ITEM 1-1
SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENTS TO THE 1985 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS A RESULT OF CHANGES IN STATE PLANNING LAW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMA Requirement</th>
<th>Pre-GMA Req.</th>
<th>1985 Plan &amp; Ordinance</th>
<th>1997 GMA Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan With Mandatory Elements Is The Standard For Land Use</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plans were merely a general guide for land use actions. No requirement that ordinances be consistent with and carry out the Plan.</td>
<td>1985 Plan did not have adopted implementing ordinances; accordingly, the Plan could not be a factor in land use decisions. The zoning code in use pre-dated the 1985 Plan; its principal permitting mechanism was by Special Use permit with no plan guidance.</td>
<td>The Land Use Map, policies, goals and actions of the Plan will be implemented by ordinance prepared and adopted to carry out the Plan provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Plan must be internally consistent, i.e., mandatory plan Elements must function as a whole</td>
<td>No requirement that Plans be internally consistent</td>
<td>Plan Elements were discrete, little or no integration as a functional whole</td>
<td>The 1997 Plan Elements are integrated and internally consistent, e.g., the Capital Facilities Plan carries out issues addressed in the land use Element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination With Other Plans</td>
<td>No requirement that Plans among cities and county be consistent.</td>
<td>No integration between the county’s 1985 Plan and City Plans, integration attempted on a project by project basis</td>
<td>Adopted Countywide Policies apply to all Plans within Benton Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating New Development: Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) Based Upon Population Projections</td>
<td>No requirement to have UGAs, or to base them on any rational criteria.</td>
<td>1985 Comp Plan had UGAs but without identifiable basis. Plan had no authority, UGAs meant little or nothing</td>
<td>Interim UGAs adopted in 1994. City of Prosser's made Final in 1987. This Plan finalizes UGAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designate city UGAs based on OFM pop. projections. No annexations or city services outside of UGAs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMA Requirement</th>
<th>Pre-GMA Req.</th>
<th>1985 Plan &amp; Ordinance</th>
<th>1997 GMA Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Development Standards for UGAs</td>
<td>No requirements for city-county co-ordination on development inside UGAs</td>
<td>The Plan did not have adopted development standards</td>
<td>This Plan requires that joint standards be prepared as part of implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties and city to develop &quot;joint&quot; development standards for within UGAs</td>
<td>No requirements for city-county co-ordination on development inside UGAs</td>
<td>The Plan did not have adopted development standards</td>
<td>This Plan requires that joint standards be prepared as part of implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate and Protect (Mineral Lands) and Conserve (Agricultural Lands) By Regulation</td>
<td>This requirement did not exist</td>
<td>Lands in or suitable for commercial agriculture were designated Ag. in the adopted 1985 Plan Map; min. parcel size was 20 and 10 acres. No ordinance provisions existed to carry out the designation. Known mineral resources sites were mapped, but not protected by policy or reg.</td>
<td>With minor changes, the area designated as Ag. in the 1985 Plan Map is so designated Ag. by ordinance (1994). With notable exceptions, the GMA Ag. Ordinance restricts uses to those which are related, supportive or not incompatible w/ ag. Mineral resources are mapped, and protected by ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Element Required For County Plans</td>
<td>No distinctions made between rural and urban or city and county roles. No requirement for a Plan component that reflects rural residents interests re: land use and community. No Rural Element. No real land use or density distinctions between county and city lands existed. All rural lands open for urbanization and annexation.</td>
<td>No Rural Element. No real land use or density distinctions between county and city lands existed. All rural lands open for urbanization and annexation.</td>
<td>Urban Growth Areas based upon population projections direct where annexations can/cannot occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties are regional service providers responsible for rural areas. Cities provide municipal services for urban development to accommodate population growth. Counties must include a Rural Element with rural densities and land uses on lands outside of Urban Growth Areas and Agricultural Lands designations in their Comp. Plan</td>
<td>No distinctions made between rural and urban or city and county roles. No requirement for a Plan component that reflects rural residents interests re: land use and community. No Rural Element. No real land use or density distinctions between county and city lands existed. All rural lands open for urbanization and annexation.</td>
<td>No Rural Element. No real land use or density distinctions between county and city lands existed. All rural lands open for urbanization and annexation.</td>
<td>Urban Growth Areas based upon population projections direct where annexations can/cannot occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Critical Resources (Aquifer Recharge Areas, Frequently Flooded Areas, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas, Geologically Hazardous Areas)</td>
<td>No requirement to protect these Excellent mapping and designation of such</td>
<td>1997 Plan uses maps and data from the 1985 Plan.</td>
<td>Excellent mapping and designation of such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA Requirement</td>
<td>Pre-GMA Req.</td>
<td>1985 Plan &amp; Ordinance</td>
<td>1997 GMA Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under GMA or not must designate and protect by ordinance &quot;Critical Resources&quot; by 1993.</td>
<td>resources.</td>
<td>resources, no regulations for biological and aquifer resources, some regulations in BC Code re; flood and geologic hazard areas.</td>
<td>Plan augmented by areal photos and new data to designate; &quot;functions and values&quot; of critical resources identified in this plan and protected by ordinance adopted in 1994.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability of Transportation System Capacity For New Development

- That jurisdictions identify and maintain a Level of Service (LOS) for transportation system components e.g., roads, transit, etc. A requirement that LOS stay "concurrent" with new transportation demands from new development, i.e., that deficits in LOS not be allowed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No requirement for LOSs or &quot;concurrency&quot;</th>
<th>No designated LOS, no system for maintaining concurrency.</th>
<th>LOS of C designated for &quot;major county collectors&quot;; LOS to be monitored and maintained within the Six Year Road Program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### State Compliance

- State agency projects and actions must comply with Local Comprehensive Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No requirement for State Agency compliance.</th>
<th>No recognition of need for state compliance</th>
<th>State agencies must comply with the 1997 Comp. Plan once it is certified by the State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ITEM 1-2

AMENDMENT PROCEDURES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Procedures to be among those included in an Ordinance enabling Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

PLAN AMENDMENT CYCLE

Frequency of Amendments
The conclusion of an amendment cycle shall occur annually unless no amendments are proposed; amendments denied can be resubmitted no sooner than in the third year from the date of denial. Amendments to Final Urban Growth Areas will be cycled only once every 5 years. Amendments do not constitute emergencies (i.e., an immediate threat to life or property for which action must be taken to alleviate the threat).

Amendments As Legislative Actions
Proposed amendments must be those proposals which fall clearly under "legislative" rather than "quasi-judicial" actions directly or indirectly. Quasi-judicial actions are for development proposals and are governed under the new and specific requirements of HB 1724 (regulatory reform bill). Legislative actions are not project related.

Linking To Budget
The conclusion of a Plan Amendment Cycle should be concurrent with the development of the county's annual budget, and capital facilities deliberations, so that the adoption of Plan amendments precedes budget adoption by no less than 30 days. The Amendment cycle should end with Board of Commissioners action by September 1 of each year, which means the Board must receive the amendment package for review by July.

Timing Of The Cycle
Once amendments in a cycle are "initiated" by the Planning Director (i.e., SEPA notice issued in preparation of preparing a staff report) the noticing requirements, SEPA review, planning analysis and public hearings procedures for Plan Amendments may take from 6 to 9 months to complete. Accordingly, Amendments must be "initiated" by January 1, which means they must be submitted for "docketing" a minimum of 30 days before that (December 1).

Steps of the Cycle
Docketing of Suggested Amendments
- Planning Dept. keeps list of amendment suggestions/requests with names and addresses of sponsors.
- Amendments can be proposed "in-house" by the Planning Commission, Economic Development Coordinator, Board of Commissioners, and Planning Director, or any
owner of property in unincorporated Benton County for his/her property, or any resident of unincorporated Benton County supported by 10 signatures of unincorporated Benton county residents, or any general or special purpose government or district.

➢ In September of each year, the Planning Dept. places legal notice in local print media of the approaching deadline for the submittal of amendment requests.

• In January of each year, the Planning Director initiates review by noticing the proposal and SEPA review.

• For each proposed amendment the Planning Department integrates SEPA/EIS and Staff Report with Recommendation to the Planning Commission.

• Planning Commission conducts at least one public hearing and forwards a Recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

• Board of County Commissioners conducts at least one hearing to consider and act upon the Planning Commission recommendation.

• Implementation

Applications For Amendments
Applications must be submitted in writing and include the following:

1) a fee (as set by the Board of Commissioners)

2) Responses to the following:
   a. Description of the requested Plan Amendment;
   b. An explanation of why the amendment is being proposed including specific areas needing changes;
   c. If appropriate, the proposed amendment should include amendatory language; and
   d. An explanation of how the criteria in 3 (below) are met by the proposal:

3) Criteria against which the proposed amendment must be evaluated and found to be in substantial compliance for approval:
   a. An amendment is necessary to resolve inconsistencies within the County Comprehensive Plan, or with other city plans or ordinances with which the county has no objection;
   b. Conditions have so changed since the adoption of the county plan or ordinances that the existing adopted provision is inappropriate;
   c. The proposed amendment is consistent with the overall intent of the goals, map, and Rural Element of the county plan;
   d. The proposed amendment is consistent with Chapter 36.70A RCW, the County-wide Planning Policies, and Plan policies;
   e. For an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Map, the proposed designation is adjacent to property having a similar and compatible designation, or the subject property is of sufficient size, or other conditions are present, to locate development or otherwise mitigate potential incompatibilities to insignificant levels;
   f. Environmental impacts have been disclosed and measures imposed to either avoid or mitigate said impacts;
g. Potential ramifications of the proposed amendment to other Comprehensive Plan Elements and supporting documents have been considered and addressed;

h. As appropriate, where an amendment of the Comprehensive Plan is approved by the Board of Commissioners, and a subsequent rezone or amendment to development regulations is required, the planning commission may consider them and make recommendations to the Board for consideration concurrent with the final approval of the comprehensive plan amendment.
ITEM 1-3

CHRONOLOGY OF PLANNING AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS IN BENTON COUNTY

PRE-PLAN
1938 - Benton County Planning Commission established.
1946 - First Benton County Zoning Ordinance adopted.
1959 - Planning Enabling Act passed by State Legislature.
1961 - Benton Regional Planning Commission established.
1965 - Comprehensive Plans for the Urbanizing Areas of Benton County, Washington prepared by the Benton Regional Planning Commission.
1966 - Benton-Franklin Governmental Conference established.

1967 PLAN
1967 - Benton County Board of Adjustment established. County Comprehensive Plan adopted.

1985 PLAN
1977 - Planning staff hired to prepare Comprehensive Plan. County divided into six citizen advisory committee planning areas. Citizen steering committees established in each area. Over 50 citizen involvement meetings held with these groups to formulate the Plan framework including goals and policies.
1978 - Complete resource inventory and mapping of the County conducted.
1979 - Citizen advisory committees reactivated. Over 40 citizen workshops held to evaluate the results of the resource inventory. Over 1500 citizen attitude surveys mailed out to strengthen the Draft Plan's responsiveness to citizen concerns. Meetings held with cities and other public and semi-public agencies to ensure Plan coordination. County Planning Commission meetings held throughout the year to provide framework and guidelines for Plan development process.
1982 - Final series of public hearings on the Draft Plan held by Planning Commission. Final revisions made in preparation for approval of Draft Plan and recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners for adoption.
1983 - Board of County Commissioners public hearings on the draft plan held. Revisions made to the draft plan and then transmitted back to the Planning Commission for final consideration.

Citizen Involvement 1985 Plan
Citizen involvement was the keystone of Benton County's plan development process. In 1977 citizen steering committees were established to develop goals and policies, a second series of more than forty (40) meetings was held with six citizen advisory committees representing seven different planning areas to evaluate the results of the staff resource inventory in 1979, and continued through the Countywide public hearing process that has accompanied the more formal adoption stages of
the process. Over 1500 citizen attitude surveys were completed in 1979. Over the course of 50 meetings the citizen committees developed the Plan framework including goals and policies. Over 700 copies of the Preliminary Draft Comprehensive Plan were distributed.

Meetings and communications with affected agencies such as the cities within the county were conducted in order to coordinate Plan provisions with the plans and policies of other agencies to the extent feasible.

The preliminary Draft Comprehensive Plan was completed and printed in March, 1980. Public hearings on the document were held in each of the six citizen advisory committee planning areas. County Planning Commission workshops were held to evaluate the results of the public hearings and to identify needed refinements.

In August 1980, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Preliminary Draft Plan was completed and distributed. In September of that year, a public hearing was held on the Draft E.I.S., and in March 1981, the Final E.I.S. was completed and distributed. During 1981 the Draft Plan was revised to incorporate changes that evolved out of the public hearings and workshops and to include background elements (Housing, Population, Public Facilities and Services, etc.). The resulting revised Draft Plan was reviewed by the Planning Commission in a series of workshop sessions. Following these review sessions, the Planning Commission held additional public hearings on the revised draft.

The Planning Commission held final review workshops, approved the Draft Plan and forwarded it to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation the Board adopt the Plan as a Final. The Plan was adopted by the Benton County Board of Commissioners in 1985.

In 1987 changing economic conditions within the county and a new Board of Commissioners resulted in a decision not to adopt implementing ordinances for the adopted 1985 Comprehensive Plan. Upon the advice of County Counsel, the Plan was afforded the status of an informational item and land uses decisions within the county were controlled by the 1967 Zoning Code, which was markedly different and inconsistent with the 1985 Plan.

THE 1997 PLAN

Summary of Chronology

The Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act in 1990. Under the Act it was mandatory for counties of a certain population size or growth rate (10% over the last 10 years) and their cities to prepare Comprehensive Plans per its provisions. Counties that did not meet these criteria were not required to plan, but could "opt in" in order to receive planning grant monies from the state.

Benton County was not required to plan, as its population size and growth rate did not meet the criteria in 1990. However, at the suggestion of some of its cities the Board of County Commissioners polled the mayors and city councils of all five cities (Prosser, Benton City, West Richland, Richland, Kennewick). The response was unanimous that the county should opt in to the GMA planning program, which it did in October of 1991 (in 1993 the county's growth rate exceed 10% for the decade and would have been mandated into the program were it not already in).
In 1991, the county initiated the formation of a Growth Management Act Committee (GMAC) comprised of representatives from the County, all cities within the County and the Regional Council. The committee was to coordinate the initiation of the GMA planning program locally. The County would the coordinate actions of the GMAC.

Assessment of Local Comprehensive Plans
The GMAC's first order of business was to prepare requests for proposal (RFP's) to select a consultant to do an assessment of local plans and identify what needed to be accomplished in each jurisdiction to meet the requirements of GMA. The County administered the contract and performed liaison between GMAC and the consultant. The consultant was hired, performed its contract and was released in 1992. All local plans were found to be deficient relative to the requirements of GMA. Each of the jurisdictions then began preparing its plan with direction from the consultant's analysis.

The county assisted the small cities of Prosser, Benton City and W. Richland in the hiring and management of a small cities "circuit rider" planner to do their comprehensive plans; the cities of Richland, Kennewick and the county proceeded to plan with "in-house" capabilities.

Amendment to GMA (1992)
In 1991 REHSB 1025 was passed by the legislature to amend the GMA. Significant additional planning requirements within 1025 were that: the cities and counties had to prepare and adopt "Countywide Planning Policies" by a date certain per a "collaborative structure" outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by all parties; that "joint development standards for inside UGAs had to be adopted by cities and counties; that "interim" Urban Growth Areas had to be adopted by a date certain, that the legislative date by which Critical Resources and Natural Resource Lands had to be designated and protected by regulation was extended to a date certain, and that all cities and counties had to accomplish this whether or not they were planning under GMA.

Countywide Planning Policies (1993)
RESHB 1025 required that the county and cities prepare and adopt countywide planning policies which would provide a legitimate policy framework within which each planning jurisdiction could proceed with its own plan, yet for essentially cross-jurisdictional planning issues (e.g., road networks and standards, transit and other public services), do so "in synch" with and complementary to adjacent jurisdictions.

In 1992-93, the GMAC acted as staff to a Countywide Planning Policy Committee (BCPC) consisting of elected officials from each of the cities and the county. Over the course of approximately 1 year, at 24 public meetings the BCPC drafted and approved for submittal to the legislative bodies of each jurisdiction, a package of 21 Countywide Planning Policies. By February 1993, the Benton Countywide Policies were approved by all the jurisdictions, and as required, submitted to the state. The Countywide Planning Policies are included in Appendix 4-1 of this document. Their principle use is to guide land use related decisions and actions requiring coordination and integratration of cross-jurisdictional and multi-jurisdictional issues.

Critical Resources and Natural Resources Lands 1993-95)
For the process of designating, and protecting by regulation Critical Resources and Natural Resource lands, an Agricultural Advisory Committee and a Critical Resources Advisory Committee were formed. To designate these resources (i.e., identify by map) the adopted designations in the 1985
plan were used as the principal data base, with minor modifications they were verified and approved by the advisory committees (the research and mapping for the 1985 plan was excellent, there was no advantage to repeating the effort for the 1997 plan). Each of the committees worked with county staff over the course of a year in public workshops to prepare draft ordinances for public review, then hearings and action by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) 1994
GMA requires each city to propose an urban Growth Area to the county, and for the county to approve an Urban Growth Area for each city after consultation with the city. Lands within Urban Growth Areas are committed to urban development and eventual annexation and regulation by the city, cities prepare and finance their capital facilities and transportation plans based upon the lands within their UGAs. The county adopted an Interim Urban Growth Area (IUGAs) for each city in 1994.

Because the cities themselves did not conduct public meetings for their proposed inclusion of unincorporated lands within their Urban Growth Areas, the county held a series of public meetings and public hearings for each city's proposed IUGA. To the extent practical, public meetings and hearings on a UGAs were held within the community at issue. Testimony and dialogue at these meetings was intensive and prolonged. By July of 1994 after 19 meetings and hearings, the county had approved by ordinance an IUGA for each city, and in the process had reduced the densities outside the IUGAs to "rural" (i.e., either 1 unit per 2.5 acres or 1 unit per 5 acres), rather than the previously allowable "urban" densities. The UGAs for each city, and the rural densities outside of UGAs is shown on maps 4-1 thru 4-5, Chapter 4.

Rural Element
As with the development of the 1985 Comprehensive Plan, full public participation and involvement was a cornerstone of the new planning process. In 1991, 3600 rural surveys were sent to rural residents countywide in 1992; over 800 were returned, from which the responses were tabulated and circulated in report form. Rural Citizen Planning Committees were formed in each of five rural planning areas; an outside consultant was contracted to do "visioning" goals, objectives and plan mapping with each of the committees; the results of the aforementioned rural survey were presented to each committee for verification. Planning staff worked with each committee at open public workshops held in the community from late 1992 to mid-1996 assisting each committee in the formulation of its community plan, plan map, and supporting text. The Rural Element (Chapter 6) of the document represents the work and consensus of each of these committees over a 4 year period extending from 1992 to 1996.

The chronology of the current Benton County's planning process is outlined below. As the planning process moved forward, new requirements per amendments of GMA as well as the need for the county to begin coordinating with USDOE-Richland on Hanford Comprehensive Planning issues who interjected themselves into the process, these events appear in the chronology.

Events and Milestones In The Chronology Of The 1997 Plan
- With consensus of the cities, opt in to the GMA planning process 10/91
- Obtain consultant for assess current city and county plans for consistency with GMA
  - Review Consultant proposals GMAC 3/8/91
  - Select for Interview GMAC 3/15/91
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- Interview                      GMAC  3/27/91
- Select Consultant              GMAC  3/26/91
- Enter contract for service     Co.   4/8/91
- Meet with consultant           GMAC  4/16/91

• Administer Contract            Co.   4/8/91
  - In-house data collection for consultant
  - Meetings and coordination with consultant
  - Review first report/meet with consultant and GMC
  - Review second report/meet with consultant and GMC  6/10/91
  - Review third and final report (Draft)  6/28/91
  - Coordinate presentation by consultant to each jurisdiction  7/12/91
  - Contract services completed

• Products Completed and/or adopted after Consultant Report
  - Draft modifications of existing Comp. Plan Policies (GMA sec 6.)  8/15/91
  - Detailed Work Program for the Comprehensive Plan Program (for county and small cities)  12/91
  - "Collaborative Structure" and MOU per RESHB 1025 (joint adoption,sent to DCD on 11/18/91)  11/18/91
  - Interlocal Agreement for Circuit Rider Planner (joint adoption)  1/21/92
  - Advertised for and hired Circuit Rider Planner for 3 small cities  2/92
  - Multi Year Regional Strategy (joint adoption)  1/21/92
  - Prepare Hanford Remedial Action EIS Comprehensive Plan Strategy  12/91
  - Draft Agricultural Ordinances and Preliminary Maps  12/91
  - Critical Areas Overlay Map (draft)  11/91
  - Critical Areas "in-house" draft ready for Advisory Comm. work  4/92
  - Re-advertise for and rehire Circuit Rider Planner  7/92
  - Mineral Resources Ordinance (draft)- Definitions for Ordinances  1/91
  - Draft Policies from the BCPC re: RESHB 1025  3/92
  - Establish Agricultural Advisory Committee to review Draft Ag. Ord.  12/92
  - Received 20 yr. pop. projection from OFM (have BCPC policy re: allocation of projections among jurisdictions within county)  2/19/91
  - OFM 20 yr. pop. projections allocated per County-wide Pol.  06/92
  - Schools, Public Facilities inventories/data collection  06/92
  - Land use inventory, per assessors records  9/92
  - Draft Crit Areas Ord. completed by CADV and sent to public  11/92
  - Public meeting on draft Crit Ord.s commence  11/92
- 3600 GMA Rural Surveys sent out to rural residents 10/92
- 800+ completed surveys returned 11/92
- Temporary help hired to enter survey data on data pgm 12/92
- Hanford Future Uses Work Group completes Report 12/92
- Per capita land use needs calculated for Prosser, Benton city W. Richland and Kenn. per County-wide Policy formula 10/92
- Kenn., Prosser, W. Richland reviewing draft UGA’s 12/92

• Hanford Site
  - Overflight of County and Hanford 3/19/91
  - Meet with WHC and DOE Representative and Tour Hanford 3/21/91
  - Update meeting with DOE 9/17/91
  - Prepare HRA/EIS Comprehensive Plan Program Strategy 10/15/91
  - Meet with DOE facilitator, Martha Bean 11/12/91
  - Meet with DOE facilitator, Martha Bean 1/06/92
  - Participate in Hanford Future Uses Study to 12/92

• GMA Public Meetings and Presentations
  - County Planner at Benton County Planning Commission 4/16/91
  - County Planner, GMC at Kennewick City Hall 4/18/91
  - County Planner at Prosser Riverview School 4/25/91
  - County Planner at Prosser Economic Development Assoc. 5/13/91
  - County Planner at Benton City Council 6/18/91
  - GMC at Kennewick City Hall (Critical Areas Mapping) 6/27/91
  - County Planner, GMC Canal Annex 7/8/91
  - County Planner, Benton City Council (survey assist) 7/10/91
  - County Planner, meet w/B.C. P.C. re: land use inventory 7/26/91
  - County Planner, GMC Kenn. City Hall (consultant) 7/11/91
  - County Planner, Prosser Planning Commission 7/16/91
  - County Planners meet w/Kenn. Planners 7/29/91
  - County Planner, GMC at Canal Annex 8/6/91
  - County Planner, consultant Prosser City Council 8/6/91
  - County Planner, GMC meet w/OFM 8/7/91
  - County Planner, consultant @ Benton City Council 8/12/91
  - County Planner, consultant @ BOCC 8/13/91
  - County Planner, BOCC 8/19/91
  - County Planner, Benton County P.C. 8/20/91
  - County Planner, @ W. Richland P.C. 8/29/91
  - County Planner, Regional Growth Mgmt Comm. 9/9/91
  - County Planner, Benton City Work Shop 9/10/91
  - County Planner, Kenn. C.C. on 1025 9/17/91
  - County Planner, Benton City C.C. on 1025 9/17/91
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- County Planner, W. Richland Chamber of Commerce on GMA 9/18/91
- Planning Staff, Benton City Council, Adopt Collabor. Structure 10/01/91
- Planning Staff, Kennewick City Council, Adopt Coll. Structure 10/01/91
- Planning Staff, Richland City Council, adopt Coll. Structure 10/07/91
- Planning Staff, W. Richland City Council, adopt Coll. Structure 10/07/91
- County Planner, County Planning Commission update 10/08/91
- County Planner, GMC at Benton City 10/08/91
- Planning Staff, BFRC Utility Committee mtg re: GMA 10/16/91
- County Planners, meet with Port Districts 10/17/91
- Planning Staff, Benton City Community Visioning/GMA 10/22/91
- County Planner, Tridec, presentation to tech adv. comm. 10/30/91
- Planning Staff, GMC at Benton City 11/01/91
- Planning Staff, at Benton City re: "Circuit Rider" 11/07/91
- Planning Staff, BCPC Countywide Planning Policies mtg. 11/22/91
- Planning Staff, GMC at Benton City 1st meeting re: BCPC 12/03/91
- Planning Staff, 1st meeting of BCPC at Canal Annex 12/10/91
- Planning Staff, GMC Canal Annex 01/09/92
- County Planner, Prosser City Council re: Interlocal Agrmnt 01/14/92
- Planning Staff, BCPC at Canal Annex 01/21/92
- Planning Staff, Agriculture Committee Mtg. 01/29/92
- County Planner, W. Richland C.C. re: "Circuit Rdr & Reg. Strategy 01/21/92
- Planning Staff, Benton City C.C. re: Regional Strategy 01/21/92
- County Planner, update Benton County Planning Comm. 01/21/92
- County Planner, presentation at W. Richland Revitalization Comm. 02/04/92
- Planning Staff, Benton County Countywide Policy Plng. Comm. 02/11/92
- Planning Staff, Ag. Advisory Committee Meetings 02/13/92
- Planning Staff, GMC, Prosser 02/21/92
- County Planner, presentation to Prosser Chamber of Commerce 02/25/92
- Planning Staff, Ag. Advisory Comm., Prosser 02/26/92
- Planning Staff, GMC, Benton City 02/28/92
- Planning Staff, Ag. Advisory Comm. meeting, Kenn. 03/04/92
- Planning Staff, Countywide Policy Planning Comm. 03/10/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Committee Mtg. 3/12/92
- County Planner, Benton City reviews CW Policies 3/17/92
- County Planner, B.C. Planning Commission, CW Policies update 03/17/92
- Planning Staff, Ag. Advisory Committee, Prosser 03/18/92
- County Planner, Prosser City Council reviews CW Policies 03/24/92
- County Planner, presentation to Env. Info. Net, Richland Library 03/26/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Adv. Comm., Prosser 03/26/92
- County Planner, Kennewick P.C. review CW Policies 03/31/92
- County Planner, Workshop with Board of Comm. 04/01/92
- Planning Staff, Richland Planning Comm. Countywide Policies 04/01/92
- County Planner, Kenn. Planning Comm. Countywide Policies 04/06/92
- County Planner, Local Gov’t Summit, presentation of GMA 04/08/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Adv. Comm., Prosser 04/09/92
- Planning Staff, Richland Planning Comm. Countywide Policies 04/15/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Comm. 04/23/92
- County Planner, Hanfrd/GMA & County-wide Policies BOCC. 04/27/92
- County Planner, County Treas. and Asses. GMA 04/28/92
- County Planner, Kennewick Council, County-wide Policies 04/29/92
- Planning Staff, County-wide Policy Committee 05/12/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Committee 05/14/92
- County Planner, Richland City Council approves County-wide Pol. 05/18/92
- Planning Staff, B.C. Plng. Commission wshp, Ag/min ords. 05/19/92
- Planning Staff, Benton Co. Plng Comm. wkshp, Co.-wide Pol /ag 06/02/92
- Planning Staff, Meet with Fire Chiefs on GMA 06/04/92
- Planning Staff, Kennewick City Council re: County-wide Pol. 06/04/92
- Planning Staff, County-wide Policy Comm. 06/09/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Committee 06/11/92
- Planning Staff, Planning Commission Workshop, GMA Agri. Ord. 06/16/92
- Planning Staff, GMA meeting with Farm Bureau @ " The Barn" 06/17/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Committee 06/23/92
- Planning Staff, BCPC last hearing on County-wide, in Kenn. 06/29/92
- Planning Staff, Benton Co. Plng Comm. workshop on Agri Ord. 07/07/92
- Planning Staff, last BCPC public meeting on County-wide Pol. 07/14/92
- Planning Staff, Benton Co. P. Comm. wkshp, GMA Agri. & Min 07/21/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Comm. 07/23/92
- Planning Staff, Kennewick C. Council approve CW Policies 08/04/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Comm. 08/11/92
- Planning Staff, GMA Management Committee, Benton City 08/12/92
- County Planner, Meet with all cities and all School Districts GMA 08/13/92
- Planning Staff, Benton Co. Commissioners, County-wide Pol. 08/17/92
- County Planner, Benton City approves CW Policies 08/18/92
- Planning Staff, B.C. Planning Commission Ag. Wshp. 08/18/92
- County Planner, meet with TRIDEC on GMA 08/19/92
- County Planner, B.O.C.C wkshp on Co.-wide & Hanford 09/08/92
- Planning Staff, Plng. Comm. wkshp on Agri & Min Ords. 09/08/92
- Planning Staff, W.Rich City Council approves CW Policies 09/21/92
- Planning Staff, B.C. Planning Commission Ag. Wshp. 09/22/92
- Planning Staff, Brd of Co. Comm. approves County-wide Policies 09/28/92
- County Planner, at League of Women Voters re: GMA 09/30/92
- County Planner, GMA update to Brd. of Comm. 10/05/92
- County Planner, GMA Hanford update to BO.C.C. 10/12/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Comm. wrkshp. 10/29/92
- Planning Staff, GMA Management Committee 11/06/92
- Planning Staff, 1st Public Mtg. on Crit./Min. Ord Draft @ Paterson 11/16/92
- Planning Staff, 2nd Public Mtg. on Crit./Min. Ord Draft @ Prosser 11/22/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Committee Mtg. 12/03/92
- County Planner, B.C. Plng. Commission Wshp. Min/Ag. ord. 12/15/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Committee Mtg. 12/15/92
- Planning Staff, Critical Areas Advisory Committee Mtg. 1/06/93
- Planning Staff, 3rd Pub. Mtg. Critical Ord./Min. Draft @ Kennewick 1/11/93
- Planning Staff, 4th Pub. Mtg. Critical Ord./Min. Draft @ Benton City 1/25/93
- Planning Staff, B.C. Plng. Commission Wshp. Critical Areas Ord. 2/02/93
- Planning Staff, B.C. Plng. Commission Wshp. Critical Areas Ord. 4/13/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, “Orientation” Mtg. Rural Planning Committee Prosser/Whitstran, Benton City/Kiona, Richland/W. Richland areas 5/11/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”orientation” Mtg. Kennewick/Finley Area 5/12/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”Visioning Workshop I” Prosser/Whitstran 5/24/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”Visioning Workshop I” Kennewick/Finley 5/25/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”Visioning Workshop I” Paterson/Plymouth 5/26/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”Visioning Workshop I” BC/Kio,Rich/W.Rich 5/27/93
- Planning Staff, Pros/Wht. Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg. 6/14/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”Visioning Workshop II” Pros/Wht 6/21/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”Visioning Workshop II” Kenn/Finley 6/22/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”Visioning Workshop II” Pat/Plymouth 6/23/93
- Planning Staff, Consultant, ”Visioning Workshop II” Ben/Kio, WR/Rich 6/24/93
- Planning Staff, Pros/Wht. Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg. 7/12/93
- Planning Staff, Pat./Plymouth Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg. 7/14/93
- Planning Staff, B.City/Kiona. Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg. 7/22/93
- Planning Staff, Kenn/Finely Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg. 7/27/93
- Planning Staff, Board of County Comm. Wshp. Critical Areas Ord. 10/20/93
- Planning Staff, Agriculture Committee mtg. 10/28/93
- Planning Staff, Agriculture Committee mtg. 11/18/93
- Planning Staff, IUGA Public Meeting (Benton City) 12/09/93
- Planning Staff, IUGA Public Meeting (West Richland) 12/14/93
- Planning Staff, IUGA Public Meeting (Prosser) 12/16/93
- Planning Staff, B.C. Plg. Commission Wshp. IUGA’s 1/18/94
- Planning Staff, B.County Plng. Comm. IUGA hrgs. (B City/WRich/Pro) 1/25/94
- Planning Staff, IUGA Public Meeting (Richland) 2/09/94
- Planning Staff, BCounty Plng. Comm. IUGA hrgs. (B City/WRich/Pro) 2/15/94
- Planning Staff, IUGA Public Meeting (Kennewick) 2/17/94
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BCounty Plng. Comm. IUGA Hrgs. (Rich/Kenn)</td>
<td>4/19/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearings IUGA's (Pross/BCity/W.Rich)</td>
<td>4/14/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, B.C. Planning Commission Wshp. Ag Ord.</td>
<td>5/15/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing (Pross/BCity/W.Rich)</td>
<td>5/18/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Adopt IUGA's for PR/WR/BC &amp; Interim Densities</td>
<td>6/06/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing, Critical Areas Ordinance</td>
<td>6/08/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing, Critical Areas Ordinance</td>
<td>6/13/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, B.C. Planning Commission Wshp. Ag Ord.</td>
<td>6/21/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearings IUGA's (Kenn/Rich)</td>
<td>6/22/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Adopt IUGA's for Kenn/Richland</td>
<td>7/01/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Adopt Critical Areas Ordinance</td>
<td>7/01/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Planning Commission Hrg Ag/Min. Res. Ordinance</td>
<td>7/19/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Draft EIS Scoping Hearing Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>8/03/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Stakeholders Mtg. EIS Scoping Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>8/04/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Planning Commission Hrg Ag. Ordinance</td>
<td>8/16/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing Mineral Res. Ord.</td>
<td>8/30/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Adopt Mineral Res. Ord.</td>
<td>9/12/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Planning Commission Hrg. Ag. Ordinance</td>
<td>9/13/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, IUGA Public Meeting (Grandview)</td>
<td>9/27/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, B.County Plng. Commission IUGA Hrg. (Grandview)</td>
<td>10/18/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearings IUGA's (Grandview)</td>
<td>11/07/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing Agriculture Ord.</td>
<td>11/29/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing Agriculture Ord.</td>
<td>12/13/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing Agriculture Ord.</td>
<td>12/19/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing Agriculture Ord.</td>
<td>2/22/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing Agriculture Ord.</td>
<td>2/27/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Kenn/Finley Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg.</td>
<td>3/28/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC wrkshp. AG Ord.</td>
<td>3/29/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Kenn/Finley Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg.</td>
<td>4/10/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC wrkshp. AG Ord.</td>
<td>4/25/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Kenn/Finley Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg.</td>
<td>4/25/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC wrkshp. AG Ord.</td>
<td>5/01/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, Kenn/Finley Rural Plng. Area Comm. Mtg.</td>
<td>5/17/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC wrkshp. AG Ord.</td>
<td>5/22/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC wrkshp. AG Ord.</td>
<td>6/05/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC wrkshp. AG Ord.</td>
<td>7/10/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing Agriculture Ord.</td>
<td>7/11/95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Planning Staff, BOCC Hearing Agriculture Ord. Adopted 7/26/95
- Planning Staff, Paterson/Plymouth Rural Pleting Area Comm. Mtg. 4/11/96
- Planning Staff, Prosser/Whitstran Rural Pleting Area Comm. Mtg. 4/18/96
- Planning Staff, Benton City/Kiona Rural Pleting Area Comm. Mtg. 4/23/96
- Planning Staff, Prosser/Whitstran Rural Pleting Area Comm. Mtg. 5/16/96
- Planning Staff, Prosser/Whitstran Rural Pleting Area Comm. Mtg. 7/16/96
- Planning Staff, Paterson/Plymouth Rural Pleting Area Comm. Mtg. 5/14/96
- Planning Staff, Benton City/Kiona Rural Pleting Area Comm. Mtg. 5/21/96
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Comm. Rural Element Wshps. 8/20/96
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Comm. Land Use Elem. Wshp. 10/03/96
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Comm. Rural Element Wshps. 10/15/96
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Comm. Trans. Element Wshp. 1/19/96
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Comm. Capital Facilities Element Wshp. 1/21/97
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Comm. Capital Facilities Element Wshp. 2/18/97
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Comm. Housing Element Wshp. 3/18/97
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Comm. Economic Element Wshp. 4/15/97
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Commission Draft Comp Plan Wshp. 5/20/97
- Planning Staff, BC Pleting. Commission Draft Comp Plan Wshp. 7/15/97
- Public Hrg, BOCC, December 1997 Draft Comp Plan, Prosser 2/19/98
- Public Hrg, BOCC, December 1997 Draft Comp Plan, Paterson/Plymouth 2/23/98
- Public Hrg, BOCC, December 1997 Draft Comp Plan, Kennewick/Finley 2/25/98
- Public Hrg, BOCC, December 1997 Draft Comp Plan, Benton City/Kiona 2/26/98
- Public Workshop, BOCC, December 1997 Draft Comp Plan, Prosser 4/21/98
- Public Workshop, BOCC, December 1997 Draft Comp Plan, Prosser 4/30/98
- Public Hrg Con’t, BOCC, Adoption of Benton County Comprehensive Plan 6/22/98