

**Siskiyou County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
May 15, 2024**

The Siskiyou County Planning Commission meeting of May 15, 2024, was called to order by Chair Fowle at approximately 9:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 311 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor, Yreka, California.

Present: Commissioners Melo, Lindler, Veale, and Fowle

Absent: Commissioner Hart

Also Present: Rick Dean, Community Development Department Director; Hailey Lang, Deputy Director of Planning; Rachel Jereb, Senior Planner; James Phelps, Senior Planner; Bernadette Cizin, Associate Planner; William Carroll, Assistant County Counsel; Janine Rowe, Commission Clerk

Minutes:

March 20, 2024: It was moved by Commissioner Melo, seconded by Commissioner Veale, to approve the Minutes from the March 20, 2024, Planning Commission meeting.

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present, with Commissioner Fowle abstaining because he was absent from that meeting.

April 17, 2024: It was moved by Commissioner Veale, seconded by Commissioner Melo, to approve the Minutes from the April 17, 2024, Planning Commission meeting.

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present.

Unscheduled Appearances: None

Conflict of Interest Declaration: None

Changes to the Agenda: None

Presentation of Documents, Availability of Public Records, Public Hearing

Protocol, and Rights of Appeal Statement: Chair Fowle advised those attending the meeting both physically as well as those listening remotely that the Presentation of Documents, Availability of Public Records, the Public Hearing Protocol, and the Right of Appeal Statement were contained in the Agenda and that he would not be reading them verbatim since the only item of business on today's agenda was the presentation of the background report for the General Plan Update. Assistant County Counsel William Carroll concurred.

New Business:**Agenda Item 1: Presentation of the Existing Conditions Background Report for the Siskiyou County 2050 General Plan Update**

The Existing Conditions Background Report provides a clear understanding of current trends and conditions in the county. The Report provides a detailed description of a range of topics within the county, such as economic and demographic conditions, housing, land use, natural resources, and public facilities, services, and infrastructure. The Existing Conditions Background Report is policy neutral. The Background Report also serves as the “Environmental Setting” section of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the General Plan.

The action of presenting a report is not defined as a “Project” pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 21065. Therefore, CEQA does not apply. Additionally, no action will be taken. This item is simply a presentation of a report to provide information to the Planning Commission and the public as well as seek input from the Planning Commission and the public.

Staff Report:

The previously circulated Staff Report was reviewed by the Commission, and a presentation of the project was provided by Ms. Lang.

Ms. Lang told the Commission that the purpose today was to present the public review of the General Plan Existing Conditions Background Report. She said staff would also discuss where they are in the process, where they’re going, and certain timelines and deliverables for the future.

Before Ms. Lang turned the presentation over to Brent Gibbons of Mintier Harnish, the consultant team that is preparing the report, discussion was held that there would be no action taken today and that the Commission was free to ask questions during the presentation.

Mr. Gibbons told the Commission that today’s discussion was just an informational meeting that would provide some background information. He said they would open it up for discussion and further comments on the background report which Ryan Lester would be presenting. Mr. Gibbons said after the presentation, they would work with county staff to take those comments and make modifications as necessary.

Mr. Gibbons discussed the consultants’ tour of the county which was also attended by some members of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Gibbons told the Commission there is a website called Siskiyou 2050 which is the hub for the entire project. Deliverables and meeting notifications are posted there. He said there are summaries on the website if a member of the public, the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors were unable to attend a meeting, and sometimes the workshops are digital so virtual attendance is an option.

Mr. Gibbons said project status memos have been prepared and County staff has reported back to the Commission and the Board on a regular basis, which was requested by both bodies so as to have those ongoing discussions for transparency purposes. He said those types of touchpoints would continue throughout the process.

Mr. Gibbons went on to talk about the joint study session that was held with the Board of Supervisors

and Planning Commission at the beginning of the project. He reviewed the next steps that will take place during the public review period. After that process is complete, the feedback that is received from the public, the TAC, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors will be incorporated into the final plan.

Mr. Gibbons described the next steps of Vision and Guiding Principles which will include six public workshops in June held simultaneously at various locations throughout the county. A summary of the feedback will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The TAC will meet again and another joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors study will be held.

Mr. Gibbons described the next phases of zoning and the actual policy document in the General Plan which are being updated at the same time in order to ensure they are consistent. He anticipated this process to start in the Fall of 2024.

Mr. Gibbons said the next phase will be the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which takes 9 to 12 months and is anticipated to take place in 2025. The public review will depend on how many comments are received from the community, organizations, and surrounding jurisdictions.

The final phase will be the adoption of the General Plan. Mr. Gibbons said that the General Plan can still be modified up until the time it is adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Gibbons turned the presentation over to Ryan Lester who provided more information regarding the background report.

Mr. Lester told the Commission that the background report covers a number of topic areas such as population, land uses, and resources in the community. He said the topics covered in the background report are really specific because most of them are required as part of doing the larger EIR on the general plan. He said the background report is incorporated into the EIR which is why the topics covered are very specific.

Mr. Lester said the background report was just published and a newsletter would be going out that goes into some of the key findings from each section which makes that available to the public in a readable way. He said the public review period was extended by two weeks which goes past the upcoming workshops.

Discussion was held that the Commission would ask questions as Mr. Lester went through the report instead of waiting until he concluded his presentation.

Mr. Lester said his firm wrote some of the sections but specialists wrote other sections, especially regarding cultural and biological resources. He said if there were questions from the Commission that he and Mr. Gibbons couldn't answer, they would take them to their subconsultants for answers.

Land Use

Mr. Lester said the first section is Land Use which looks at existing uses in the county, existing zoning, what was planned for in the past, and existing general plan designations. The information is gathered from assessor parcel data and what is reported as existing uses by tax data.

Discussion was held regarding nonconforming pre-existing uses. Chair Fowle wanted to know if those parcels that are not grandfathered in could be identified and cleaned up. Ms. Jereb said if they are a nonconforming use that predated the old general plan and they still are an existing use, staff may want to look into whether they need to have a zoning change so their preexisting use would be

conforming. Further discussion was held that staff didn't know of an accurate way to identify nonconforming parcels other than going area by area to look at the uses compared to the zoning. Ms. Lang said the definitions contained in Article 25 are open to interpretation and perhaps it would be beneficial to redefine what is considered to be nonconforming. Chair Fowle said he would like to see the Assessor's and Tax Collector's offices be included in the TAC so all County departments are on the same page.

Mr. Lester said included in the Land Use chapter are regional plans and where cities have responsibility and the county has responsibility. He said an analysis of disadvantaged unincorporated communities was done which is required by state law, and it is included in the background report. An index is being finalized which will go into detail about each of the service areas and any service deficiencies that were identified.

Commissioner Lindler asked that the Shasta, Scott, and Butte Valleys be included in the description of the county's Regional Setting on page INT-5.

Discussion was held regarding public services which should only include police, fire, sewer or water and not private businesses such as convenience stores, gas stations, etc.

Discussion was held that the Montague Airport (Rohrer Field) has more activity than the Siskiyou County Airport.

Under Existing Land use Categories, discussion was held regarding timber being a land classification and that clarification needs to be made that the 588,000 acres referred to is more than likely private land that is classified as Timber Production (TPZ) because Siskiyou County has significantly more timber acreage than that.

Discussion was held regarding the percentage in the Miscellaneous category in Table 2.1 (LU-4) be further broken down so the County Supervisors would have real numbers when requesting fire resistance and salvage funds from the county or state. Also discussed was identification of acreage containing timber that may be logged in the future because the county has managerial responsibility on those acres. Mr. Gibbons said they would have to coordinate with county staff on how to identify and locate that information. Discussion was held that the information contained in the Miscellaneous category was obtained from the Assessor so further discussion with their office would be necessary.

Discussion was held that breaking down the Miscellaneous category would include wilderness, public access to federal lands, BLM, forest service, etc.

Discussion was held regarding the census and suggested modifications to boundaries.

Discussion was held regarding the definition of TPZ and that the description contained in Municode needs to be revised. Mr. Lester said any updates to the zoning could be flagged to get changed in the zoning and policy documents during the next phase of the project.

Discussion was held regarding discrepancies between Assessor parcel land uses and Planning land uses. The solution would be to look at the assessor views as taxable use on the ground compared to what the county is designating the land. Ms. Jereb added that cleaning it up has been discussed because it's a known issue. Mr. Gibbons reiterated that the Assessor data doesn't take into account federal land that is under agricultural zoning, and the tables are usually not consistent because they are analyzing different things.

Chair Fowle said he wanted to see that the General Plan and zoning are consistent in the final

document and not have different designations such as what is currently happening between the Assessor and Planning.

Discussion was held that the General Plan is applied to all Planning projects.

Chair Fowle called for a recess at approximately 10:14 a.m.

Chair Fowle called the meeting back to order at approximately 10:20 a.m.

Population, Employment, and Housing

Mr. Lester told the Commission that the chapter on Population, Employment and Housing contains data regarding who lives in the county, which you have to understand in order to plan for them. Discussion was held regarding LAFCo's role in the growth of cities.

Going back to Land Use, discussion was held regarding projecting where a city will grow. Approval from LAFCo is required to extend the sphere of influence (SOI) to ensure services are available which is done through a municipal service review (MSR). The Commission suggested that the consultants contact the incorporated cities regarding their growth plans, and Ms. Jereb said that LAFCo staff have maps from the most recent city MSR/SOI updates which were done in 2021 and were given to the consultants.

Economic and Market Analysis

Mr. Lester told the Commission that this section looks at growth industries and potential. An economic subcontractor looked at a few specific industries and prepared this section. The TAC provided some helpful comments which expanded the analysis, especially regarding the fact that the Oregon border is very close so people shop there in order to avoid paying sales taxes. He said rural counties in Northern California are projected to lose population and to not have enough housing.

The discussion returned to Population, Employment, and Housing. The Commission discussed the Comparison of Jobs to Resident Workforce reflected in Table 3.10 (POP-14) which contains data compiled in 2021 from the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS). The table reflected deficits in some job categories, and Mr. Lester said it was because there are more resident workers than jobs. Discussion was held regarding what is classified as a government job.

Discussion was held regarding obtaining more current data than 2021, and Mr. Lester said they would see if any data is available from 2022.

Regarding Population but relating to Economics, the Commission asked where the information was obtained that is contained in Figure 3.9 on page POP-19 showing a decline in county population from 2020 to 2050. Chair Fowle said he questioned the data used to come up with the forecast. Mr. Lester said they would have to talk to the subconsultant who wrote that section. Ms. Jereb added that the information was from the California Department of Finance.

Discussion was regarding housing vacancy data and that the numbers are based on recent housing element study (Table 4.6, page ECON-10). The vacancy rate is based on properties for sale or rent.

The Commission discussed the accuracy of the data source for un-insurability issues (ECON-11) and the possibility that possible third party certification may be required. Planning staff noted that the State Insurance Commission is in discussions regarding whether third-party certification is something

legal or allowable, and a clearer direction may be forthcoming in the near future.

Also, in the same paragraph under un-insurability, the Commission asked that clarification be made that fuels drive wildfires in the county and not necessarily climate change. The consultants recommended leaving the insurance language out until policies have been enacted.

Discussion was held regarding adding the topic of dam removal and how potential future severe flooding will place some communities at risk, particularly Happy Camp, and thus will relate to un-insurability as it applies to the general plan.

The Commission discussed Industry Growth Trends (ECON-12) and that the numbers in Table 4.8 don't match up in the ratio of projected decrease in population compared to decrease in employees. Discussion was held regarding information contained in Tables 4.13 (ECON-16) and 4.17 (ECON-18) showing population declining and a number of other data points on an incline. With a declining population, many of the other tables should also reflect a decline.

Mr. Lester said they would talk to the subconsultants and ask that they revise it to make the information clearer.

The Chair called for a recess at approximately 11:22 a.m.

The Chair called the meeting back to order at approximately 11:30 a.m.

Discussion was held regarding the bullet points discussing drought under Agriculture (ECON-26). The Commission requested that the differentiation between drought and state regulated drought needed to be more clearly defined and that regulated drought has had more impact than natural drought.

The Commission also requested that bullet points be added regarding elimination of overtime allowances causing a major impact on receipts from ag activity, as well as California Air Resources Board regulations and new pesticide regulations greatly impacting farms, ranches, nurseries, timber, etc.

Circulation and Transportation

Mr. Lester told the Commission that this section discusses transportation and mobility in the county such as transit services, transportation facilities, and aviation transportation facilities.

Discussion was held regarding the reduction of public transit use beginning in 2018 shown in Figures 5.10 and 5.11 (CIR-11) and whether it was related to gas prices or COVID. Staff responded that transit is heavily subsidized by the federal government and funding was removed during COVID.

The Commission requested clarification regarding the close to 300-mile increase in miles for federally maintained roads (Table 5.1, CIR-3) and what caused the increase. Discussion was held that it might have to do with new roads being put in to fight wildfires.

Biological Resources

Mr. Lester told the Commission that this section summarizes agricultural, biological, open space, scenic, mineral and forestry resources and that this chapter informs the EIR.

The Commission requested that mention be made in the Background Report regarding the fact that

Siskiyou County has the largest timber nursery in California.

The Commission requested that the consultants gather more information regarding the Williamson Act from the USDA Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service because they have more accurate information regarding acreage, crop types, and soils in Siskiyou County.

The Commission requested a definition of farmland of statewide importance, unique farmland, and farmland of local importance used in Figure 6.1 (BR-6). Land noted as farmland is actually federal wilderness. The Commission noted that the NRCS has all the vegetative soil maps.

The Commission noted there was no mention of the Trinities in the Water section (BR-7). The Trinities supply a large percentage of available water and runoff to Scott Valley.

Also, on BR-7 under the Environmental Setting, the Commission requested that the tree species be correctly designated.

The Chair called for a recess for lunch at approximately 11:59 a.m.

The Chair called the meeting to order at approximately 12:45 p.m.

The Commission requested that data regarding groundwater information for Scott Valley Basin be corrected to reflect that the basin has not decreased and that it recharges yearly (BR-7). The Commission reiterated that the Trinities need to be included in the discussion under Environmental Setting (BR-7).

The Commission also requested that the type of desert terrain be specified as high desert containing chaparral and juniper.

The Commission requested that the bank swallow and sucker be included in the Scott River habitat (BR-8).

In reference to Habitat and Wildlife Corridors (BR-10), discussion was held regarding areas that need to be considered as high travel areas for wildlife.

Discussion was held regarding Special Status Species listed on Table 6.2. The Commission requested that species that do not have habitat in Siskiyou County be removed. As to tree species, the narrative is outdated. The Commission added that there are some species that have habitat in Siskiyou County but are not listed for Siskiyou County so that needs to be corrected.

Mr. Lester told the Commission that the data came from federal and state resources. If there is a requirement that they all have to be listed, he suggested that an extra column be added to designate whether or not it is relevant in Siskiyou County.

Discussion was held regarding Forestry Resources in Section 6.8 (BR-30). The Commission requested that more current and accurate information be provided and recommended some resources to research.

Discussion was held regarding Regulatory Setting in Section 6.10 (BR-34) and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). Discussion was held that the primary regulatory body would be the local GSA so it needs to be added into the local county portion and leave SGMA at the state level.

The Commission requested that because the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District is not a regulatory body, reference to it needs to be moved to another section of the background report.

In the section regarding the California Forest Practice Act (BR-35), discussion was held regarding there being numerous additional plans available for timber harvest in addition to a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) or a Nonindustrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP). Mr. Gibbons asked that the Commission make recommendations on what to include.

Discussion was held that the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) should not be included as a regulatory agency because they are a federal form of a resource conservation district. The Commission recommended including NRCS to the same section as other resource conservation districts. The Commission requested that the Army Corps of Engineers and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration be included with federal regulatory agencies.

Cultural Resources

Mr. Lester told the Commission that this section will also inform the EIR and requested that they point out any missing information.

Discussion was held regarding including historical photographs local to Siskiyou County in the Cultural Resources section.

Discussion was held regarding listing the Native American tribes located in Siskiyou County.

Discussion was held regarding getting updated census numbers for the county's population.

Public Facilities, Services and Infrastructure

Mr. Lester told the Commission that this section discusses capacities of law enforcement, fire protection and emergency services and where their services areas are which provides the content to figure out where resources are needed and what to plan for. Healthcare, schools and child care, and parks and recreation are also included in this section.

Discussion was held regarding the Verizon data coverage map being outdated (PFSI-21). Discussion was held regarding fiber optics becoming available.

Discussion was held regarding fire protection districts and making sure all districts are listed.

Discussion was held regarding including Discovery High School and Yreka Options in the Yreka Union High School District.

The Commission requested a correction be made on PFSI-63 from Shasta Land Trust to Siskiyou Land Trust.

The Chair called for a recess at approximately 1:52 p.m.

Commissioner Melo left the meeting.

The Chair called the meeting back to order at approximately 1:57 p.m.

Safety and Hazards

Mr. Lester told the Commission that Rincon Consultants prepared this section because they specialize in this area along with environmental issues. The section discusses emergency

preparedness, response and recovery, and different hazard types such as geologic hazards, severe weather, rock falls and avalanches, floods, fires, hazardous materials. Also included in this section are noise, air quality and greenhouse gases.

Discussion was held regarding certain programs being added to this section and then cross-referenced under fire in Safety and Hazards.

Discussion was held regarding including information for geographically closer sources of water for fire fighting due to the removal of reservoirs.

The Commission requested that more descriptive information be added to Earthquake Shaking Potential Figure 9.1 (SAF-8).

Under Landslide Hazard on SAF-9, discussion was held regarding including specifics for planning processes related to geologic hazards. Discussion was held regarding modifying reference to irrigation, groundwater withdrawal, and logging causing landslides because the description seems generalized and some instances may not be applicable.

The Commission requested that the last sentence on page SAF-10 be deleted (*As climate change exacerbates the severity of wildfires and increases extreme precipitation events, landslide hazards are most likely to become more common*) because the severity of wildfires is directly correlated to excess fuels in the area and precipitation has not been extreme over the last five to 10 years.

The Commission requested that the description be clarified to reflect that some landslides are natural and some are caused by catastrophic wildfires causing unstable soil. Removal of the dams has caused increased turbidity in the rivers.

Regarding Figure 9.2 Landslide Susceptibility (SAF-11), the Commission asked that the consultants look into getting an updated map that would more accurately reflect the soil types.

Under Section 9.4 Severe Weather (Drought) (SAF-12), the Commission asked that the area be defined as a mediterranean climate and is susceptible to drought. The Commission would also like a discussion to be included in the Background Report regarding the difference between manmade and natural drought. The Commission asked that history beyond 20 years ago be used since the General Plan will prepare the county to be ready for times of drought and times of flood.

Going back to Public Facilities, the Commission requested that reference be made regarding the potential creation of water storage facilities in Scott Valley to meet the GSP through the GSA so they are not left out of the General Plan and do not become at odds because of desired infrastructure improvements for water retention facilities in the Scott Valley. This is linked to Safety Hazards but it is also linked to infrastructure.

Under Section 9.7 Fire Hazards (SAF-19), the Commission requested that a correction be made stating that fuels are the most important factor influencing wildfire hazard levels and not climate and landscape characteristics.

Discussion was held regarding recommissioning roads in order to fight wildfires. The Commission also noted that local resources are sent to fight fires in other parts of the state and they are not returned until those fires are under control. Therefore, being able to access remote areas is necessary for those limited resources that this county has available during local catastrophic wildfires.

The Commission requested that Happy Camp be added to the Wildfire History Map (Figure 9.7,

SAF-23) because that area is where a lot of fire activity has occurred over recent years.

The Commission requested that the consultants doublecheck the statement under History of Events (SAF-22) stating, *“Over the past ten years, large fires have caused significant damage to millions of acres of wildland and several Siskiyou County communities.”* The Commission believes it is probably millions of acres in the entire state but not Siskiyou County.

The Commission requested that the Antelope and Lava fires that occurred in 2021 be added under History of Events and to also add the table included in the Housing Element that lists fires and structures and acres burned in the last ten years.

Under Existing and Future Development (SAF-24), the Commission requested that fires that occurred in Siskiyou County be used as a discussion point and reference instead of the Camp Fire. For example, the Boles Fire was particularly devastating to Weed.

Under Section 9.8 Hazardous Materials (SAF-25), discussion was held that Siskiyou County no longer has a hazardous materials site, nor does the county have a site for the proper disposal of toxic products. All these materials are being transported a facility out of the county. The Commission believes this is a limiting factor in the discussion about planning, growth and development.

Under Section 9.9 Noise (Traffic, Railroad and Stationary) (SAF-28), discussion was held that the lack of a local rail spur is a limiting factor on commerce and needs to be discussed in the General Plan. Discussion was held that the noise section will need to be updated.

The Commission noted that the McCloud River Railroad and Yreka Western Railroad are permanently closed which needs to be corrected in the Background Report.

Under Section 9.10 Air Quality, the Commission would like Jim Smith and Jodi Aceves of the Siskiyou County Department of Agriculture to review this section so they can contribute language to accurately describe the county’s air quality. The air quality is generally the cleanest in the state, but previous local wildfires have caused the worse air quality ever recorded.

Under Section 9.11 Greenhouse Gas (SAF-30), Mr. Dean told the consultants he wants to include a discussion in the Background Report regarding greenhouse gas emissions from the thousands of acres of decaying trees from the wildfires. The report talks about the smoke but it does not talk about the actual breakdown and decay of the large amount of dead tree material.

The Commission said attention needs to be given to healthy forests, timber, and the ranching and farming environment that sequesters gas emissions. More onerous regulations and government caused drought limits the ability to sequester what we’re trying to prevent.

Under Section 9.12 Climate Change Effects and Impacts (SAF-30), discussion was held that this information is not accurate—use average not site specific data. A lot of burns will be prescribed, not catastrophic. Burned areas are projected to increase because of fuel mitigation. The Commission recommended speaking with CAL FIRE officials for more information regarding burn plans for Siskiyou County.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Commission requested a correction be made that the Scott River originates in the Trinities and is fed by the Trinities, the Russians and the Marbles and is known for coho and chinook. Regarding the Scott River watershed, French Creek, Shackelford Creek, Mill Creek are much larger contributors to

the Scott, more so than Indian Creek.

The Chair called for a recess at approximately 3:19 p.m.

The Chair called the meeting back to order at approximately 3:23 p.m.

Regarding the North Coast Basin Plan under 10.3 Water Quality (HYD-8), the Commission preferred that only impaired water bodies be listed because biostimulatory substances, chemical constituents, oil, grease, pesticides, radioactive sediment are not listed impairments of either the Scott River or the Shasta River.

Under Section 10.4 Water Suppliers, Treatment and Delivery (HYD-8), the Commission requested that all districts that provide water to the unincorporated areas of the county be listed.

Discussion was held regarding the Hornbrook water system being damaged as a result of wildfire but they are continuing to have problems which may or may not be drought related (HYD-9).

Discussion was held regarding revision to the language contained under Basin Setting (HYD-15). The Commission would like the consultants and planning staff to check with Siskiyou County's Natural Resources Specialist Matt Parker regarding implementation of the plan over 20 years.

Under Section 10.7 Water Management (HYD-17), the Commission would like the organizations that manage water resources to be defined and to include the Siskiyou County Superior Court. The Commission also requested that a correction be made that a permit is required to *extract* groundwater, not collect groundwater.

Under State on HYD-19, discussion was held that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife is a state regulatory entity specifically for 1600 permits.

By way of wrap up, Mr. Lester told the Commission that the Draft Administrative Background Report is available on the project website for public review through the end of June and that the public can submit comments via the website or send them to the General Plan email address.

Mr. Lester said the next step in the project will be drafting the Community Vision and Guiding Principles which will be compiled during the upcoming workshops. Discussion was held regarding dates and locations of the workshops.

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Comments:

There being no comments, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Fowle thanked the consultants for their hard work on the project.

Items for Discussion/Direction:

Miscellaneous:

- 1. Future Meetings:** The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, June 26, 2024, at 9:00 a.m.

- 2. Correspondence: None
- 3. Staff Comments: None
- 4. Commission Comments: None

Adjournment: The meeting was concluded at approximately 3:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature on file

Hailey Lang, Secretary

\jr