

Attachment N

Notes from Jan 11, 2001 Feedback Meeting with Thurston County After their Review of the Completed Project Review Forms (version 4a)

Attendees: Patty Betts, Brenden McFarland, Rebecca Inman, Linda Witcher, Roger Giebelhaus, Cindy Wilson

Linda Witcher reviewed Dan Biles and Beth Spelsberg's PRFs
Roger Giebelhaus reviewed Jason Bruhn and Lori Ochoa's PRFs
Cindy Wilson reviewed Ali Raad and Gary Kruger's PRFs

Comments:

- Cindy tries to find out what applicant knows; doesn't presume applicant is honest or knowledgeable
- Linda doesn't like 2nd sentence in E.
- Cindy does not take checklist as gospel
- For 2.6, Special Reports, clarify not project specific
- There should be a place for agency comments on all of part B
- Roger and Cindy, think this form gets less information from the applicants than in the current checklist
- Don't put document into columns (e.g. part A)
- Don't like the yes/no box; one staff person didn't realize they were yes/no boxes
- Don't need a n/a box either, just ask the question as with the current checklist
- 4.1 – word as follows
 - 4.1.1 Are you aware of any water quality problems in the area?
 - 4.1.2 What are they?
- For animals and plants, circle things they know about
- 3.1 – if these characteristics are important, list out and ask them to circle. Don't care how the applicant identified it.
- Most important parts to them: Tax parcel 3, Address, Attached reports
- 24% of the applicants are foresters – answering these questions would be difficult
- everything needs to be as clear as possible
- add “for examples” to existing checklist
 - for filling and grading – was useful information but needs to be asked differently (*not sure I captured their thought correctly*)
- formatting confusing (e.g. part C with boxes, indents and duplication of information requested in Part b)
- simplify questions
- asked the question more than once in Natural Environment – both in Part B and Part C
- get rid of “proximity” in the area
- get rid of yes/no