least Marion County has an ordinance that will help people work through the process.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS  
9:30 A.M.**

None.

Commissioner Carlson reading the weekly calendar.  
Commissioner Carlson adjourned the meeting at 11:08 a.m.

**Attachments:** Agenda

ABOVE MINUTES APPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMMISSIONER

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMMISSIONER

\*\*\*\*\*

**If you require interpreter assistance, an assistive listening device, large print material or other accommodations, call 503-588-5212 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. TTY 503-588-5168**

**Si necesita servicios de interprete, equipo auditivo, material copiado en letra grande, o culaquier otra acomodacion, por favor llame al 503-588-5212 por lo menos 48 horas con anticipacion a la reunion. TTY 503-588-5168  
Marion County is on the Internet at: [www.co.marion.or.us](http://www.co.marion.or.us)**