



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
1	Kathryn Johnson	Global on policies	Please consider modifying many of the verbs used in the action statements under Goal and Policies through the document. Verbs such as “shall”, “will”, and in some instances, “should” seem incongruent with the purpose of the plan which is to “guide” and “advise”. Recasting the statements as “should consider” or “should review” is more appropriate in a guidance document. Prescriptive verbs should be used sparingly and only after intentional discussion. Achieving many of the action statements would have associated costs. An example is Goal LUH-5 which advises the County to establish comprehensive building codes and require building inspections. Before I could develop an opinion about these actions, I would need to know the costs of implementing and maintaining the program as well as the expected benefits.	For discussion with PC	See response from PC in # 2
2	Kathy – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	Global	Will & Shall, Should - define each. Are Will and Shall the same. It's appropriate that Will/Shall and Shoulds can be used, but pick either Will or Shall and be consistent.	Requested change made This comment relates to the comment in #1	Changed all “wills” to “shalls”  A description of each focus area, and maps showing their locations, are included in Chapter 2. For the purpose of implementation of this Comprehensive Plan, each policy includes the term “shall”, which provides specific and certain guidance for development <a href="#">that must be achieved</a> , or “should”, which signifies a less rigid directive <a href="#">that may or may not be achieved</a> .



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
3	Sandra Runde	Global on building codes	Building codes. I believe strongly that the County should at least review the completion of projects in order to issue a "certificate of occupancy." While it may not make sense to hire additional people to enforce International Building Code...it seems prudent to at least see if the applicants have following the conditions set forth during the permitting process. The Director of Equalization employees the Marshall and Swift evaluations for the assessed valuation.	For discussion with PC	See response from PC in #4
4	Sandra Runde Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19		Ok to keep the goal of having building codes within the document.	Comment noted This comment relates to the comment in #3	No change made
5	Sandra Runde	Global on using geographic structure	I agree with the division of the county into three separate groups. It makes sense to have different criteria for the areas in the far eastern half vs the western. The area surrounding the City makes sense as well.	Comment noted	No change made
6	Planning Commission Member	Global	Comment was to have us go through globally and fix document so that periods, commas, etc. are inside a quotation, where that occurs.  For instance, on page 1-6, where we say "elements". It should be "elements."	Requested change made	Revised throughout
7	County Planning	Global on maps	The subdivision should not be split between the two areas on the final version of the maps that show the dividing line between Black Hills and Central Pennington.	Requested change made	Border adjusted to put the sub division into the Black Hills area.



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
8	County Planning	Global on maps	We show "Oglala Lakota County" to south. Maps I look at say Shannon County.	After discussion with Planning, no change required.	No changed made.
9	County Planning	Global on maps	Two counties to the north. Lawrence and Meade (we only list Meade) Three counties to the south. Custer, Shannon, and Jackson (we only list Custer).	Requested change to be made	Additional county labels added as needed.
10	Sandra Runde	General comment	I believe Rapid City and the various smaller communities are working aggressively to encourage traditions to celebrate the agricultural heritage through cultural activates, the arts and special events. I don't believe the county should be involved with this type of activity.	Per Planning Commission meeting on 2/25/19, no changes to be made.	No change made
11	County Planning	Acknowledgements Page	George and Ron are off the Board. Replace with new Board members. Remove the statement "(I don't know if you needed me in here too)" after PJ's title (oops)	Requested change has already been made to online version.	No further change made
12	Kathy Johnson – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	Pg 1.1	Take General, Comprehensive, Long-Ranger Goals and Policies and explain how they fit in there. How will these goals/policies be utilized in the general Comprehensive Plan.	Requested change made	This plan serves as a guide that should be used to gauge short-term and current decisions against the long-range vision that has been developed. <a href="#">The goals and policies herein were developed to support the envisioned future for Pennington County while the implementation actions were identified to execute these goals and policies.</a>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
13	Kathy Johnson – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	Pg 1.1	Use of Will and Shall	Description of “shall” and “should” provided.	For the purpose of implementation of this Comprehensive Plan, each policy includes the term “shall”, which provides specific and certain guidance for development <a href="#">that must be achieved</a> , or “should”, which signifies a less rigid directive <a href="#">that may or may not be achieved</a> .
14	Commissioner Johnson	Pg 1.1	Under Purpose of Comprehensive Plan, the last sentence. Change the phrase about implementation as follows: “. . . While the implementation program identifies actions that would be necessary to execute these goals and polices.”	Requested change made	The goals and policies herein were developed to support the envisioned future for Pennington County while the implementation <a href="#">program identifies</a> actions <del>were identified</del> <a href="#">that would be necessary</a> to execute these goals and policies.
15	Andrew Busse	Page 2-2 Section 2.2 Focus Areas, Black Hills Focus Area, Paragraph: Future Land Uses	Possible grammatical error: first sentence in the paragraph states: “Land use in this area is focused on <u>tourism commercial</u> in communities and along highways and rural residential uses in the hill areas.” <i>Recommendation would be to edit order of tourism commercial for commercial tourism.</i>	Requested change made	Land use in this area is focused on <del>tourism</del> commercial <a href="#">tourism</a> in communities and along highways and rural residential uses in the hill areas.



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
16	Kathryn Johnson	Page 2-2	Future Land Use. Low density residential with maximum density of 2 du/ac should not be the primary focus of the Black Hills. Agriculture, Ranchette Residential, and Rural Residential are more compatible with the Black Hills area.	Requested change to be made	This area will primarily have a focus on <a href="#">Rural Residential</a> , <a href="#">Ranchette Residential</a> , <a href="#">Agriculture</a> , and <a href="#">Open Space</a> <del>low density residential</del> to ensure that the natural character remains intact as growth occurs.
17	County Planning	Figure 2-2 (and others)	Line on the west side of the Urbanized Area cuts through a development. Will need to adjust (and other maps too). He will send info on where to move to.	Requested change to be made	Border adjusted to put the sub division into the Black Hills area.
18	Andrew Busse	Page 2-2 Section 2.2 Focus Areas, Black Hills Focus Area, Paragraph: Future Land Uses	Second sentence in the paragraph states: "This area will primarily have a focus on <u>low density residential</u> to ensure that the natural character remains intact as growth occurs." This contradicts the fact that the majority of the area west of Rapid City Urbanized Area in the Black Hills is not low density residential. <i>Recommendation would be to edit to reflect actual land designations to Rural Residential, Ranchette, Agriculture and Open Space.</i>	Requested change made	This area will primarily have a focus on <a href="#">Rural Residential</a> , <a href="#">Ranchette Residential</a> , <a href="#">Agriculture</a> , and <a href="#">Open Space</a> <del>low density residential</del> to ensure that the natural character remains intact as growth occurs.



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
19	Andrew Busse	Page 2-9 Section 2.2 Focus Areas, Central Pennington Focus Area, Paragraph: Issues and Opportunities	Third paragraph states: "Ellsworth AFB is a significant economic driver in Pennington County, as is the Rapid City Regional Airport. While both facilities are positive influences on the county, they also require protections to ensure long-term compatibility between new development and air operations." <i>Recommendation would be to include the economic impact of the South Dakota National Guard in Pennington County and the need to protect the training areas for future use to include Camp Rapid, West Camp, and the numerous training areas throughout the Black Hills.</i>	Requested change made	Ellsworth AFB is a significant economic driver in Pennington County, as is the Rapid City Regional Airport. While both facilities are positive influences on the county, they also require protections to ensure long-term compatibility between new development and air operations. <a href="#">Additionally, the South Dakota National Guard has a location outside of Rapid City and includes the South Dakota National Guard's Training Center Command. Like Ellsworth AFB and the Rapid City Regional Airport, Camp Rapid, as well as other associated training areas, such as West Camp, requires surrounding land uses to be compatible with its mission and operations.</a>
20	Public and Planning Commission	Page 2-9	ADD into this chapter this overarching aspiration of the county, "The County shall continue to encourage public and tribal engagement in ordinance development and permitting."	Requested change made under description of Focus Areas.	<a href="#">The County shall continue to encourage public and tribal engagement in ordinance development and permitting within each focus area.</a>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
21	Andrew Busse	Page 3-1 Section 3.1 Land Use Designations and Standards, Future Land Use Map	The first paragraph states: <i>"The most recognizable feature of the Comprehensive Plan is the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The FLUM is the figure that designates the location of the various land use designations in the county. The Pennington County FLUM is shown on Figure 3-1 included at the end of this chapter." The FLUM is too small to read and interpret; recommendation would be to enlarge and depict in full detail with breakdowns by section.</i>	A PDF version of the FLUM is available online at the County's website and can be zoomed to specific properties. After adoption, this information would be added to RapidMap online.	No further change made
22	County Planning	Page 3-3	Use acro "RCH" for two designations. Rural Residential (yellow) should be "RR"	Requested change made	<a href="#">RCHR</a>
23	Mark Ruddeforth	Page 3-3	A stated in the Black Hills Focus Area issues & opportunities, you recognize "issues associated with ... a shortage of and competition for housing." Why then is STAFF HOUSING not allowed on anything less than a 40 acre parcel? This will not address the affordable / staff housing problem at all. I suggest that, at a minimum, staff housing be allowed on any AG parcel and its 10 acre minimum lot size.	Responses from PC are provided in #22 and #23	See #22 and #23
24	Staff – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	Page 3-3	Change "Staff Housing" to Ranch Hand Residence / or something which clearly states that it's help for an operable ag business.	Requested change made This comment is in response to line #21	<a href="#">Staff-Ranch hand residence housing (minimum 40-acre lot size)</a>
25	Rich – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	Page 3-3	Remove (minimum 40-acre lot size) from AG zoning designation.	Requested change made This comment is in response to line #21	<a href="#">Staff-Ranch hand residence housing (minimum 40-acre lot size)</a>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
26	County Planning	Page 3-4	Under the Purpose and Application for LDR. Put period after "uses" and delete "on 1/2 acre minimum lots."	Requested change made	The Low Density Residential designation denotes areas of semi-rural residential uses <del>on 1/2 acre minimum lots.</del>
27	Planning Commission – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	Page 3-5	An explanation of why existing PUD's are being honored if existing prior to adoption of the new Comp Plan, but in the future PUD's will not be a choice for citizens. Please explain why this, the benefits of this change, and what the alternatives are.	Requested change made	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><u>As of the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan on XX/XX/2019, no new</u><del>The</del> Planned Unit Development (PUD) designations are permitted. All PUD designations legally permitted as of XX/XX/2019 may be permitted to apply for a new land use designation, or continue as a grandfathered PUD designation, subject to allowable uses for PUDs as described in the Pennington County Zoning Ordinance. <del>is to allow districts in which ingenuity, imagination, and design efforts on the part of the builders, architects, site planners, and developers can produce desirable residential developments that are designed to include open space areas, protect natural resources, design around hazards (such as flood zones), and provide a unique mix of housing that best meets the needs of the County.</del></p> </div>





#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
28	Commissioners & Planning Staff	Page 3-5	Discussion needs to be had on whether PUD's stay as a Future Land Use option or if the intent of the County is to honor existing PUD's, but not allow for new one. If there will no longer be NEW PUD's it needs to be clear that the old ones are grandfathered and new ones will not be permitted.	Requested change made	<p><u>As of the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan on XX/XX/2019, no new</u><del>The</del> Planned Unit Development (PUD) designations are permitted. All PUD designations legally permitted as of XX/XX/2019 may be permitted to apply for a new land use designation, or continue as a grandfathered PUD designation, subject to allowable uses for PUDs as described in the Pennington County Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p><del>is to allow districts in which ingenuity, imagination, and design efforts on the part of the builders, architects, site planners, and developers can produce desirable residential developments that are designed to include open space areas, protect natural resources, design around hazards (such as flood zones), and provide a unique mix of housing that best meets the needs of the County.</del></p>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
29	Mark Ruddeforth	Page 3-6	Is it the intent to reclassify all tourism related businesses into Highway Service zoning? Are rental cabins & RV parks allowed in Commercial Zoning?	<p>Typically “yes”, though specific sites and areas inside of existing PUD may merit evaluation as the Zoning is updated.</p> <p>RV Park can be added as a listed use. Rental cabins would come under Recreational/ Tourist uses. Some uses may require a CUP, per zoning.</p>	No change made
30	Mark Ruddeforth	Page 3-6	There should be an allowed use for Staff Housing in the Commercial and HS zoning districts - allow us to solve our own staff housing problem with on-site facilities.	This is a specific use that would be further defined in Zoning update. Currently, Zoning allows housing for on-site managers, caretakers, and similar uses in General Commercial and Highway Service zones.	No change made
31	Mark Ruddeforth	Page 3-6	Open Space areas should include allowed accessory structures to support recreation activities, ie, equipment rental, stables, etc	Open Space covers land under Federal management, and accessory structures would not be subject to County permits.	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
32	Andrew Busse	Page 3-6 Section 3.1 Table 3-1, Commercial and Highway Services	The table reflects the only compatible zoning for each designation is its own designation respectively. <i>Recommendation would be to have reciprocal compatibility between Commercial and Highway Services at a minimum and to <u>add Amusement Parks and Rides as stated in the Ordinance to list of allowed uses of Highway Services.</u></i>	Allowed uses in Commercial are reciprocated in Highway Services, except for public and quasi-public, are meant to be compatible with surrounding neighborhoods. Highway Services are tourist-oriented and, thus, may not be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Amusement Parks and Rides would fall under the category of “Recreational / tourism uses” under Highway Services.	No change made
33	Andrew Busse	Page 3-9 Section 3.2 Land Use Overview, Military Compatibly	The paragraph barely makes mention of Camp Rapid. <i>Recommendation would be to include further detail on the role of the South Dakota National Guard in Pennington County to include West Camp Firing Range and the Aviation Support Facility (located at the Rapid City Regional Airport which houses 2 companies of military helicopters) and its associated Low Level Flying areas in the Black Hills and southeast of Rapid City.</i>	Requested change made in Chapters 3 and 9 based on available data.	There are two military installations in Pennington County: Camp Rapid, part of the South Dakota National Guard, and Ellsworth Air Force Base (AFB). <a href="#">Camp Rapid is part of the South Dakota National Guard. In addition to Camp Rapid, the South Dakota National Guard also includes West Camp Firing Range and the Aviation Support Facility, which is located at the Rapid City Regional Airport. The National Guard has low level flying areas in the Black Hills and southeast of Rapid City.</a>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
34	County Planning	Page 3-10	Last sentence in first paragraph (intro) on page seems incomplete. What should this say?	“Due to the potential hazards associated with structures in a floodway, <a href="#">limitations on changes within floodway are required in order to protect public health and safety.</a> ”	Due to the potential hazards associated with structures in a floodway, <a href="#">limitations on changes within the floodway are required in order to protect health and safety.</a>
35	Commissioner Marsh	Page 3-10 LUH-1.2	In the edited version there is a LARGE space after "f or location"	Updated spacing.	Spacing updated.
36	Commissioner Johnson	Page 3-10	REPLACE the word "shall" with "should."	Requested change made	LUH-1.2 The County <del>should</del> <a href="#">shall</a> encourage the development of small neighborhood convenience and grocery uses immediately surrounding residential land uses in cities and towns to meet the everyday shopping and personal needs of residents.
37	Joyce Sugrue	General Comp Plan	Allow for alternatives to multi-family housing. For example: multi-generational, co-housing, extended family housing, dual living homes.	The Planning Commission discussed multi-family dwellings and multi-generational houses on 5/28/19. No change to the current comprehensive plan was made as the necessary wording exists on page 3-10, LUH-2-2 and further clarification will be made in an updated zoning ordinance.	No change made
38	Mark Ruddeforth	Goal LUH-5	This is a huge change that will cost the community thousands of dollars. What data is there to support the need to conduct building inspections? Has there been a	Planning Commission responses to this comment are listed on #34 and #35	Revised policy according to lines 33 and 34



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
			problem with unsafe buildings in the unincorporated areas? The state already sets standards and inspects electrical & septic work. At most I would recommend plan review to a given IBC standard. The cost of adding a whole layer of complexity (building inspections) must be weighed against the potential benefits (ie, what problem are we trying to solve?)		
39	Kathy – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	Goal LUH-5	Be more descriptive that this is a process ... Language, "Establish a program for comprehensive building codes..." something like this.	Planning Commission response to this comment is listed in #35	Revised policy
40	Kathy – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	LUH-5.1	Rewrite this AND it's sister Goal in Chapter 11 (Action # 5 - page 11-2) to reflect what we're really doing. Rewrite to say, "The County should establish a building code and inspection program."	Requested change made	<p>LUH-5.1 The County should establish a <del>comprehensive</del> building code <u>and inspection program</u>.</p> <p>Action 5: The County shall adopt a current version of the International Building Code, <u>International Residential Code, and inspection program</u> and implement its use in new construction.</p>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
41	Workshop #3 public meeting Danielle Wiebers	LUH Q6:	<p><b>How should the County regulate signs and billboards?</b>  <i>Wall 5 LUH 6 Regulate signs &amp; billboards. Tax billboard use! Help control plus bring in revenue.</i></p> <p>I was at this meeting and made the statement that the county should leave the billboards alone for the simple fact that 1) they are needed by the tourism industry which is reportedly a key industry for the county and 2) they help the Ag producers offset some of the increase in property taxes that cut into their already slim profit margins. I checked the notes before attending each meeting and during the 4th workshop I specifically asked that the record be corrected to reflect my actual comments. The results of the 4th workshop were not posted (as of 1/23/19).</p> <p>I would also ask that Pennington county not move forward a version of the comprehensive use plan that adopts California state regulations by reference (SMARA). The consultants may have meant SMCRA which is a federal regulation.</p> <p>-Danielle Wiebers. Wiebers Farm and Ranch, Inc.</p>	<p>Policies related to billboards include limiting on State Scenic Byways and County Scenic Routes (TC-5.4 and TC-5.5). An implementation action is to update the Zoning Ordinance to includes specifications on the location and use of the digital and LED billboards within these scenic routes.</p> <p>Requested change will be made for the SMARA/SMCRA comment.</p>	Removed SMARA
42	Andrew Busse	Page 3-11 Goal LUH-4	<p>The title of Goal LUH-4 states: <b>"Land uses in Pennington County are compatible with Ellsworth AFB and Rapid City Regional Airport operations."</b> <i>Recommendation would be to include the South Dakota National Guard Helicopter Operations, and other Commercial Heliports throughout the county.</i></p>	<p>Land uses in Pennington County are compatible with <a href="#">military installations and operations</a> Ellsworth AFB and Rapid City Regional Airport operations."</p>	<p>Land uses in Pennington County are compatible with <a href="#">military installation operations</a> Ellsworth AFB and Rapid City Regional Airport operations.</p>
43	Rich – Planning Commission Meeting 2/25/19	LUH-8	<p>Scattered use of "shall" and "should" in this section -- change "shalls" to "shoulds in LUH 8.1, LUH 8.3, and LUH 8.4</p>	<p>Requested change made</p>	<p><del>shall</del> <a href="#">should</a></p>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
44	Kathryn Johnson	Page 4-1 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph	As the top employer in the area Regional Health should be included as an economic driver in the County.	Requested change to be made based on available data	<p>These elements were identified as key economic drivers for Pennington County by County staff and participants in the public outreach efforts that went into formulating this Comprehensive Plan. <a href="#">An additional economic driver is the healthcare industry with the location of Regional Health in the county.</a></p> <p>...</p> <p><b><a href="#">Regional Health</a></b>  <a href="#">The healthcare industry is prominent in Pennington County. One of the largest employers in this industry in the county is Regional Health. Regional Health has locations throughout South Dakota and in eastern Wyoming. Regional Health has a location in Rapid City, providing 22 health locations and employing almost 5,000 employees.</a></p>
45	Andrew Busse	Page 4-2 Section 4.1 Economic Development Overview, Table 4-1 Top Employers	Recommendation would be to include Top Industries in the county as well and revenue generated by each industry.	Per Planning Commission comments on 3/11/19, information to not be included.	No changes made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
46	Andrew Busse	Page 4-3 Section 4.1 Economic Development Overview, Tourism	Recommendation would be to include the significance of Tourism to Pennington County (2017 Tourism Spending was nearly ¾ of billions dollars in Pennington County and was responsible for over 7,000 jobs directly and over 10,000 jobs indirectly, roughly 12% of the county's employment, and generated over \$61 millions dollars of state and local tax revenue).	Requested change to be made <a href="https://sdvisit.com/research-reports">https://sdvisit.com/research-reports</a>	The tourism economy is prominent in Pennington County – in 2018, tourism generated approximately \$166 million in revenue. Tourism, attracting attracts businesses and employment opportunities that operate primarily from April to October to accommodate the tourist season.
47	Andrew Busse	Page 4-3 Section 4.1 Economic Development Overview, Ellsworth Air Force Base	The last sentence of the paragraph states, "Black Hills State University could also be integrated with Ellsworth AFB by offering an incubator program on their campus." Recommendation would be to include other higher-level academic campuses that are actually based in Pennington County such as the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.	Revised per Planning Commission comment on 3/11/19	Such industries Higher-level academic campuses Black Hills State University could also be integrated with Ellsworth AFB by offering an incubator program on their campus.
48	Andrew Busse	Page 4-3 Section 4.1 Economic Development Overview, Ellsworth Air Force Base	Recommendation would be to include the South Dakota National Guard in this area with the economic impact of Camp Rapid, West Camp, the Aviation Support Facility, and the Annual Training Exercise that brings soldiers and airmen from all over the World to train in the Black Hills during June of every year.	Requested change to be made based on data availability	Although not a part of Ellsworth AFB, the South Dakota National Guard is also an economic driver, with a total annual economic impact of \$172 billion in 2017. Within Pennington County, the South Dakota National Guard includes Camp Rapid, West Camp Firing Range, and the Aviation Support Facility.





#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
49	Commissioners	Page 4.3, Tourism	REMOVE reference to any AMOUNT of revenue or economic development information.	Requested change made	The tourism economy is prominent in Pennington County — <del>in 2018, tourism generated approximately \$166 million in revenue.</del> Tourism attracts businesses and employment opportunities that operate primarily from April to October to accommodate the tourist season.



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
50	Commissioners	Page 4.4, Ellsworth Air Force Base	REMOVE reference to any AMOUNT of revenue or economic development information.	Requested change made	<p>Ellsworth AFB serves as a large economic driver for the county. <del>In 2014, Ellsworth AFB had a regional economic impact of over \$300 million. This impact can be broken down among traditional categories that are used to measure economic impact. The categories are annual payroll, annual expenditures, and an estimated dollar value of jobs created from base operations and expenditures</del></p> <p>Although not a part of Ellsworth AFB, the South Dakota National Guard is also an economic driver, <del>with a total annual economic impact of \$172 billion in 2017.</del> Within Pennington County, the South Dakota National Guard includes Camp Rapid, West Camp Firing Range, and the Aviation Support Facility.</p>
51	Commissioner Johnson	Page 4-3 & Page 4-4	REPLACE the words "Higher-Level" with "Post-secondary."	Requested change made	<p><del>Higher-level</del> <u>Post-secondary</u> academic campuses could also be integrated with Ellsworth AFB by offering an incubator program on their campus.</p>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
52	Commissioner Johnson	Page 4-4	REPLACE both existing sentences with, "Headquartered in Rapid City, Regional Health serves 20 communities across western South Dakota and in eastern Wyoming."	Requested change made	The healthcare industry is prominent in Pennington County. <a href="#">Headquartered in Rapid City, Regional Health serves 20 communities across western South Dakota and in eastern Wyoming.</a> <del>One of the largest employers in this industry in the county is Regional Health. Regional Health has locations throughout South Dakota and in eastern Wyoming.</del> Regional Health has a location in Rapid City, providing 22 health locations and employing almost 5,000 employees.
53	Commissioners	Page 4.4	Similar to Table 4-1, create a chart listing the MAJOR economic drivers in Pennington County -- cite sources of data, including date.	Previous comment recommended removing economic development information.	No action taken.
54	Commissioner Rivers	General	ADD dates to all citing references throughout the document.	Requested change made	Updated sources accordingly.
55	Andrew Busse	Page 4-4 Goal ED-2, ED-2.2	ED-2.2 states, "The County should work with Black Hills State University to share information on employment needs, internship opportunities, and further prepare graduates for the workplace." <i>Recommendation would be to include other higher-level academic campuses that are actually based in Pennington County such as the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.</i>	Revised per Planning Commission comments on 3/11/19	The County should work with <del>Black Hills State University</del> <a href="#">higher-level academic campuses</a> to share information on employment needs, internship opportunities, and further prepare graduates for the workplace.



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
56	Sandra Runde	Page 4-5 Goal ED-4	<p>The tourism issues should be left to the current organizations which are already in place.</p> <p>The City has its own economic profile which is merging with the Chamber of Commerce to promote industry and expansion. The county would merely be duplicated the efforts already being put forth.</p>	Per Planning Commission comments on 3/11/19, removing Policy ED-4.2, 4.3 and revising 4.4 and 4.5.	<p><del>4.2 The County should research and pursue grant funding to increase tourism and other business opportunities and to support new industry.</del></p> <p><del>4.3 The County should establish a joint tourism task force involving local, regional and state governmental agencies, as well as non-governmental organizations. The intent of this task force should be to establish and implement a long-term strategic plan to grow the number of visitors to southwestern South Dakota.</del></p> <p>4.4 The County should <u>seek support</u> value-added agriculture opportunities in the Eastern Plains.</p> <p>4.5 The County should work with other adjacent counties and other regional economic development entities, to expand and improve the economic base of Pennington County, especially related to Ellsworth AFB, National Parks, and agriculture.</p>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
57	Mark Ruddeforth	Page 4-5 Goal ED-4	A county tourism task force would add redundancy to an already robust state tourism office. The Black Hills are well represented by the state office. Perhaps a local representative and/or closer county interaction with the state dept of tourism is all that's needed.	The intent of this task force is to have a regional view related to tourism that is specific to southwestern South Dakota.	No change made
58	Kathryn Johnson	Page 4-5 Goal ED-4	The action statements are too vague and not realistic. For example: What specific actions by the County will attract tourism-related business (ED-4.1). What is the expected outcome from a joint tourism task force without the presence of the business community (ED-4.3). The County does not have a business development office – why not work with the Governor’s Office of Economic Development, Elevate Rapid City, and the Black Hills & Badlands Tourism Association (just to name a few) and learn what these groups need from the County to help their efforts.	ED-4.1 establishes a general policy for the County  Can add business component  These agencies will be added to policy	ED-4.3 The County should establish a joint tourism task force involving <a href="#">the business community</a> , local, regional and state governmental agencies, as well as non-governmental organizations. <a href="#">Some examples of agencies include the Governor’s Office of Economic Development, Elevate Rapid City, and the Black Hills &amp; Badlands Tourism Association.</a>  The intent of this task force should be to establish and implement a long-term strategic plan to grow the number of visitors to southwestern South Dakota.
59	Kathryn Johnson	Page 4-5 Goal ED-4, ED-4.6	Should be added to state that “the County should allow for development of its natural resources such as logging and mining in an economically feasible and environmentally sustainable manner.”	Revised per Planning Commission comment on 3/11/19	ED-4.4 <a href="#">The County should allow for development of its natural resources in an economically feasible and environmentally sustainable manner.</a>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
60	Deb Hadcock	General	Insert a statement into the document, somewhere, which states that we do care about the other major economic drivers (mining, logging, etc.)	Requested change made	ED-4.5 <a href="#">The County should continue to support major economic drivers, such as, but not limited to, mining and logging.</a>
61	Andrew Busse	Page 4-5 Goal ED-5	ED-5 states, <b>“Pennington County supports Ellsworth AFB and the Rapid City Regional Airport.”</b> <i>Recommendation would be to edit to read; Pennington County supports our military bases and facilities and commercial aviation. (This would serve to include the Air Force and the Army National Guard and support all commercial aviation to include Life Flight, Fugro, Aerial Fire-Fighting, and charter operations; all vital components to our County.</i>	Revised per Planning Commission comment on 3/11/19	The County should <del>require</del> <a href="#">consider</a> disclosure statements for any residential development within or adjacent to airport <del>noise</del> contours.
62	Andrew Busse	Page 4-5 Goal ED-5, ED-5.2	ED-5.2 states, “The County should require disclosure statements for any residential development within or adjacent to airport noise contours.” <del>SEP</del> <i>Recommendation would be to edit to read; The County should require disclosure statements for any residential development within or adjacent to FAA recognized airports or heliports.</i>	Requested change made: “The County should require disclosure statements for any residential development within or adjacent to FAA recognized <a href="#">airfields</a> , airports, or heliports.”	The County should require disclosure statements for any residential development within or adjacent to <a href="#">FAA recognized airfields, airports, or heliports</a> . <del>airport noise contours.</del>
63	Sandra Runde	Page 4-5 Goal ED-5, ED-5.2	Ellsworth Air Force base has already established the boundaries for sound control and issues regarding the properties surrounding their area. The City of Box Elder appears to have it under control	Statement acknowledged by the Planning Commission on 3/11/19. The Planning Commission believes the existing disclosure statement for any residential development is acceptable. No discussion.	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
64	Sonny Rivers	Page 4-5 Goal ED-5, ED-5.2	From the discussion on Goal ED-5, ED5.2, Commissioner River's asked, if it is possible, could there be a zoning district (overlay) for airstrips, airfields, heli-ports, etc.? That the public will know it's there.	Policy to be added for this	The County should develop and adopt an Airport Zoning Overlay zone that provides guidance for development within the 55 DNL noise contours associated with both Ellsworth AFB and the Rapid City Regional Airport.
65	Public and Rivers	Page 4-5 Goal ED-3.2	REPLACE the words "provide incentives" and with the word "continue."	Requested change made	The County should <del>provide incentives</del> <u>continue</u> to attract clean, environmentally-friendly businesses.
66	Public and Commissioner Rivers	Page 4-5 Goal ED-3.2	Planning Commission believes the strikethrough on Goal ED-3 Goal ED 3.2 is a mistake and should NOT have a strikethrough.	ED-3.2 is not struck though and remains.	No change made.
67	Public	Page 4-6 Goal ED-4 / ED4.5	REPLACE the word "major" and with the word "other."	Requested change made	The County should continue to support <del>major</del> <u>other</u> economic drivers, such as, but not limited to, mining and logging.
68	Planning Staff	Page 4-6 Goal ED-4	ADD all three icons to Goal 4.4 and Goal 4.5.	Requested change made	Icons added
69	Kathryn Johnson	Page 5-1 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph	Page number misprinted as 3-1 "Processing" should be added to the list of value-added facilities for agricultural products.	Requested changes made	Page number corrected "Value-added", for agricultural, refers to uses or facilities that increase the value of agricultural products over the cost of the raw agricultural inputs, such as canning, drying, freezing, <u>processing</u> , or packaging agricultural produce for ultimate sale to consumers.



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
70	Kathryn Johnson	Page 5-2 AG-1.2 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet	The County should not get involved in determining the relative value or productivity of agricultural land for siting a value-added operation. Land owners should retain the sole discretion about best use of land.	Requested change to be made	<del>The use should not be sited on productive agricultural lands if less productive land is available in the vicinity;</del>
71	Kathryn Johnson	Page 5-2 AG-1.3	Consider modifying this statement to read, "The County should develop a procedure for fast-tracking permit approvals that would be available to new high value-added food processing facilities."	Revised per Planning Commission comment on 3/11/19	Deleted policy
72	Sonny Rivers	Page 5-4 AG 1.4	Delete AG 1.4 Page 5.3	Ok'd by Planning Commission on 3/11/19	Deleted policy
73	Kathryn Johnson	Page-5-4 AG-2.1	The reference to Senate Bill 66 does not stand the test of time. The statement should refer to the objective of the Senate Bill rather than the specific bill number from a previous legislative session.	Revised per Planning Commission comment on 3/11/19	Deleted policy
74	Kathryn Johnson	Page-5-4 AG-2.2	This statement needs specificity. Logging primarily occurs on land owned by US Forest Service. What authority does the County have to control the impacts on these lands?	Per Planning Commission comment on 3/25/19, edit AG 2.2 to read, "The County should work with the United States Forest Service to ensure that high impact agricultural processes, such as timber production, have low impacts on surrounding sensitive land uses." (Decision NOT made during meeting on 3/11 - edits contained here were recommended)	The County should <a href="#">work with the United States Forest Service</a> to ensure that high impact agricultural processes, such as timber production, have low impacts on surrounding sensitive land uses. <del>such as residential land uses.</del>





#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
75	Kathy & Mark D.	Page-5-4 AG-2.2	Edit AG 2.2 re-edited from March 11 meeting to read, "The County should encourage that high impact agriculture processes have low impacts on surrounding sensitive land uses such as residential land uses."	Requested change made – overrides #58	The County should encourage that high impact agricultural processes, such as timber production, have low impacts on surrounding sensitive land uses, such as residential land uses.
76	Commissioner Johnson	Page 5-4 AG-2	REPLACE Goal AG-2 / AG2.1 with, "The County should encourage the high impact agricultural processes do not negatively affect surrounding sensitive land uses."	Requested change made	The County should encourage that <u>the</u> high impact agricultural processes <u>do not negatively affect</u> , <del>have low impacts on</del> surrounding sensitive land uses.
77	Kathryn Johnson	Page 6-2 Trails and Bicycle Systems	The Mickelson Trail is maintained by SD Game Fish and Parks rather than the Forest Service.	Requested change made	The US Forest Service also owns and maintains trails through the Black Hills National Forest, including <del>the Mickelson Trail</del> <u>and the</u> Centennial Trail.
78	Commissioner Johnson	Page 6-2 Trails and Bicycle Systems	ADD the following third sentence, "The Mickelson Trail through the Black Hills is managed by South Dakota Game Fish and Parks."	Requested change made	The US Forest Service also owns and maintains trails through the Black Hills National Forest, including the Centennial Trail. <u>The Mickelson trail through the Black Hills is managed by South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks</u>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
79	Kathryn Johnson	Page 6-9 TC-1.5	This statement needs specificity. What technologies are being considered?	Reword as follows:  “The County should seek opportunities to incorporate new technologies into their transportation system, <a href="#">such as facilities for electronic vehicles, autonomous vehicles, and ridesharing services.</a> ”	The County should seek opportunities to incorporate new technologies into their transportation system, <a href="#">such as facilities for electronic vehicles, autonomous vehicles, and ridesharing services.</a>
80	Sandra Runde	Page 6-10 TC-2	Bike paths make no sense. Too much money is already being spent in the City to incorporate this type of activity. It strikes me as a waste of funds (whether it be the County’s money or the land owner’s money.)	Planning Commission Comment on 3/25/19: No action required - changes to be addressed in TC 2.1 and TC 2.2	No change made
81	Kathryn Johnson	Page 6-10 TC-2.1	This is an example of when “should” is too prescriptive. A bike trail as described is a big costly undertaking. More fitting would be rewording such as, “The County should examine the feasibility of ... as a long-term project.”	Requested change to be made See #65 for additional change	The County should work with SDDOT, the US Forest Service, and US National Park Service to <a href="#">examine the feasibility of</a> <del>create</del> <a href="#">creating</a> a bicycle route connecting the Black Hills National Forest to the Badlands National Park and Buffalo Gap National Grassland <a href="#">as a long-term project.</a>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
82	Kathy / Mark D.	Page 6-10 TC-2.1	Edit TC 2.1 Page 6-10 to read, "The County should examine the feasibility of a bike route or bike routes as a long term project."	Planning Commission comment on 3/15/19 – revised accordingly, see #64	The County should <del>work with SDDOT, the US Forest Service, and US National Park Service to examine the feasibility of create</del> a bicycle route <del>connecting the Black Hills National Forest to the Badlands National Park and Buffalo Gap National Grassland as a long-term project.</del>
83	Kathryn Johnson	Page 6-10 TC-2.2	Considering the long distances and elevation differences within the County bicycling may offer only limited utility. More appropriate would be to say, "The County should evaluate the feasibility of developing a program to promote bicycling...".	Changes to this policy were made based on comments from Planning Commission on 3/25/19	See #67
84	Kathy / Jim / Mark D.	Page 6-10 TC-2.2	Edit TC 2.2 Page 6-10 to read, "The County should consider a bicycle advocacy program to encourage bicycling as a viable form of transportation throughout the County."	Planning Commission comment on 3/25/19 – revised accordingly, see #64	The County should <del>consider a</del> <u>consider</u> <del>promote a</del> bicycle advocacy program to encourage bicycling as a viable <del>daily</del> form of transportation <del>and recreation</del> throughout the County.
85	Kathryn Johnson	Page 6-11 TC-5.1	This statement is too prescriptive. Consider rewording to say, The County should consider ...." In the last sentence please change "This will include the following." to "This may include the following."	Planning Commission comment on 3/11/19: Replace "will" with "may" in the last sentence of the first paragraph on Page 6-11	This <del>will</del> <u>may</u> include the following.



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
86	Kathryn Johnson	Page 7-1 Water Supply 3rd sentence	More accurate description of the groundwater is as follows. Replace “Most” with “All but the crystalline core of the Black Hills”. Add the sentence, “Within the crystalline core of the Black Hills that extends from Rockerville to Deer Field Reservoir groundwater supplies are limited and depend upon secondary permeability in fracture zones and seasonal recharge from rain and snow.”	Requested change made	<del>Most of Pennington County</del> <u>All but the crystalline core of the Black Hills</u> is underlain with one or more aquifers that yield water of varying quality. <u>Within the crystalline core of the Black Hills that extends from Rockerville to Deer Field Reservoir, groundwater supplies are limited and depend upon secondary permeability in fracture zones and seasonal recharge from rain and snow.</u> The aquifers within the county capable of supplying sufficient quantities of water to support municipal and industrial growth are the Deadwood, Madison, Minnelusa, Minnekahta, and Inyan Kara Aquifers.
87	Kathryn Johnson	Page 7-2	Is it anticipated that a section of Goals and Policies will be added?	Goals and policies for this chapter start on Page 7-6.	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
88	Kathryn Johnson	Page 7-5 Libraries	I am not aware that Rapid City has two libraries. The Library has the main downtown location and a partner branch location at General Beadle Elementary School.	Rapid City has two library facilities. While common vernacular would be to describe them as libraries (the facilities, not the operational construct), can modify statement to say two branches.  Planning Commission 3/25/19: Edit Libraries Page 7-5 to indicate that Rapid City has a Main Library Location and a Branch Location, not two libraries.	There are five public libraries within the county, Hill City, Keystone, and Wall each has one library and Rapid City has <a href="#">a main library location and a branch location</a> <del>two</del> .
89	Kathryn Johnson	Page 7-6 PFS-1.2	I don't know what "to be buffered" means? Consider the following: "The County should require reasonable assurance that wells and water sources are not impacted from high pollution sources, such as mining or heavy industrial activities."	Requested change to be made  Planning Commission 3/25/19: Edit PFS 1.2 Page 7-6 to read, "The County should require reasonable assurance that wells and water sources are not impacted from high pollution sources."	The County should require <a href="#">reasonable assurance that</a> wells and water sources <a href="#">are not impacted</a> <del>to be buffered</del> from high pollution sources.
90	Sonny Rivers	Page 7-6 PFS-1.4	Edit PSF -1.4 Page 7-6 to include education about wastewater treatment. Starting in 1.4 after the word about - "...water quality, sources, scarcity, conservation methods, and wastewater treatment."	Requested change to be made	The County should educate the public about water quality, sources, scarcity, <del>and</del> conservation methods, <a href="#">and wastewater treatment</a> .



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
91	Sonny Rivers	Page 7-6 PFS-2.1	Insert the word "minimize" after the comma and before the word impervious.	Requested change made	The County should encourage stormwater facility designs that minimize drainage concentrations, <a href="#">minimize</a> impervious coverage, and avoid floodplain areas, where feasible.
92	Sonny Rivers	Page 7-6 PFS-2.2	Delete the words, "...as part of new development...".	Requested change made	The County should require the provision of erosion control measures <del>as part of new development</del> to minimize sedimentation of streams and drainage channels.
93	Sonny Rivers	Page 7-6 PFS-3.1	Delete the last two words, "...when available."	Requested change made	The County should encourage developments to connect into public wastewater treatment systems. <del>when available.</del>
94	Sonny Rivers	Page 7-6 PFS-3.3	Edit - (Make it new 3.2) / Place a period after the word inspected and delete the rest of the sentence (...at least once every 3 years.)	Requested change made	The County should require on-site wastewater treatment systems to be inspected. <del>at least once every 3 years.</del>
95	Sonny Rivers	Page 7-6 PFS-3	EDIT PSF-3 Page 7-6 / New goal in PSF-3 to read, "The County should support technological innovation to protect and an ensure the sustainability of our water resources."	Requested change made	<a href="#">The County should support technological innovation to protect and ensure the sustainability of our water resources.</a>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
96	Kathryn Johnson	Page 7-6 PFS-3.2 to 3.6	I don't think this Comprehensive Plan should suggest changing the septic regulations. I suggest addressing public safety from on-site wastewater treatment systems as, "The County ordinances pertaining to on-site wastewater treatment systems should ensure public safety and protection of water resources."	Response during 3/25/19 meeting: <a href="#">The County ordinance pertaining to on-site wastewater treatment systems should ensure public safety and protection of water resources.</a>  Per Planning Commission comments on 3/25/19, deleted 3.2, 3.4, and 3.5	<a href="#">The County ordinance pertaining to on-site wastewater treatment systems should ensure public safety and protection of water resources.</a>
97	Mark Ruddeforth	Page 7-6 Goal PSF 3.3 & 3.4	What science is there that requires septic inspection at 3 year intervals? Current 6 year interval was supposedly science-based, and the county sponsored training for installers teaches 5 to 6 year intervals are sufficient. 3 years is overly restrictive. Again, what data exists to support the 3 year interval? Have the current 6-year inspections identified problems? The addition of staff to conduct septic inspections is a county takeover of what is now done by the business community. What benefit is expected from the takeover of a private enterprise by county government?	Per Planning Commission comments on 3/25/19, deleted 3.2, 3.4, and 3.5	Deleted policy



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
98	Mark Ruddeforth	Page 7-6 Goal PSF 3.5	What science exists to justify annual septic pump out if a garbage disposal is used? How will the sludge and scum layers be measured and by whom? At what interval will these measurements be required? This whole goal is flawed and should be eliminated.	Per Planning Commission comments on 3/25/19, deleted 3.2, 3.4, and 3.5	<del>The County should require tanks to be pumped whenever the top of the sludge layer is less than 12 inches below the bottom of the outlet baffle or whenever the bottom of the scum layer is less than three inches above the bottom of the outlet baffle. When a garbage disposal is used, the on-site wastewater treatment system tank should be pumped at least once per year.</del>
99	Dustin Willett	PSF-4.6	EDIT / Remove existing PSF4.6 and replace with, "The County shall continue to update all aspects of disaster planning."	Requested change made	The County shall continue to <del>regularly update its Emergency Operations Plan</del> <a href="#">update all aspects of disaster planning.</a>
100	Travis Lasseter	Chapter 8 "3.2"	Page number should be corrected to be 8.2.	Requested change made	Page number corrected





#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
101	Andrew Busse	Page 8-2 Section 8.1 Recreation, Open Space and Tourism Overview, Tourism, Wine Trail	The paragraph states, “Highway 385 is considered the “wine trail” area in South Dakota. The trail connects Hill City’s Prairie Berry Winery, Naked Winery, and Stone Faces Winery to the Belle Joli Winery and Schade Winery in Deadwood. The 50-mile drive passes through forested glens and meadowlands, as well as providing roadside views of Pactola Reservoir and Sheridan Lake.” <small>SEP</small> Recommendation would be to delete this paragraph entirely or at least eliminate naming private establishments. Under similar conditions, it would be recommended to delete the following paragraph as well and maybe list significant Tourist Favored Events in the area: Such as Black Hills Stock Show and Rodeo, Hills Alive, Sturgis Motorcycle Rally, Black Hills Powwow, etc.	Revised to remove the private establishments named under the Wine Trail section.	<del>The trail connects Hill City’s Prairie Berry Winery, Naked Winery, and Stone Faces Winery to the Belle Joli Winery and Schade Winery in Deadwood.</del> The 50-mile drive <u>connects different wineries and</u> passes through forested glens and meadowlands, as well as providing roadside views of Pactola Reservoir and Sheridan Lake.
102	Andrew Busse	Page 9-2/9-7	Duplicate Paragraph. <i>Recommend deleting one of the duplicates.</i>	Requested change made	Removed duplicate paragraph
103	Kathryn Johnson	Page 9-7 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	This paragraph is a duplicate of last paragraph on page 9-2.	Requested change made	Remove duplicate paragraph



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
104	Andrew Busse	Page 9-7 Section 9.1 Health and Safety Overview	Recommendation would be to add the South Dakota National Guard and the two companies of helicopters they have available for Aerial Fire Fighting Support and Search and Rescue Operations. Additionally, I would recommend the addition of the Life Flight Helicopters currently stationed throughout the Hills to support Pennington County residents and the Life Flight fixed wing located at Rapid City Regional Airport to move residents to higher levels of care as the needs arise. Under this section, I would add the South Dakota National Guard Civil Support Team for its availability in the event of disaster and the numerous National Guard Units and Armories in the County. It might also be worth adding South Dakota Wild Land Fire who has a presence in the county.	Added mention of various search and rescue operations and other examples provided as data was available.	<a href="#">In addition to the Emergency Management Department in Pennington County, there are emergency services that are provided by other entities. The following provide emergency services in Pennington County: Black Hills Life Flight: Black Hills Life Flight is an emergency air medical transport service through Air Methods 82<sup>nd</sup> Civil Support Team South Dakota National Guard: the 82<sup>nd</sup> Civil Support Team (CST) is a hazard response team through the South Dakota National Guard. The 82<sup>nd</sup> CST responds to natural and man-made disasters. South Dakota Wildland Fire Division: The South Dakota Wildland Fire Division hosts up to five Single Engine Air Tankers in South Dakota, some of which are located or co-located, at the Rapid City Heavy Air Tanker Base and the Rapid City Regional Airport, among other locations in the state, to support wildland fires in the Black Hills.</a>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
105	Rick Bell	Page 9-8	April 18 1643 email: Discussion: "Due to hazards found at home, the County educates residents on proper hazardous waste storage and disposal. The County also hosts Household Hazardous Waste events where household hazardous waste is collected and safely disposed. {Please add "at least once annually" because the last one was held in 2017.} NO ADDITIONAL ACTION TAKEN -ADDRESSED DURING 4/22 PC MEETING GOAL HS-3.4 PAGE 9-12	Requested change made	The County also hosts Household Hazardous Waste events where household hazardous waste is collected and safely disposed <a href="#">at least once annually</a> .
106	Commissioner Johnson	Page 9-8	Last paragraph....REMOVE the words, "at least once annually."	Requested change made	The County also hosts Household Hazardous Waste events where household hazardous waste is collected and safely disposed <del>at least once annually</del> .
107	Kathryn Johnson	Page 9-12 HS-3.2	I don't think it is prudent for the County to "participate" in remediation of hazardous waste sites. At best, the County could "cooperate" in the remediation being conducted by responsible parties.	Revised per Planning Commission Comment on 3/25/19	The County should <del>participate</del> <a href="#">monitor and cooperate</a> , as appropriate, <del>with</del> <a href="#">in</a> the remediation <a href="#">actions of federal, state, and private entities</a> of hazardous waste sites in the county.
108	Rick Bell / Sonny Rivers / Kathy Johnson / Dustin Willett / Ron Rossknecht	Page 9-12 HS-3.4	April 18 1643 email: Edit Goal HS 3.4 Page 9-12 to read, "The County will continue to support Household Waste collection events in which household hazardous waste is collected from residents for proper disposal at a frequency commensurate with community need." NOTE: The Planning Commission requested that Dustin Willett come up with this new verbiage for Goal HS 3.4. During the April 22, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission desired collection to be annually and as-needed.	Requested change made	The County <del>will</del> <a href="#">shall</a> continue to <del>host</del> <a href="#">support</a> Household Hazardous Waste <a href="#">collection</a> events in which household hazardous waste is collected from residents for proper disposal <a href="#">at a frequency commensurate with community need</a> .



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
109	Rick Bell / Jerome Harvey	HS 3.9	<p>April 18 1643 email: Edit Goal HS 3.9 Page 9-12 to include "...and Carbon Monoxide Detectors." at the end of the existing Goal. (See May 13 meeting items below)</p> <p>...</p> <p>April 18 1643 email: Discussion "HS-3.9 The County should encourage and participate in voluntary inspections of residential homes, particularly those occupied by the elderly or handicapped, including education on the proper use of residential smoke detectors. {Please add " and carbon monoxide detectors"} NO ADDITIONAL ACTION TAKEN -ADDRESSED DURING 4/22 PC MEETING GOAL HS-3.9 PAGE 9-12</p>	Requested change made	The County should encourage and participate in voluntary inspections of residential homes, particularly those occupied by the elderly or handicapped, including education on the proper use of residential smoke detectors <a href="#">and carbon monoxide detectors</a> .
110	Sonny Rivers / Kathy Johnson	HS 3.9	MOVE Goal HS 3.9 Page 9-12 to Page 9-15 and move into GOAL HS-9	Requested change made	Moved policy accordingly
111	Kathryn Johnson	Page 9-13 HS-5.1 – 5.4	I suggest revising Goal HS-5 to reflect the fact that the JLUS was completed in 2016. The County should continue is role as a partner for implantation of actions identified to mitigate or avoid compatibility issues. The specifics of the County's role should be determined in discussions within the County government.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <p>JLUS described in the Existing Conditions Report. Date does not alter approach here.</p> <p>County's role was established in discussions with County government during development of the JLUS.</p>	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
112	Rich Marsh	Page 9-14 Goal HS 6 / HS 6.1	Edit Goal HS 6.1 Page 9-14 to read, "The County should consider implementing the findings and recommendation . . ." (Rest of sentence stays the same).	Requested change made	The County should <a href="#">consider implementing</a> the findings and recommendations of the Ellsworth AFB JLUS through adoption of new ordinances, policies and other regulations specified in the JLUS.
113	Kathryn Johnson	Page 9-14 HS-8.1	On the face of it, the suggestion that the County should consider participate in paying for remediation at EAFB seems preposterous. Explanation is required.	No change recommended. Part of JLUS programs reviewed with County. Only states "possible participation" by the County.	No change made
114	Kathryn Johnson	Page 10-1 Table 10-1	Consider adding Mt. Rushmore Nation Park with 1,278.45 acres to the list.	Land area was included with the Black Hills National Forest, but will be broken out separately.	Added Mt Rushmore to table
115	Commissioner Marsh	Page 10-2	ADD more clarifiers for what and where the Josef and Maria Judrna Homestead and Ranch are. Life long residence in Pennington County are not familiar with what this is.	Requested change made	<a href="#">The Josef and Marie Kudrna Homestead and Ranch is a homestead and ranch from 1910 in eastern Pennington County, which was listed on the National Register for its significance in homesteading and agriculture.</a>
116	Kathryn Johnson	Page 10-3 NCR-2.3	This statement needs greater specificity. It is not clear what actions the County could take affect "future growth of municipalities" I believe that landowners adjoining the City can petition the city for annexation without approval of the County. In addition, all development impacts the natural environment – what specifically is being considered in this statement?	No change recommended.  Only states coordination with cities.	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
117	Kathryn Johnson	Page 10-3 NCR-4.2	Please add the definition of "Low Impact Development" to this statement.	Clarification made during Planning Commission meeting on 3/25/19	The County should promote Low Impact Development (LID) practices to limit developments impact on Spring Creek's water quality. <a href="#">LID is an approach to stormwater management that mimics a site's natural hydrology as landscape develops.</a>
118	Commissioner Johnson	Page 10-5 NCR-6	REWRITE to the goal description...it should read, "Mining Operations in Pennington County will be reclaimed following excavation according to best practices designed to restore the site to the pre-mining land us."	Requested change made	Mining operations in Pennington County will be <del>conditioned to be</del> reclaimed following excavation according to best practices designed to restore the site <del>to</del> for the pre-mining land use.
119	Rick Bell	NCR-6	"Goal NCR-6 Mining operations throughout Pennington County shall be conducted in a manner that does not detract from the County's natural environment."	Planning Commission took no action on this item.	No change made
120	Rick Bell	NCR-6	Mr. Bells comments included a renumbering of Section Goal NCR-6. "NCR-6 NCR-6.1 No hard-rock mining will be allowed anywhere in the County."	No change to NCR-6 recommended by Planning Commission	No change made
121	Rick Bell	NCR-6.2	"NCR-6.2 As part of permit review process for surface sand and gravel mines, the County will work with applicants to minimize the adverse effects on environmental features such as water quality and quantity, air quality, flood plains, biological resources, archaeological and cultural resources, viewsheds, and aesthetic factors."	No change to goal NCR-6 recommended by the Planning Commission.	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
122	Rick Bell	NCR-6.3	Mr. Bell proposed the following: "NCR-6.3 As part of permit review process for surface sand and gravel mines, the County will work with applicants to minimize the manage and minimize potential hazards and nuisances of mining activities to persons and properties in the area during extraction, processing, and reclamation operations."	No change to goal NCR-6 recommended by the Planning Commission.	No change made
123	Kathryn Johnson	Page 10-3 NCR-6.2	There seems to be a typo in this statement – “to minimize the manage”.	Reword as follows:  “As part of permit review process, the County will work with applicants to <del>minimize the manage and</del> minimize potential hazards and nuisances of mining activities to persons and properties in the area during extraction, processing, and reclamation operations.”	As part of permit review process, the County <del>will</del> <u>shall</u> work with applicants to <del>minimize the manage and</del> minimize potential hazards and nuisances of mining activities to persons and properties in the area during extraction, processing, and reclamation operations.
124	Kathryn Johnson	Page 10-3 Goal NCR-6	This goal is highly subjective. Some would argue that any mining regardless of subsequent reclamation detects from the natural environment. Other’s would argue the opposite. Perhaps re-write a more objective goal such as: “Mining operations throughout Pennington County are reclaimed following excavation according to best industrial practices to minimally restore the site for the pre-mining land use.”	Support change with these modifications:  “Mining operations <del>throughout in</del> Pennington County <u>will be conditioned to be</u> <del>are</del> reclaimed following excavation according to best industrial practices <u>designed</u> to <del>minimally</del> restore the site for the pre-mining land use.”	Mining operations <del>throughout in</del> Pennington County <u>will be conditioned to be</u> <del>are</del> reclaimed following <u>excavation according to best practices designed to restore the site for the pre-mining land use.</u> <del>excavation in a manner that does not detract from the County’s natural environment.</del>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
125	S. Ann Harjes	Pg 10-4 Goal NCR-6	Dear Planning Department: I will keep this simple and direct. In regards to "Pg 10-4 Goal NCR-6". I vehemently object to any type of drilling or mining when in close proximity to any water source, especially Pactola. No matter the claim for restoration/restitution. This honestly seems, in casual terms, like a no-brainer situation. This is a no vote. Please go beyond chasing a dollar and protect our outdoor lifestyle, our environment, our drinking water, and us.	No changes to Comprehensive Plan recommended. Planning Commission discussed this item on 3/25/19 and felt it was not appropriate for this type of direction in the comprehensive plan.	No change made
126	Cathy Thrash	Page 10-3 Goal NCR-6	Hi there, I've viewed some of the 2040 Pennington County Comprehensive Plan. It's clear there's been a lot of effort put in that plan, thank you. I am quite concerned over the Goal NCR-6 section on page 10-4.  Please consider this my input/comment/request on this EARTH DAY, as a Pennington County resident and a fellow human who LOVES and appreciates this area: NO MINING. Let's keep our beautiful Black Hills BEAUTIFUL and our water supply and air quality SAFE for our kids and generations to come.  THANK YOU for your continued work on this project.	No changes to comprehensive plan recommended. The Planning Commission took no action on this item due to a lack of specifics.	Np change made
127	Rick Bell	NCR-6	Mr. Bell proposed the following: "NCR-6.4 The County will encourage the development of any mineral deposits in a manner compatible with surrounding land uses."	No change to goal NCR-6 recommended by the Planning Commission.	No change made





#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
128	Julie Santella	NCR-6	"I would like to see a stance explicitly against hardrock mining in the county comprehensive plan. I would also like there to be language requiring public input regarding any proposals to mining in the county."	No changes to comprehensive plan recommended. The Planning Commission took no action on this item due to a lack of specifics.	No change made
129	Julie Santella	NCR-6	The current zoning ordinance #34-35, governing the extraction of sand, gravel, limestone & the like, now holds that Tribal Historic Preservation officers are to be notified when applications to mine are filed." Next paragraph, "I want to encourage the Commission to continue this trend and make sure provisions requiring public input & meaningful tribal consultation are included in the section in the Comprehensive Plan focused on mining under mining : under Goal NCR-6 on page 10-4 of that draft plan.	The Planning Commission discussed the possibility of placing in the Comprehensive Plan a statement similar to the following: "That it is a priority of Pennington County that public comment is incorporated into the creations of Ordinances."	No change made at this time
130	Julie Santella	NCR-6	I would like to see a stance explicitly against hardrock mining in the county comprehensive plan. I would also like there to be language requiring public input regarding any proposals to mining in the county.	No changes to comprehensive plan recommended. The Planning Commission took no action on this item due to a lack of specifics.	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
131	Kathy Johnson	NCR-6	EDIT - change requested / The acronym SMARA is not spelled out or defined in the document. There is no explanation of this acronym. This also appears as Item 24 of the Comment Matric and may be SMCRA.	Requested change made – should be SMCRA	All surface mines in the County, unless otherwise exempted, shall be subject to reclamation plans that meet <a href="#">Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA)</a> requirements. Reclamation procedures shall restore the site for future beneficial use of the land consistent with the Pennington County Comprehensive Plan, subsequent to the completion of surface mining activities. Mine reclamation costs shall be borne by the mine operator, and guaranteed by financial assurances set aside for restoration procedures.
132	Rick Bell	NCR-6.5	Mr. Bell proposed the following: "NCR-6.5 All surface mines in the County, unless otherwise exempted, shall be subject to reclamation plans that meet SMARA requirements. Reclamation procedures shall restore the site for future beneficial use of the land consistent with the Pennington County Comprehensive Plan, subsequent to the completion of surface mining activities. Mine reclamation costs shall be borne by the mine operator, and guaranteed by financial assurances set aside for restoration procedures."	No change to NCR-6 recommended by the Planning Commission.	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
133	Rick Bell	NCR-6.6	Mr. Bell requested the addition of a new NCR-6-1, which thus created NCR-6.6. Mr. Bell proposed the following: "All surface mining operations in the County shall be required to take precautions to avoid contamination from wastes or incidents related to the storage and disposal of hazardous materials, or general operating activities at the site."	No change to NCR-6 recommended by the Planning Commission.	No change made
134	Nancy Hilding	Goal NRC-2	I suggest this Goal NRC-2 section - you all add the word "state" as the state of SD has it's own threatened and endangered list that is related to, but independent of the federal list: <a href="https://gfp.sd.gov/threatened-endangered/">https://gfp.sd.gov/threatened-endangered/</a>  Suggested edit:  Goal NRC-2  The County shall ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive wildlife and plant life, including those species designated as rare, threatened, and/or endangered by the Federal [and/or SD State] government, through compatible land use development.  I hope I have time to write a more comprehensive and formal letter later, before next PC meeting.	Requested change made	The County shall ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive wildlife and plant life, including those species designated as rare, threatened, and/or endangered by the Federal <a href="#">and/or South Dakota State</a> government, through compatible land use development.
135	Commissioner Johnson	Page 11-1	REPLACE the word "appropriate" with the word "necessary."		



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
136	County Planning	Page 11-2 Action #5	Add "and International Residential Code" following International Building Code text.	Requested change to be made	The County shall adopt a current version of the International Building Code, <a href="#">International Residential Code, and inspection program</a> and implement its use in new construction.
137	Commissioner Johnson	Page 11-2	REPLACE the words "shall" with the word "should." Be sure to change in LUH-5 and AG-1 too.	Requested change to be made	To help ensure that <del>appropriate</del> <a href="#">necessary</a> actions are taken to implement the Comprehensive Plan, a set of implementation actions are provided.
138	Sandra Runde	Chapter 11	I am concerned about the additional cost it would take to implement all these proposals. I find it particularly odd that in Section 11 – Implementation Program – that of the 34 items listed all but two falls into Short-Term and On-Going categories. Two are under Mid-Term and none are listed under Long-Term.	The timeframe needs to reflect priorities and resources. The timing of these items will be discussed during the hearing process to get guidance from the Planning Commission and Board.	No change made at this time



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
139	Planning Staff	Action #8	Add definition or clarification of what a Right-to-Farm Ordinance is.	Requested change made	The County shall develop a Right-to-Farm ordinance, <a href="#">which seeks to protect farmers and ranchers from lawsuits related to nuisances. The Right-to-Farm ordinance will be</a> designed to protect agricultural land uses from conflicts with non-agricultural uses, as well as to help purchasers and residents understand the inconveniences that may occur as the natural result of living in or near agricultural areas.
140	Sonny Rivers	Action #20	The word "enhanced" needs to read as "enhances".	Requested change made	enhance <del>s</del> <sup>d</sup>
141	Sonny Rivers	Action #27	The word "avigation easement" appears to be misspelled. Possibly should be aviation easement?	NOTE: avigation easement is the correct use and means, "an easement or right of overflight in the airspace above or in the vicinity of a particular property. It also includes the right to create such noise or other effects as may result from the lawful operation of aircraft in such airspace and the right to remove any obstructions to such overflight."	No change made



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
142	Planning Commission	Action Number 32	REMOVE this action item. Be sure to remove NCR-4 as well.	Requested change made	<p data-bbox="1648 321 2032 418"><del>Spring Creek is re</del></p> <p data-bbox="1648 459 2032 995"><del>The County shall continue to support the Spring Creek Watershed 319 Project and implement the recommended best management practices to meet standards for fecal coliform / E. coli. The County should promote Low Impact Development (LID) practices to limit developments impact on Spring Creek's water quality. LID is an approach to stormwater management that mimics a site's natural hydrology as landscape develops.</del></p> <p data-bbox="1648 1003 2032 1198"><del>The County should educate the community on the importance of the Spring Creek Watershed and how the public can help reduce contaminates from the creek.</del></p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="1648 1247 2032 1344"><del>The County shall continue to regularly monitor the water quality of Spring Creek.</del></p>



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
143	Commissioner Johnson	Action Number 33	REPLACE the word "shall" with the word "should."	Requested change made	The County, <a href="#">in coordination with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources</a> , <del>should</del> regularly monitor water quality within its five aquifers.
144	Commissioner Marsh	Action Number 33	Incorporate within this Action Item that the County should also work with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources to monitor water quality within its five aquifers.	Requested change made	The County, <a href="#">in coordination with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources</a> , <del>should</del> regularly monitor water quality within its five aquifers.
145	Commissioner Johnson and Rivers	Action Number 34	REPLACE the verbiage in Action Item 34 with, "The County should ensure that Ordinances include the requirement for financial assurance for remediation and restoration where appropriate."	Requested change made	The County should <a href="#">ensure that Ordinances includes requirement for financial assurance for</a> <del>require appropriate bonding to ensure</del> remediation and restoration <a href="#">where appropriate.</a>
146	Kathy Johnson / Planning Commission	Chapter 11	Planning Commission discussion about how few goals from the Comprehensive Plan actually appear in Chapter 11.		
147	Planning Commission	General Comp Plan	Comp Plan goals in Chapter 11 appeared to related more to Ellsworth Air Force Base and less to overall County.		
148	Planning Commission	GOAL LUH-4	Goals from LUH-4 Page 3-11 do not appear in Chapter 11.		



#	Name	Document Location	Concerns / Comments	Response	Action
149	Planning Commission	Chapter 11	Something more needs to be added, a "larger view" to the beginning of Chapter 11 to better/further explain why specific goals are in Chapter 11 and why others are not and what should happen to those in the general document, but not listed in Chapter 11.		
150	Planning Commission	Chapter 11	Not all Chapters in the Comp Plan have goals reflected in Chapter 11. This should be corrected -- why are some more important than others. (For example: Chapter 4 -- no goal from Chapter 4 appear in Chapter 11.		
151	Planning Commission		Need the goals throughout the comp plan, the ones that were changed and unchanged to match goals in Chapter 11 if changed		
152	Planning Commission		Check all page numbers for accordance	Requested change made	Revisions made as needed throughout
153	Planning Commission		Check all spelling for accuracy	Requested change made	Revisions made as needed throughout
154	Planning Commission		Check all punctuation for accuracy	Requested change made	Revisions made as needed throughout
155	Planning Commission	Chapter 3	Under LDR Zoning, the Minimum Lot Size should be changed to 21,780 square feet (1/2 acre)	Requested change made	<del>20,000 sf</del> <a href="#">1/2 ac</a>