

Sandy Guinn

From: Kathy Heywood <deskworks@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 12:56 PM
To: Sandy Guinn; Dave Kuhl
Subject: tonight



Importance: High

Hi guys,

Unfortunately I have picked up a cold and I am very much contagious and obnoxious right now (*some may argue I am this all the time!*), so I thought I should spare you all from the sneezing, blowing and hacking at the moment. I didn't think those would be good things to share from the dais! I will not be attending tonight's meeting. I waited this long to see if I might be a little more presentable as the day progressed, but alas, no.

I did do my homework, however! And, though I know it isn't much and probably will be fixed before any adoption, I thought I should point out a few errors I found. These are all in Critical Areas Ordinance 605, and the attached version showing the changes and markups. I did not undertake a complete edit for typos or other language issues, but these just sort of popped out at me, so thought I'd bring them to your attention:

Exhibit 53

Page 1 of 26:

Line 48, last word should be areas

Line 49, extra word "area" should be deleted

Line 51, should be benefit (no "s" at end)

Page 2 of 26:

Lines 3 through 32. There is a verb tense problem here. On line 3 it says "This chapter seeks to:" then beginning on line 4 all the beginning words have the wrong tense, for example, protecting should be protect, maintaining should be maintain, and on down the line. Either the beginning statement needs to change, or each one of these words needs to change. For example, the end of line 3 could state "The intention of this chapter is" or something like that. Otherwise what follows will need to be changed to match the tense and sentence structure used. Hope that makes sense!

There may be other errors. These just sort of leaped out. This isn't an all inclusive edit. (I just can't curb the writer in me!)

Also, just a question. I note that this ordinance does not include 21.24.290 regarding geologically hazardous areas. Has this been removed, perhaps to another area, renamed, or maybe just not addressed with the rest of this material? Or am I missing something? Perhaps my foggy cold laden brain is not getting this. Just wondering. We have talked about this, but I don't recall doing any work on the actual code in this regard. My apologies if I am in a fog!

Thank you, and have a great meeting. Without me, should be shorter!

Thanks for all your work,

K