

CITY OF FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION
February 28, 2012 ** MEETING MINUTES **

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Nieberlein opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Roll call: Chairperson Nieberlein; Vice Chairperson Tilton, Commissioners, Peters, Hoile, Bare and Wise were present. Commissioner Muilenburg was absent and excused. Also present: Community Development Director (CDD) Belson and Assistant Planner (AP) Michelle Pezley.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

* November 8, 2011

Commissioner Hoile referred to page 5 in the last paragraph where some wording was omitted; staff stated they would make that correction. Minutes were approved as corrected.

* December 13, 2011

Minutes were approved with 2 abstentions from Commissioners Bare, and Peters as they were not in attendance at that meeting.

* February 14, 2012

The minutes of February 14, 2012 were approved with 2 abstentions from Commissioners Bare and Hoile as they were not in attendance at that meeting.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairperson Nieberlein welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated that this was an opportunity for members of the audience to bring to the Planning Commission's attention any items not otherwise listed on the agenda. Comments would be limited to 3 minutes per person, with a maximum time of 15 minutes for all items. There were no public comments

4. PUBLIC HEARING - RESOLUTION PC 12 04 CUP 03

Chairperson Nieberlein said this is a public hearing on Resolution PC 12 04 CUP 03; an application submitted by the City of Florence for a conditional use permit and design review to construct the Siuslaw Interpretive Wayside at two locations. The east wayside will be located south of Bay Street, between Waterfront Depot and Siuslaw Coffee Roasters (Map Reference 18-12-34-14 Tax Lots 700, 101 and 107). The east wayside consists of a stormwater demonstration project, pedestrian trail, bridge overlook, and picnic tables. The west wayside will be under the Siuslaw Bridge and consists of benches, seawall and a parking lot.

Chairperson Nieberlein then read the following into the record:

These proceedings will be recorded. These hearings will be held in accordance with the land use procedures required by the City and the State of Oregon. Prior to the hearing tonight, staff will identify the applicable substantive criteria which have also been listed in the staff report. These are the criteria the Planning Commission must use in making its decision. All testimony and evidence must be directed toward these criteria or other criteria in the Plan or Land Use Regulations which you believe applies to the decision per ORS 197.763 (5). Failure to raise an issue accompanied by

statements or evidence sufficient to afford the Planning Commission and parties involved an opportunity to respond to the issue, would preclude an appeal based on that issue. Failure of the applicant to raise constitutional or other issues relating to proposed conditions of approval without sufficient specificity to allow the Planning Commission to respond to the issue precludes an action for damages in circuit court. Any proponent, opponent or other party interested in a land use matter to be heard by the Planning Commission may challenge the qualification of any Commissioner to participate in such hearing and decision. Such challenge must state facts relied upon by the party relating to a Commissioner's bias, prejudgment, personal interest, or other facts from which the party has concluded that the Commissioner will not make a decision in an impartial manner.

Chairperson Nieberlein then asked if any commissioner wanted to declare a conflict of interest, bias, ex-parte contact or site visit. Chairperson Nieberlein, Vice Chairperson Tilton, Commissioners Bare and Wise all stated they had visited the site.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked if anyone wished to challenge any commissioner's impartiality; there were no challenges.

Chairperson Nieberlein opened the public hearing at 7:09 p.m. for Resolution PC 12 04 CUP 03

Staff Report

AP Pezley stated that her presentation would be reviewing the criteria, the location and existing conditions, and the proposal. She pointed out the new exhibits that were handed out that evening which would be entered into the record.

AP Pezley reviewed the criterion which was listed on page 7 of the staff report. She then referred to an aerial photo of Old Town and pointed out the location of the proposed Interpretive Wayside and gave a summary of the project description which begins on page 2 of the staff report. She said the project will give citizens an opportunity to sit down and enjoy the space.

Lighting

AP Pezley said in the staff report it is noted that there are issues with the lighting and the Planning Commission had approved other applicants with similar criteria.

Buffer

There is a buffer required; the Planning Commission could reduce that buffer as needed. There is approximately 25' between the condos and the parking lot; the standard is 15' buffer with a solid fence and staff was not recommending a fence at this time.

New Exhibits

She entered four new exhibits into the record which included a prepared resolution for their review.

- Exhibit T- letter and email from Angus Castronuevo from the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw requesting that she be notified 72 hours prior to ground disturbance.
- Exhibit U – the notice that was sent out to surrounding properties, which included a map and a list of those receiving the notification. A notice was posted on the property on each side of the wayside as well as a notice in the paper.

- Exhibit V – proposed revisions to the staff report. She noted that the commissioners did not have time to review the document; she pointed out that there was a definition used in the code differently than what the code actually requires for a structure. She read from the document, “Any temporary or permanent structure constructed and maintained for the support, shelter or enclosure of people, motor vehicles, animals, chattels or personal or real property of any kind.” The staff report originally said that there were no buildings proposed, however the observation deck and retaining wall on both sides are considered structures; therefore, the Findings have been revised to incorporate that there is structures on the proposal.
- Exhibit W: Site location map

AP Pezley said that she had received a question from Chairperson Nieberlein asking where the metal had come from that was existing on the site; she replied that the site used to be a cannery and she had been told that the metal debris were left over that use; that clarification was added into the Findings.

She referred to page 4 and said that the words, “east” and “west” were reversed on the Findings, and that correction had been made.

The applicant was proposing three street trees within the Bay Street right-of-way and that clarification was added.

Based on Exhibit T – staff was proposing new Condition of Approval that the city notifies the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw at least 72 hours prior to ground disturbance and that was incorporated into the Findings on page 53.

Staff Recommendation and Proposed Conditions of Approval – page 61

AP Pezley said staff recommendation is approval of the project with those conditions as listed in the staff report.

Questions from Commissioners

Lighting

Commissioner Wise said his concern was for the residences that they would get glare in their windows. He asked if there were residents across the street and AP Pezley said there may be a residence above the Book Store and the antique store. AP Pezley said the applicant was proposing to keep the lighting as existing in the east wayside.

AP Pezley said the Old Town Street light in front of the Bay Street condos measured at 2’ candles underneath the light and that would be the brightest light and as it goes farther it gets less and that was indicated in the applicants lighting plan.

Signs

Commissioner Wise asked if the signs were subject to Title 4; AP Pezley replied public signs were exempt from a permit in Title 4 but they would have to comply with the standards. He asked who would approve the content of the sign. CDD Belson said the sign code exempts public signs from getting a permit; she suggested asking the applicant how the signs would be designed and how they would comply with the code.

Sidewalks

Commissioner Wise noted the discussion in the report about the sidewalks near the western wayside; about them being 5' or 8' and if they were made 8' we would have to tear up a lot of work that was done in the past. AP Pezley the applicant was proposing pavers that would abut the existing sidewalks, so the sidewalk would still look the same, they would expand it with pavers.

Variance

Vice Chairperson Tilton asked about retaining the two parking spaces if they applied for a variance. CDD Belson said the applicant was willing to change what was in the report per an email discussion, they are willing to put in an 8' sidewalk and they could speak to that this evening. There would be no need for a variance. Vice Chairperson Tilton asked if they could put in an 8' sidewalk and still retain the parking spaces; CDD Belson replied, yes. She went on say that they could probably not get the full 8' up next the bridge bent, she would view that as a utility pole where you have an obstruction to work around but you have the space that would be extended out to 8'.

Condition 14

Commissioner Wise referred to Condition 14 on page 63, and the sentence, "The walkway design along the western side of the parking lot shall not prohibit the passage of vehicles," and said it implied that from the western side of the parking lot one could drive into Stillwater and asked if staff meant the eastern side. AP Pezley said he was correct that it should state, "Eastern." She noted on the map the parked car and said that was where the sidewalk would be located and that business has a parking lot and will still use the driveway approach to get to their parking lot and it was not on their property but ODOT right-of-way.

Completeness of Application

Commissioner Wise asked if there was anything staff asked the applicant to supply that they chose not to; AP Pezley referred to Exhibit Q, the completeness letter. She said the letter shows what the applicant needed to make the application complete; some items required clarification; and then there was a discussion between the applicant's narrative versus the drawing. She said they provided a revised drawing of the lighting plan that does not show a location of a restroom and they also revised the application itself to remove any wording that there would be rip rap in the west wayside. They briefly went over everything in their response to the completeness letter which is Exhibit R.

Findings of Fact

Commissioner Wise asked if the applicant had received the revised Findings of Fact, she replied, yes, they had received everything the Planning Commission received.

Buffering between Coffee Roasters

Commissioner Wise asked about the buffering between the east wayside and Coffee Roasters as it was confusing. AP Pezley replied their property line is on the eastern side of their building and there is a picnic table on the property between the Coffee Roasters building and the actual east wayside; staff replied they did not have the information on who owned the property but would supply that to the commissioners. He asked if there would be a buffer between the wayside and the empty lot; AP Pezley replied since it was a vacant piece of property and the same zoning, there was no need for a buffer.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked for any further comments from the commissioners; there were none.

Chairperson Nieberlein said the Planning Commission would be taking testimony from the applicants, proponents and opponents. Copies of the written comments received had been

distributed to the Planning Commission. She asked those testifying to sign in and state their name for the record.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked for the applicant to come forward and asked if they had read the staff report and PWD Miller replied, yes. She then asked if they understood the conditions of approval as proposed and PWD Miller replied, yes.

Applicant

Public Works Director (PWD) Mike Miller provided a PowerPoint and said he would go over the project background which had a long history, that dated back prior to 2000, when the project first started. He said late in 2007 to early 2008, the city identified the Barnett property and shifted the entire project over to two locations. The property was purchased in 2010 and the city entered into a contract with Branch Engineering in April 2011. He said the project was heavily funded by federal scenic byways monies, and federal transportation monies which are passed through to the city in federal gasoline tax. There is a small amount of local Urban Renewal money, but primarily it is ODOT and federal scenic byways and as such it will be managed, brought to bid and constructed under ODOT regulations.

Buffering Requirements

He said one of the issues with the project is the portion underneath the ODOT Bridge is the right-of-way and the condition of buffering and their requirements; buffering requirements in their opinion, do not apply to the right-of-way as it is public right-of-way. He said we have a parking lot adjacent to a neighboring parking lot; that is why they thought the buffering requirements would not be applicable; it is also an ODOT project on ODOT right-of-way.

PWD Miller referred to a slide which showed how it would be a nice public space providing opportunities for not only looking at the demonstration project and interpreting how stormwater best management practices are used, but then also providing ample opportunity for citizens to have a public gathering place overlooking the river, estuary and the bridge.

Project Timeline

The joint permit application was submitted in January 2012; because it is an ODOT project it requires an ODOT process and there is a sensitive timeline. It is a 21 week process once the plans are submitted to ODOT for them to do the review before it can go to bid. They are limited in the construction time; their permits require them to do the construction during the in water work period which is December 2012, if they miss that opportunity it puts the project off for an entire year. The project will be managed by ODOT with ODOT inspection and city involvement and expect construction could start as early as November 2012.

PWD Miller introduced to the consultants: Damian Gilbert the design lead engineer, Chris Irvin had been involved with the NEPA process and federal regulatory permitting, Carol Heinkel had been involved with the land use and City Manager Jacque Betz is representing the city, and noted that this is a high priority on the council's goals.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked for any questions of the applicant from the commissioners.

Questions from Commissioners

Right-of-Way

Commissioner Wise asked about the ODOT right-of-way under the bridge and asked if that just

meant it was their property or something other than that. PWD Miller replied right-of-way belongs to ODOT just as the highway 101 paved sections in town, and it should be treated differently than private property ownership.

NEPA Project

Commissioner Wise asked about the NEPA project and PWD Miller stated that there was a NEPA process that the city went through, we have a categorical exclusion for some of the aspects but we had go through a NEPA process which took 5 years to complete.

ODOT

Commissioner Wise asked if ODOT would select the contractors to do the work, PWD Miller replied it would be a competitive bidding project, bid through ODOT, and will advertise it. The city develops the plans and specifications, ODOT reviews it and with their criteria. He requested a slight change on Condition 1 – to add “state and federal permitting requirements.” He explained may be something that comes through that may have to be changed based upon the state’s interpretation of the project because of the way it is funded and part of it is in ODOT right-of-way.

Noise Control

Commissioner Wise asked when the construction was being done, who was responsible for noise control. PWD Miller replied it would be up to the contractor; the normal quiet time is between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. We don’t expect any nighttime work but if something needed to be done at night they would have to ask for a variance to the noise ordinance.

On-Going Maintenance

Vice Chairperson Tilton said when the project is completed is the city going to be responsible for maintenance; PWD Miller replied, yes. Vice Chairperson Tilton asked if there was some type of strategy to keep the tables and benches clean from bird droppings. PWD Miller said they were hoping that some community volunteers could be persuaded to help with the day to day maintenance, possibly adopt the park.

Tides

VC Tilton referred to the west component under the bridge in the parking lot and the highest measured tide area that goes into the parking spaces and wondered if the elevation of the parking spaces would be above the high tide levels. After reviewing the drawing it was concluded it was well above the highest tide.

Budgeted Maintenance

Commissioner Wise said there would also be physical maintenance, and asked if those would be budget items that the city will have to carry; PWD Miller replied, yes they would be incorporated into the annual budget, although he did not expect it to be very much because of the type of materials they were using have a long life.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked for anyone who wished to speak in favor of the project and to come forward and sign in.

Joshua Greene – said he had been one of the lucky few to be involved in this project from its earliest conception and had seen it morphed into this plan and was totally in favor of the project as presented. He said this would be a beautiful view shed with a beautiful interpretative center with signage.

Marianne Brisbane - said she was the owner of the Waterfront Depot and was very much in favor of the project. She said she had a few concerns because her property was adjacent to the property; and her liability as far as people coming in and going onto her property. She asked if there was anything to keep a separation from her property from people going in from the wayside. She suggested a light fence that goes with the terrain that could separate the two properties. She stated her concern about the three trees on her property and the possibility that their roots would be in the way of the project; was there something could be worked out with her regarding those trees.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked for those who were neutral who would like to address the project neither for nor against.

Susan Noble - said she was a property owner and resident in Old Town. She said she appreciated the project and was in favor, although she had two concerns. The east side of the project, there is a huge rose bush that had been there for a very long time and a fairly rare native; most of the people involved in the Old Town Association would like to preserve that rose as part of the horticultural changes that are being made. She suggested that part of it could be taken up, saving it, taking cuttings and replanting it. Her other concern was on the west side; there is only one exit and entrance to the parking area. She said that area of Bay Street is very congested; she expressed her concern about the traffic flow.

Chairperson Nieberlein then asked for anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the project to come forward, no one came forward.

Marianne Brisbane requested to add to her testimony and Chairperson Nieberlein asked her to come forward.

Marianne Brisbane – said she felt that all the activity that is going on that side of Bay Street, we have no public restroom in that area and it is a real concern to the merchants. She said it would be a great addition to add public restrooms into the project, although she knew the money was very scarce. Commissioner Wise asked if portable restrooms would be sufficient, Ms. Brisbane replied yes, but they would not be very nice looking and that was very important.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked the applicant to address some of the questions.

PWD Mike Miller went over the list of questions.

- Buffer for the wayside east between Waterfront Depot and the facility – he said there was proposed landscaping in that area. They had “jogged” the sidewalk over to the viewing area and it was a heavily vegetated area, so people will not be able to walk through it once it grows up.
- Construction activities affecting the existing trees – there will be some surface work with the sidewalk; the structure is all on pilings, which will be far enough away from the trees that it should not disrupt the tree’s root system.
- Rose bush – unfortunately it is in the middle of the stormwater demonstration project. Public works will be transplanting the rose bush down to the Gazebo park area to preserve it.
- Fencing – they are not proposing any fencing, they plan to use the vegetation for separation.
- Driveway – PWD Miller said he would have the consultant speak to that directly, but they had looked at the sight distances, the traffic volume, we would not be doing this if it was not safe. It provides a good element of parking for the project that is needed for the area.

Damien Gilbert – Branch Engineering – he said the parking area meets city development code for dimensions and they were not concerned with any of the widths. As far as the one entrance, there is not another available area for one without losing ADA spaces.

Restrict Left Turn

Commissioner Wise asked what could be done to restrict the left turning and Mr. Gilbert said that would not work as people would take the next area to turn, using driveways, backing into the street, u turn on the other side of the pier, pushing the problem somewhere else.

Restrooms

PWD Miller referred to the request for restrooms; there is no funding available, we're using every funding source they could to build the project. He said for a modest public restroom facility it would cost approximately \$¼ million to meet all the requirements. They recognize the need; there is no money available.

CM Jacque Betz: Ms. Betz said this project had been in the making for over 10 years, and the city had spent over \$400,000 on the project. The city is working with the business community to make it a good project. She thanked the planning department for an exceptional job in making it work.

Waterfront Depot

Vice Chairperson Tilton asked PWD Miller about the possible trespassing into the Waterfront Depot property, if it became a problem could the city put some type of colored wired fencing in there as a temporary measure until the vegetation really closed in? PWD Miller said if it became a problem the city would look into that at the time, possibly a split rail fence if it became a problem.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked staff if they had anything to add before the hearing was closed.

She went on to say that she had worked on this project beginning with the original request for the grant; she was happy to see it on the table that evening.

Conditions of Approval

AP Pezley referred to the resolution that was handed out that evening and the changes to the Conditions of Approval.

- PWD Miller recommended adding to Condition 1 the state and federal building codes.
- Commissioner Wise pointed out in Condition 14 is actually the walkway along the eastern side of the parking.

Chairperson Nieberlein closed the hearing at 8:25 p.m. with consent of the commissioners.

Commissioner's Discussion

Sidewalk

Commissioner Wise asked if it is a regular sidewalk. AP Pezley said for the Condition of Approval they wanted to make sure that it was clear that it should be a walkway that can be driven over; it appears from the submitted drawings the applicant is just proposing a regular sidewalk.

Stop Sign

Commissioner Wise stated his concern about the business using the ODOT right-of-way and the possible liability of someone entering the city's property and questioned if there needed to be a stop

sign on the owner's side of the property. After some discussion it was determined that there should not be a problem and a stop sign or hold harmless clause was not needed.

Biological Assessment – Traffic Flow

Vice Chairperson Tilton said he was especially pleased to see the biological assessment that showed putting in the project will improve the water quality in terms of the water going into the river; we're going to put more pavement under specific treatment for the stormwater treatment. He said in terms of the traffic, if there becomes a problem we have some ways to deal with it at that time.

Lighting Plan

Vice Chairperson Tilton said he was in favor of approving a lighting plan with lower light levels. He said we have the wording in the Conditions of Approval that if that didn't prove sufficient the PC would have 30 days to respond. He thought this project would be a benefit to Florence and would like to move ahead.

Positive Side

Chairperson Nieberlein said we often look at negative sides and we need to look at positive sides too and encouraged people to visualize what it would look like under the bridge and on the vacant lot where we will be able to see the river. She thought the little problems could be tweaked and hoped that the PC would take that into consideration.

Archeological Find

Commissioner Hoile said her concern being a tribal member that there may be a chance during the construction they would come across some archeological find, and she was pleased with the updated letters and it was noted in PWD Miller's report that there were no issues. She agreed with the concern of the lack of a restroom we need something down there. She pointed out that there is money in the community fund that someone could apply for a get some money to possibly do the restrooms. She was also concerned with the parking lot and the egress and ingress she could see a potential problem. She was glad to see this being updated and the area under the bridge cleaned up.

Commissioner Peters moved to approve the request for CUP Resolution PC 12 04 CUP 03 with the language stated in the printed resolution and the accompanying Conditions of Approval as amended. Seconded by Commissioner Bare. Commissioner Wise asked if they should review the proposed changes.

CDD Belson said they would change:

- Condition 14, the last sentence from western to eastern.
- Condition 1, to include that the drawings would be changed to meet state and federal permitting requirements.
- Adopt the Findings of Fact which are included in Exhibit A
- Adopt revisions in Exhibit V

The commissioners agreed. Chairperson Nieberlein then called for the vote, by voice 6 ayes, motion carried unanimously, (Chairperson Nieberlein, Vice Chairperson Tilton, Commissioners Hoile, Bare, Peters and Wise), it is noted for the record that Commissioner Muilenburg was absent and excused.

Chairperson Nieberlein recessed the meeting for 2 minutes.

5. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION ITEMS

Premier Landscaping Mural

Commissioner Hoile referred to Premier Landscape's mural and said she was pleased with it.

Transportation System Plan (TSP)

Commissioner Wise asked about the TSP and when would they receive the remainder of the materials. CDD Belson said it was on the project website, there was an updated community transit plan and an updated transportation system plan. Staff could print those out at the commissioner's request.

Thoroughness of that Evening's Packet

The commissioners thanked staff for the thoroughness of that evening's packet.

Thank you to AP Pezley

Commissioner Wise thanked Michelle for her January letter, as the commissioners had talked about the evolving requirements of the Planning Commission and the things that they had been asking for; letting the applicants know that so the Planning Commission could have a more productive session and he really appreciated her paying attention to that detail.

Signs at Piccadilly

Chairperson Nieberlein asked about trailers at Piccadilly and all of the signs on each trailer. CDD Belson said she did not remember how it is handled in the current code and would do some research.

Port's Site and Landscape Plan

Commissioner Wise said the last time the Port was in attendance the Planning Commission was not happy with their site and landscaping plan and he hoped that it was conveyed to them that they would like to have accurate plans. AP Pezley said she had briefly reviewed the drawings and said they were much better than the previous ones; they are also on line for the commissioners to review.

6. DIRECTORS REPORT

TSP

CDD Belson said what the commissioners do not have in the TSP at this point and hopefully will be available before the hearing, is the Findings of Compliance with the state transportation planning rule. There may be some changes to the Comp Plan policies as staff completes those findings if we need to do some refinements.

Worksession with Consultants

The worksession with the consultants will be on March 27th at 6:00 p.m. and asked the commissioners for their input on how they would like the worksession structured. She said this is a legislative matter; please feel free to discuss this with anyone there is not an issue of ex parte contact or conflicts of interest.

Land Use Issues in TSP

Commissioner Wise said it was a complex issue with a great deal of information, studies, modeling, etc. He asked if prior to the meeting staff could give the commissioners a better understanding of what land use issue needed to be considered. CDD Belson said in the Transportation System Plan, there is a chapter that identifies proposed amendments to the comp plan. Staff has not proposed any changes to the Goals, but there are proposed changes to the Policies. Those policies are definitely a land use aspect; there are also identified changes to city code which would also be land

use. There are components that will be better articulated to the commissioners in terms of more detail beyond that, what is comp plan amendment and what isn't in terms of the changes.

Comments from Public on TSP

CDD Belson was asked if staff had received comments since the public workshop, in particular, on the roundabouts. She said since the workshop staff had not received any comments on the roundabouts, the only comment she had received was on transit. Several comments from Greentrees, they want the Rhody Express to continue to stop there; staff had put a Rhody Express bus stop sign at Greentrees so there is more awareness of the Rhody Express. The other comment staff had received was the concern of speed on Rhody Drive.

Education on Intersection Safety – Signals, Roundabouts

Commissioner Wise said that he had been approached about roundabouts. CDD Belson said one of the objectives for the consultants is to assist the community start to understand the issues of intersection safety with a signalized intersection versus a roundabout; there are times when one approach is better than another. The Plan as proposed now, does not say that we want one or the other at a particular location; it's an opportunity to start that discussion as people become more informed.

She asked consultant, Carol Heinkel to come forward to give the commissioners a little more detail.

Carol Heinkel – Consultant -: She said the Comp Plan policies will look different from the ones that were initiated; staff will go through and review the Findings, there will be compliance with state law that will result in some additional policies and possible code changes and staff would make sure that is highlighted, and how those are changed. The plan itself would be adopted as a supporting document to the Comp Plan the same way all the other facility plans are; it is part of the city's public facility plan. The policies in the TSP are incorporated physically into the Comp Plan, the TSP map or a description of the general location of all of the projects. The project list, either the description of the location or the map of the location are adopted as part of the Comp Plan as well as the policies. The project list will be physically located in the TSP, but they are considered part of the Comp Plan.

9. CALENDAR

- * Tuesday, March 13, 7:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting: Public Hearing on Port's offices
- * Tuesday, March 27, 6:00 p.m. – Work Session on Transportation System Plan
7:00 p.m. – Public Hearing on Transportation System Plan

With no further business to come before the Florence Planning Commission, Chairperson Nieberlein the meeting at 10:11 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THE 20 DAY OF March 2012.


JAN NIEBERLEIN, CHAIRPERSON
FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION
04-27-2012