

## ROUTT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

### MINUTES

December 1, 2022

The regular meeting of the Routt County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with the following members present: Chairman Steve Warnke and Commissioners Greg Jaeger, Ren Martyn, Brian Kelly, Bill Norris, and Linda Miller. Commissioners Andrew Benjamin, Paul Weese, and Jim DeFrancia were absent. Planning Director Kristy Winser and staff planner Alan Goldich also attended. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

#### **MINUTES - October 20, 2022**

Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the above cited minutes, as written. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

**ACTIVITY: PL20220032**

**PETITIONER: Scott Zayatz**

**PETITION:** 1) Consolidation of eight lots to create one new lot  
2) Rezone from High Density Residential (HDR) to Mountain Residential Estates (MRE)  
3) Vacation of utility and drainage easements along interior lot lines

**LOCATION:** Lots 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55 and 56 Horseback at Stagecoach. Located approximately 500' from the wester intersection of Kickapoo Way and Pima Way.

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the consent agenda, as presented. Commissioner Miller seconded. **The motion carried 6 - 0, with the Chair voting yes.**

**ACTIVITY: PL20210004**

**PETITIONER: Tara Sanders**

**PETITION: Special Use Permit for a Gravel Pit**

**LOCATION: Approximately 3,300 ft. south/southeast of the intersection of CR 129 and CR 54**

Mr. Kent Holsinger, an attorney representing the petitioner, stated that the petition is for a gravel pit. He said that gravel pits fall under joint jurisdiction from the state and the counties. He said that in 2020 the petitioner, Ms. Sanders, purchased the 35-acre property with an existing unpermitted gravel pit that had been on the property since 2005. He stated that there is a 50 ft. highwall at the pit that is dangerous and needs to be addressed. Mr. Holsinger stated that Ms. Sanders was issued a notice of violation (NOV) from the County. An NOV from the Division of Reclamation Mining and Safety (DRMS) was also issued. He said that Ms. Sanders had always intended to bring the pit into compliance and cut down the high wall, use the gravel, and sell it off site. He said that in April of 2022 Ms. Sanders obtained a DRMS 110 permit, which allows for a gravel pit of up to 10 acres. Mr. Holsinger reviewed the DRMS permitting requirements. He stated that Ms. Sanders had originally made an application to the County for a 9.9-acre pit, but that after meeting with staff, she revised the proposal. The current proposal is to reclaim the existing pit by cutting back the highwall, as described in Phase I of the original plan submitted to the County and permitted by DRMS. He said that this revised proposal would consume approximately 4.33 acres of the 35-acre site, with an estimated disturbance area of around 2 acres. Mr. Holsinger stated that Ms. Sanders' residence is the closest residence to the pit, at 835 ft. **away. Three other residences are located between 1500 ft. and a ¼ mile from the site.** Mr. Holsinger stated that the pit is located in a natural depression and cannot be seen from any of the residences or from the County Road. He said that the operation is in compliance with state noise standards and that Ms. Sanders has agreed to limit the use of jake brakes on the haul trucks. Mr. Holsinger presented a vicinity map and aerial photo of the area, and indicated the location of the pit, the access road, and the nearby residences. He said that the access road has very little traffic and is most commonly used by Ms. Sanders. One residence is accessed via the first 150 ft. of the access road. Mr. Holsinger stated that the petitioner disagrees with staff's assessment that the access road is of insufficient width to serve the truck traffic associated with the pit.

Mr. Tony Waldron, a consultant representing the petitioner, presented photos of the existing site, the access road and the highwall. He described the original plan to mine a 9.9-acre pit on the site, with Phase I to include the reclamation of the highwall. He said that the current proposal includes only what was originally proposed as Phase I. He described the plan to cut back the highwall to create a 3:1 slope and emphasized that the most important element in reclamation is to establish geotechnical stability. He said that the best stability is achieved by cutting back to the naturally occurring base soil, which will require the removal of material. Mr. Waldron presented a site plan showing the proposed slope area. He reviewed the reclamation plan that includes the creation of a level future building site and a sediment trap. The final use following reclamation would be rangeland and pasture. Mr. Waldron presented photos from the bench above the highwall, and said that at final reclamation the area would appear much the same as the existing rangeland.

Mr. Waldron stated that the existence of the highwall is unacceptable and dangerous, and that reclaiming the site as proposed would mitigate the hazards. He said that the area must be returned to a beneficial use per the requirements of the DRMS permit. Mr. Waldron stated that Ms. Sanders has agreed to mitigate the off-site impacts and limit the scope of the operation. He added that the proposal will have no impact on water resources, presents no significant health or safety hazards, would include noxious weed mitigation and would not substantially impact wildlife.

Mr. Holsinger stated that a level 2 traffic study had been conducted for the original, larger scale proposal. He said that the study determined that it would be safer to use tandem axel trucks rather than semis, and that this would also apply to the revised proposal. He reviewed the proposed hours of operation and stated that there was never any intention to operate the pit during the winter. He also reviewed the dust mitigation plan. Mr. Holsinger emphasized that the proposed operation is for resource extraction only, which is not the same as an industrial use. No processing of material is being proposed. He stated that resource extraction is compatible with the Agricultural/Forestry (A/F) zone district. He stated that the Routt County Zoning Regulations do not limit the size of the parcel on which gravel pits are allowed, and added that the proposed use will take up less than 12% of the parcel. Mr. Holsinger reviewed the locations of other pits in the County, many of which are very close to each other. He said that the closest gravel pit to this site is 6 miles to the north. Mr. Holsinger stated that they believe that the proposal is in full compliance with the County regulations.

Mr. Goldich reviewed the application and review process for a Special Use Permit (SUP) and noted that because the application was submitted prior to the adoption of the 2022 Master Plan, it is being reviewed under the 2003 Master Plan. He stated that the original application had been for a 10-acre pit, but had been revised to a much smaller operation. He stated that it is staff's opinion that the location is not appropriate for the proposed use, and that the proposal does not represent the minimum amount of mining and disturbance necessary to reclaim the site, reduce the highwall to an acceptable slope and mitigate the offsite impacts. He stated that staff is recommending denial of the petition. Mr. Goldich stated that resource extraction is allowed with an SUP in the A/F zone district if deemed appropriate.

Mr. Goldich reviewed the history of the site. He said that Routt County Planning Department was unaware of the existence of the gravel pit when the property was owned by the previous owner, and so no enforcement action was taken until a complaint was received in 2021. At that time a cease and desist order was issued. Subsequently the applicant obtained a DRMS permit and applied for an SUP with the County. Mr. Goldich stated that in addition to the gravel pit there is a residence and several accessory structures on the 35-acre parcel, and that there are four residences within 2000 ft. of the pit. He reported that one neighbor to the west has said that the noise from the operation in 2021 was an issue. Mr. Goldich reviewed the location of the pit on a site plan and stated that it is

accessed by a 12 ft.-wide driveway. The existing highwall is approximately 50 ft. tall. He reviewed the applicant's plan to remedy this dangerous situation by mining out additional gravel to reduce the slope. He stated that the applicant proposes to remove approximately 75,000 tons or 50,000 cubic yards of material, which would take around 5,000 trucks loads (10,000 truck trips). No crushing or washing of gravel on site is proposed. Mr. Goldich said that if the petition is approved, staff is recommending a two-year term to minimize the amount of time the neighbors will have to live with the off-site impacts. He stated that Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) has recommended limiting operations to a 4.5-month period of the year. Removing the proposed amount of gravel from the site within a two year time frame would require 27 truckloads, or 54 truck trips per day.

Mr. Goldich stated that the County and the applicant share the goal of wanting to remedy the unsafe situation that currently exists, but differ in how they think this goal should be achieved. He stated that instead of cutting the highwall back and exporting additional material, the site could be reclaimed using the existing material to create a stable foundation resulting in a 3:1 slope. Mr. Goldich offered that this is not an appropriate location for a gravel pit, and that the minimum amount of mining and hauling necessary to rectify the situation should be employed. He presented a diagram of the alternate proposed reclamation plan which would be accomplished by balancing the cuts and fills with successive layers of watering and compaction. Mr. Goldich presented a chart showing the existing pits in the County. Pits that were operating prior to the adoption of zoning were not included. He noted that all of the pits have direct access to County Roads, State Highways or US 40. Haul trucks serving the gravel pits do not have to drive through any parcel not owned by the operator. The average parcel size for properties on which pits are located is 586 acres.

Mr. Goldich stated that while DRMS had issued a permit for the site, their review is limited to operations and safety; they do not evaluate or address off-site impacts. A condition of the DRMS permit requires compliance with all local permitting requirements. He stated that CPW, which had submitted comments regarding the original proposal, was contacted when the proposal was revised. CPW stated that their comments and recommendations were still applicable. The County Road and Bridge Department stated that they had no significant concerns with the traffic study which states CR 129 could handle the truck traffic, but recommended that signage be installed south of the intersection and that a bush be removed to increase sight distance. The mitigation of off-site impacts proposed by the applicant include no use of jake brakes, signage on the access road and strategic placement of stockpile to reduce noise impacts. Mr. Goldich stated that staff does not believe the placement of stockpiles to mitigate noise impacts would be possible. He added that other mitigations proposed by referral agencies include signage on CR 129 and widening the access road from 12 ft. to 22 ft. He said that widening the road could, however, have unintended stormwater and erosion impacts due to the cuts and fills that would be necessary.

Mr. Goldich stated that the application had been reviewed under the 2003 Master Plan. He said that staff has identified numerous elements of the Plan and Zoning Regulations that do not support the application. Mr. Goldich provided detailed justification concerning non-compliance with each policy and regulation.

#### Master Plan policies

- 3.3.A - Growth Center proximity - This pit is not located within the vicinity of one of the growth centers identified in the 2003 Master Plan. It is not even within the vicinity of any of the Tier 1, 2, or 3 growth centers identified in the 2022 Master Plan.
- 4.3.B. - Altering historical use - This proposal would change the historical use of the property which has been agriculture and the extraction of gravel for use on site.
- 5.1.1. and 7.3.C. - Significant safety concerns - Staff has concerns for the safety of other users of the access drive. Other users of this access have also expressed concerns. The road is only 12' wide, which is not enough room for other users or vehicles to safely pass haul traffic. Road & Bridge has recommended that it be expanded to 22', but this comes with its own concerns as expressed earlier.
- 7.3.T - Sufficient separation distance from other mines and 7.3.R. - Limitation of haul distances - The Fetcher/Vale pit is close to Clark and the Duckels pit is close to Steamboat Springs and can supply the needs of those markets. Being close to these markets limits the distance that material must be hauled. Since this pit is not within the vicinity of a growth center, it will require a larger haul distance to access those markets than the current pits. Because of this, this pit adds unnecessary heavy truck traffic to the busiest CR in the County and adds significant negative impacts to roads and the surrounding areas.

#### Zoning Regulations

- 6.1.2 - Consistency with Master Plan - The proposal is not in consistent with the Master Plan based on the policies cited above.
- 6.1.7.I and 6.10.J - Noise - The County relies on the state noise statute. Staff does not believe that the standard found in the statute, which is 55 db measured 25' from the property line, can be complied with. The property line is approximately 170' from the highwall and even closer to the area where trucks and equipment will be working.
- 6.1.7.K, 6.13.B, and 9.2.A - Land Use Compatibility - This site is surrounded by residential and agricultural uses. Based on safety and noise concerns, this use is not compatible with the surrounding land uses.
- 6.2.4.N and 9.2.B - Sufficient separation distance from other mines - Comments related to Master Plan policies 7.3.T and 7.3.R are applicable to these regulations.
- 6.2.4.Q, 9.2.F - Haul routes - There are no other ways to route haul traffic that would not have similar impacts to what is proposed.

Mr. Goldich reviewed the issues for discussion included in the staff report.

Chairman Warnke asked if it is known how much material was removed from the site, whether any sales of material were recorded, and whether sales tax was paid on those sales. Mr. Holsinger stated that they do not know how much material was removed. He confirmed that material was removed from the site under the current owner, but that the amount is unknown. In response to a question from Chairman Warnke, Mr. Waldron described the screening process through which larger rocks are removed. He distinguished this from mixing.

Commissioner Norris asked about the complaint that initiated the County's action. Mr. Goldich said that the complaint was with regard to loaded trucks leaving the site. He said that when County staff visited the site, trucks were hauling material. Mr. Goldich said that he witnessed approximately 7-8 trucks during the times he was present on CR 129 and while posting the cease and desist and that the material was hauled to the Home Ranch for use at their riding arena. Mr. Holsinger noted that the gravel pit is visible on Google Earth going back to at least 2005. He stated that this use was inherited by Ms. Sanders when she purchased the property.

Commissioner Martyn asked about the capacity of other pits in the area to supply gravel to North Routt, where there is clearly a demand. Mr. Goldich stated that the Elam pit was expanded about 5 years ago and that the Fetcher pit has approximately 325,000 tons of reserves. The Fetcher pit hauled 52,000 tons in 2021. These numbers were provided after the 2021 operating season.

In response to a question from Commissioner Martyn, Mr. Goldich stated that he is not qualified to estimate how much, if any, material would need to be removed from the site if staff's alternate reclamation plan discussed earlier were employed.

Mr. Waldron stated that DRMS has the authority to review and approve reclamation plans, and that they had approved the plan submitted as Phase I of the mining plan. He stressed that it is important that the site be reclaimed. He said that in his professional capacity he had inspected many sites, and that he has seen problems with constructed fills like the one proposed by Mr. Goldich. He offered that it is preferable to start with geotechnical stability and that this would require the removal of 50,000 cubic yards, which equals approximately 7% of the amount of material that would be allowed to be removed under the original DRMS permit. Mr. Goldich reiterated that DRMS does not address off-site impacts.

Mr. Holsinger noted that staff's calculation of 54 truck trips per day was based on the recommended permit term of two years. He suggested that a term of 5 - 7 years would be more appropriate and would reduce the impacts of the truck traffic and still allow the material to be removed in a timely manner. Mr. Holsinger stated that many of the suggested Conditions of Approval (COAs) were excessive, overly burdensome or unnecessary, and reviewed the list of COAs that concerned him. He offered that many of the suggested COAs address issues

that are pre-empted by state law. He reiterated that the proposed use is compatible with the surrounding area and is in compliance with County standards.

Mr. Goldich stated that most of the COAs with which Mr. Holsinger took exception are standard COAs that are included in almost all County permits and reflect standard County practices. He said that the conditions that were cited as duplicative because they address issues covered by the DRMS permit are not additional requirements, but simply reiterate the state's requirements. Regarding suggested COA #35, Mr. Goldich stated that flaggers would only be required under extraordinary conditions not anticipated by the traffic study. He said that it is County policy that the cost to repair road damage caused by a particular operation must be paid by the operator. Mr. Goldich said that all of the suggested COAs that were included in the staff report are on all of the gravel pit permits recently reviewed by Planning Commission. He added that there has never been any suggestion that the County's gravel pit regulations are pre-empted by state law.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Tara Sanders, the applicant, said that although she did not know the quantity, she did know that a lot of material was removed from the site prior to her purchasing the property. She said that the previous owner told her that he hauled material off site. He also told her that the County had said that if the pit were permitted, they would purchase gravel for use on the County Roads in the area. Ms. Sanders said that the previous landowner had decided not to seek a permit, but that he also told her that she was allowed to give the gravel away, but was not allowed to sell it. She said that the pit was an existing condition when she purchased the property. She said that although she did not create the pit, she is now responsible for reclaiming it. She added that she has already posted a \$40,000 bond with DRMS.

Mr. Scott Eckburg, an adjacent property owner directly to the north of the site, stated that the access road (private easement) runs through his property and that in addition to Ms. Sanders, the other easement owners include Arie Hoogendorn, Troy Brookshire and Clay Meyer. He commended staff for their thorough research and stated his support for the recommendation to deny the petition. He expressed his agreement with the reasons Mr. Goldich discussed. He cited the burdens on the adjacent property owners and noted that a letter from George Eck, the attorney representing the easement owners, was included in the fact packet. He cited specifically Section 9.2 of the Zoning Regulations, noting that the standards listed in this section are mandatory and the proposed use must comply with them or cannot be allowed. Mr. Eckburg stated that they had sought legal advice regarding the use of a residential easement for commercial gravel hauling. He said that the road is very narrow and would not accommodate two trucks passing. Mr. Eckburg stated that when he purchased the property he was assured that the illegal pit would have to be reclaimed. Regarding the need to remove material from the site, he said that he had consulted with a friend in the

excavation business who had told him that the site could be reclaimed to a 3:1 slope without removal of material, as discussed by Mr. Goldich. He added that he had discussed the issue with representatives of DRMS, who said that their concerns are with safety and operations, and that permits of this type are not difficult to obtain. DRMS confirmed that counties regulate most issues regarding gravel pits. DRMS stated that the reclamation of the highwall is very important. Regarding the use of the road, Mr. Eckburg stated that all of last winter the road was only open to his property and the Meyers property. He said that the Sanders property is primarily accessed via a different road. He added that the illegal gravel pit is directly on the shared property line with his property.

Mr. Clay Meyer, an owner of the easement, indicated the location of his property on a site plan. He stated that he accesses his property from the private easement from CR 129. He noted that the traffic study did not address the private access road, it only addressed CR 129. He stated that his mailbox, at the intersection of the private easement and CR 129 has been hit twice. He said that if he is leaving his property and a truck is attempting to enter the access road, traffic will back up on CR 129. Mr. Meyer also noted that the haul trucks from the pit would not pass Ms. Sanders' residence, but would pass his. He said that she also has an alternative access to CR 129. Mr. Meyer said that noise from the pit is an issue and that the loaded truck coming down the steep road cause the windows in his home to vibrate.

Mr. Arie Hoogendorn, and adjacent property owner, indicated his property on a site plan. He said that the access road was created after he purchased his property in 2006. It was originally created as a trail to accommodate horses and then became a two-track.

Mr. George Eck, an attorney representing the interests of the Eckburg, the Meyer, the Brookshire and the Hoogendorn properties, noted that he had submitted a letter detailing the reasons that the petition should be denied. He noted that an SUP requires the highest level of review, and that to merit an SUP a proposal must meet the code requirements. He noted that staff had presented a list of over a dozen elements of the Master Plan and Zoning Regulations that this proposal cannot meet. He stated that staff had also presented a reasonable alternative for reclaiming the site without removing material and without causing undue impacts on the neighboring properties.

Regarding the signage proposed by the applicant, Mr. Troy Brookshire stated that as far as he knows the County will not allow signage within the County Road right-of-way and he has not been contacted regarding placing signage on his property. He asked where the signage would be located. He said that the 12 ft.-wide access road is inadequate to accommodate gravel trucks and offered that the County had never permitted a gravel pit with a 12 ft.-wide access road. He noted that the Road & Bridge Department had recommended that the road be widened to 22 ft., which would require a great deal of cut and fill. He stated that the slopes associated with widening the road would also have to be graded to



reasonable slopes and the additional cuts and fills would increase the erosion and exacerbate what is already a bad situation. Mr. Brookshire stated that the only gravel on the existing road, which used to be a two-track jeep trail, is minimal and was applied by the previous landowner. He said that the road is not adequate to handle loaded gravel trucks and would be un-useable for others if it is used for haul trucks.

Mr. Del Look described the gravel that is available at the Elam pit and stated that it is unsuitable for many applications. He said that there is demand for gravel in North Routt. He offered that the terracing of the highwall, which was a sheer wall when Ms. Sanders purchased the property, makes it look taller than it is.

Hearing no further comment, Chairman Warnke closed public comment.

In response to a question from Chairman Warnke, Mr. Holsinger confirmed that the applicant had posted a reclamation bond with DRMS. The amount of the bond was calculated based on an estimate of what it would cost to reclaim the site. Mr. Waldron stated that the bond is based on the maximum amount of disturbance allowed under the permit, so the bond is more than adequate to cover the current situation.

Mr. Goldich stated that landowners are responsible for all activities that take place on their property, whether they created the situation or not. Regarding the County's willingness to purchase gravel from the site, he stated that this offer was contingent upon the property owner obtaining an SUP for the use. He stated that the only permit that would be needed to reclaim the site if no material is removed, would be a Grading & Excavation Permit. An SUP is only required if material is removed from the site. Regarding the details of the reclamation, Mr. Goldich stated that a civil engineer's opinion would be needed to determine if the reclamation could be accomplished without removing any material. If some material must be removed, then the applicant could re-apply for an SUP specifically for that.

Mr. Holsinger stated that Mr. Waldron's opinion is that the best way to reclaim the site is to cut back the highwall, which would require removal of material. He stated that Ms. Sanders has every right to use the access road within the terms of the easement.

### **Roundtable**

Commissioner Martyn stated that he agrees Ms. Sanders has the right to the use the easement, but offered that it would be different if she were the only user of the road.

Chairman Warnke, noting that the highwall must be reclaimed, offered that the question is whether this is an appropriate location for a commercial gravel mining operation.

Commissioner Norris offered that if no material leaves the site, there would be no sales. He expressed concern with the adequacy of the access road.

Commissioner Kelly asked if the issue is with selling the material or with taking it off site. Mr. Goldich said that the issue is with taking it off site. No SUP would be needed if all the material remains on the site.

Commissioner Jaeger stated that gravel pits are allowed in the A/F zone district only where they are determined to be appropriate. Citing the noise, the truck traffic, and access road, he stated that a gravel pit in this location is not compatible with the surrounding land uses.

Commissioner Miller stated her agreement with Commissioner Jaeger, and added that she does not feel that the additional gravel trucks on CR 129 would be safe for other users, citing the amount of recreational use and agricultural use there is on that road. She added that gravel trucks on the private access road would not be safe for the other users of the easement. She stated that the proposed use is not compatible with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Kelly noted that there is no shoulder on this section of CR 129. He said that the road is dangerous already, without the additional gravel trucks, and cited the significant amount of recreational traffic on the road. He said that although he sympathizes with the applicant, who did not create the situation, he is confident that if a proposal for a gravel pit in this location, without the history of this site, were to come before the County, it would be denied.

Commissioner Martyn offered that it remains unknown if the site can be properly reclaimed without removing material from the site. He added that there is demand in the area for gravel, and that there would be gravel trucks traveling on CR 129, regardless, to fill that demand in North Routt.

Chairman Warnke agreed that there will be truck traffic on CR 129, and there is high demand for gravel in North Routt, but stated that this is not an appropriate location for a gravel pit. He agreed that if an application for a pit on this site were to come in fresh, it would not be approved. He stated that the ultimate goal is to reclaim the site and eliminate the highwall. He said that the bond for this work has already been posted, and this work can be accomplished without gravel leaving the site.

Chairman Warnke reviewed the topics for discussion listed in the staff report. There was consensus that the location is not appropriate for the use, and the use is not compatible with the surrounding uses. Chairman Warnke offered that whether the proposed mine plan presents the minimum amount of mining and hauling required to make the site safe was too technical a question for Planning Commission to answer. There was consensus that this pit is not within the vicinity of a designated growth center. Chairman Warnke offered that the issue of CR

129 and the impact of additional truck traffic had already been thoroughly discussed.

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Kelly moved to deny item PL20210004, a request of an SUP for a gravel pit, with the following findings of fact:

1. The proposal does not comply with the following policies of the Routt County Master Plan:
    - a. 3.3.A - Growth Center proximity
    - b. 4.3.B - Altering historical use
    - c. 5.1.1 and 7.3.C - Significant safety concerns
    - d. 7.3.T - Sufficient separation distance from other mines
    - e. 7.3.R - Limitation of haul distances
  2. The proposal does not comply with the following standards of the Routt County Zoning Regulations:
    - a. 6.1.2 - Consistency with Master Plan
    - b. 6.1.7.I - Noise
    - c. 6.1.7.K, 6.13.B, and 9.2.A - Land Use Compatibility
    - d. 6.10.J and 9.2.B - Sufficient separation distance from other mines
    - e. 6.2.4.N, 6.2.4.Q, 9.2.F - Haul routes
  3. The application does not represent the minimum amount of mining and hauling necessary to achieve a safe site.
- Commissioner Norris seconded the motion.

**The motion carried 6 - 0, with the Chair voting yes.**

### **ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

Ms. Winser stated that there would be no meeting on December 15th.

Ms. Winser reviewed the recent approval of the Snow Country Nursery application by the Board, following an agreement between the applicant and the City regarding the location of an easement for the Core Trail.

Planning Commission reviewed the existing remote attendance policy, which was crafted to accommodate remote participation during COVID-19. There was also a discussion of moving toward paperless meeting materials.

Ms. Winser stated that two responses to the RFP for a consultant to assist with the revision of the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations had been received. She stated that a committee would be formed to interview the firms. She added that she would send out the two proposals and would welcome comments.

**The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.**