MINUTES – Regular Meeting

Thurston County Planning Commission
Wednesday, May 7, 2003
County Courthouse Complex
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Building 1 - Room 152
Olympia, Washington 98502

1. Call to Order

Chair Lyman, followed by introductions of Planning Commission members, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

a. Attendance

Members Present: Bob Bower, Liz Lyman, Joyce Roper, Craig Ottavelli, Mark Lovrien, Margaret Paradise, Tom Cole

Members Absent: Liz Kohlenberg

Staff Present: Fred Knostman, John Sonnen, Jeff Fancher, Mark Swarthout and Cami Olson

b. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved.

c. Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Bower moved to approve the April 16, 2003 minutes. Commissioner Paradise seconded. Motion carried.

2. Public Communications

None.

Commissioner Bower provided three articles to the Planning Commission members: 1) Local Governments Take Action to Protect Watersheds; 2) Under GMA Shellfish Beds Can be Protected as Resource Lands; 3) Counties Face Urban Concerns in Rural Areas.

3. Worksession/Action: Review/finalize Wireless Amendments

John Sonnen opened the discussion of the proposed changes to the draft document titled “Wireless Communication Facilities and Antenna Support Structures, Proposed Amendments to the Thurston County Zoning Code.” The document before the Planning Commission titled “The following proposed amendments would apply to chapters 21.33, 22.33 and 23.33 as well as 20.33” was discussed and included the following:

a. 20.33.050, Item 2di – Mr. Sonnen asked to remove the following language from the first sentence which reads: (in longitude and latitude, degrees, minutes and seconds to the nearest tenth of a second). The Planning Commission agreed.
b. 20.33.060, Item2aiii – Mr. Sonnen explained that Commissioner Lyman has suggested to revise this item to read: if the facilities are proposed to be located within one hundred feet of a structure occupied on a regular basis. A discussion followed. The Planning Commission and staff decided the language will read: if the facilities are proposed to be located within one hundred feet of a structure occupied at least three days a week.

John Sonnen provided the Planning Commission members a handout outlining comments to the Wireless Amendments from Commissioner Roper.

c. 20.33.030 – Mr. Sonnen asked Commissioner Roper to explain her comments regarding siting criteria. A discussion followed which resulted in the changes as follows:

1. 20.33.080, Item 1a – Commissioner Roper suggested removing the wording: to provide adequate capacity and coverage from the first sentence. The Planning Commission agreed.

The Planning Commission and staff agreed to remove the word “capacity” throughout the document, and replace it with alternate wording (to be determined per occurrence.)

d. 20.33.060, Item 2c – Mr. Sonnen stated that the first sentence should read: …shall be tested by the county or a third party reviewer, at the permittee’s expense and gather initial field measurements… The Planning Commission agreed.

e. 20.33.060, Item 2d – Mr. Sonnen explained that he would like to change the first sentence to read: …an existing facility that would increase its radio frequency emissions or the activation of any additional channels on a facility for which testing is required under subsection (2) (a). The Planning Commission agreed

f. 20.33.070 – Mr. Sonnen referred to a suggestion made by Commissioner Lyman at the end of this sentence that would read: …or other suitable structure within one mile (or the effective radius of radio frequency coverage, whichever is greater) of the proposed site. A discussion followed. The Planning Commission agreed to change this wording to read: …or other suitable structure within one mile or one half of the effective radius, which ever is greater.

g. 20.33.070, Item 5 – Mr. Sonnen explained that he would like to refer to “scenic views” in this sentence as they are defined in Section 20.33.080, Item 1b. The Planning Commission agreed.

h. 20.33.080, Item 1a – The Planning Commission decided to leave the wording: technically feasible” in this sentence, and remove the wording: to provide adequate capacity and coverage.

i. 20.33.080, Item 1aiv – A lengthy discussion followed concerning the suggestions of Commissioner Bower and Commissioner Roper. The Planning Commission agreed to add language in this item that would say: …encourage the applicant to speak with the community prior to submitting an application for a specific Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) site. The Planning Commission felt that this would give the community a chance to voice their opinion concerning the proposed application.
j. 20.33.030 – Commissioner Cole requested clarification concerning the wording: …publicly owned wildlife refuges… A discussion occurred. It was suggested to change the wording to read: …state and locally owned wildlife refuges… The Planning Commissioners agreed.

k. 20.33.080, Item 1bi, second paragraph – A discussion occurred concerning adding Commissioner Roper’s suggested language which would read: …as determined by the approval authority, or the applicant demonstrates that no alternative location is available. The Planning Commission agreed.

l. 20.33.080, Item 1bii – Commissioner Lyman had asked for clarification of the wording “trees taller than thirty feet” in the second sentence of this item. A discussion followed concerning this item. Jeff Fancher suggested changing this sentence to read: The approval authority shall deny applications for WCF/antenna support structures in open areas (i.e. fields, prairies, or lawns without trees taller than one half of the proposed tower height)… The Planning Commission agreed.

Mr. Sonnen stated that Commissioner Roper has proposed changing the use of “i.e. and e.g.” throughout the document to consistently read “including but not limited to”. The Planning Commission agreed.

m. 20.33.080, Item 1e1 – Mr. Sonnen stated that he has researched the suggestion that had been raised as to adding birds of conservation concern to this item. Mr. Sonnen explained that these birds are already on the state priority species list. A lengthy discussion followed concerning which lists of endangered or threatened species should be included in this item. The Planning Commission agreed to use the Federal and State lists, but did not agree on adding birds of local concern within the County code.

n. 20.33.080, Item 1f – Mr. Sonnen provided the Planning Commission members with a handout concerning recommended changes to this item. The Planning Commission agreed to add Mr. Sonnen’s proposed language in this item.

o. 20.33.080, Item 2a, second paragraph – Commissioner Lyman suggested changing the wording to read: …a minimum of one hundred ten percent of the proposed Wireless Communication Facilities height, including antennas.

p. 20.33.080, Item 3a and b – Mr. Sonnen addressed Commissioner Lyman’s question concerning the differences in separation distances between WCF’s in UGA and rural areas.

q. 20.33.080, Item 5dii – Mr. Sonnen explained that Commissioner Lyman had questioned the wording of the last sentence which reads: …that there is no alternative for providing necessary service. Mr. Sonnen would like to leave the word “service” as it is written. The Planning Commission agreed.

r. 20.33.080, Item 5f – Mr. Sonnen stated that he would like to change the wording in this sentence to be consistent with the use of the word “service” throughout the document. The sentence would read: WCF/antenna support structures shall not exceed the minimum height necessary to provide adequate service for the communications facilities proposed… The
Planning Commission agreed.

s. 20.33.080, Item 6di and ii – Mr. Sonnen explained that Commissioner Lyman had asked about the different buffer sizes sited within these items. Mr. Sonnen explained the reason for the two buffer sizes.

t. 20.33.080, Item 6di – Commissioner Lyman asked that the word “antenna” be moved in the first sentence so it would read: ...retention buffer to remain in effect for as long as the WCF/antenna support structure is in place. The Planning Commission agreed.

u. 20.33.110, Item 1 – an unidentified Commissioner stated that she would like to remove the language in the first sentence which reads: ...in the event the responsible party fails to act in accordance with the provisions of the Section... A discussion followed. The Planning Commission decided to not remove the language.

v. 20.33.110, Item 1 – Commissioner Roper asked that the last sentence be added which reads: All successors to the applicant shall submit evidence of comparable surety coverage. After a discussion the Planning Commission decided to not remove this sentence.

w. 20.33.110, Item 3, first paragraph – Commissioner Lyman suggested revising this sentence to read: Any WCF/antenna support structure that ceases to perform the normal functions associated with the facility on a continuous basis for a period of six consecutive months, facilities deemed by the county to be unsafe, or in violation of this chapter shall be deemed abandoned. The Planning Commission agreed.

x. 20.33.110, Item 3, second paragraph – A discussion concerning Commissioner Roper’s suggested changes to this item concerning surety and abandonment. The Planning Commission agreed not to change this item.

y. 20.33.130 – Commissioner Roper suggested removing this item. The Planning Commission agreed.

z. 20.33.110, Item 5 – Commissioner Lyman asked staff if an addition to this item should be made to require a WCF structure be removed sooner than 180 days if it is a hazard to public safety. The Planning Commission agreed to add language with this requirement.

Commissioner Ottavelli moved to submit the draft document “Wireless Communication Facilities and Antenna Support Structures, Proposed Amendments to the Thurston County Zoning Code” as amended. Commissioner Roper seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Mr. Sonnen stated that he will create the final draft of the document “Wireless Communication Facilities and Antenna Support Structures, Proposed Amendments to the Thurston County Zoning Code,” and explained that the Board of County Commissioner’s will be briefed on this document on June 10, 2003. Mr. Sonnen stated that he will ask the Board of County Commissioners to set the public hearing concerning these proposed amendments on June 12, 2003.

Mr. Sonnen asked the Planning Commission to submit any comments they may wish to be included in the cover letter to be presented to the Board of County Commissioners by May 16, 2003.
4. **Briefing/Worksession: Chapter 9 Natural Environment**

Mr. Sonnen addressed the Planning Commission to discuss the proposed amendments to Chapter 9 Natural Environment of the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan. The format of the document titled “Proposed Amendments to the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter Nine – Natural Environment” was discussed and it was concluded that the organization of the document should be addressed. Mr. Sonnen asked the Planning Commission to submit those proposed format and substantive changes to him by email or telephone and he will provide a new draft for the regular Planning Commission meeting on May 21, 2003.

Mark Swartout was introduced and the discussion concerning the content of the Chapter 9 Natural Environment document included the following changes:

a. IV Goals, Objectives and Policies, Goal 2, Action needed for Objective A, Policies: 2, page 17 – Mr. Swartout discussed this item and stated that staff would like to remove this item. Mr. Sonnen suggested that this instead be replaced with the first sentence of IV Goals, Objectives and Policies, Goal 2, Action needed for Objective B, 3, page 20. The Planning Commission agreed.

Commissioner Lyman asked Mr. Sonnen if he had heard back from Mr. Fancher regarding the question that she had asked about WAC provisions related to Protection of Shellfish Growing Areas under Critical Area Regulations and if they are binding on the County. Mr. Sonnen explained that Mr. Fancher had generally explained that these regulations are not strictly mandatory. However, the Growth Hearing Board measures plan amendments against them so we cannot deviate from the WAC without a very good reason. Mr. Sonnen explained that a separate category will be created to discuss shellfish protection.

Mr. Sonnen asked the Planning Commission members to submit their proposed changes to the draft document titled: “Proposed Amendments to the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter Nine – Natural Environment,” by email or mail by May 19, 2003. Mr. Sonnen will then incorporate the proposed changes and the new draft document will be discussed further at the May 21, 2003 regular meeting.

5. **Follow-up: Amendments**

Mr. Sonnen asked the Planning Commission for a decision concerning the presentation given on April 16, 2003 by Mr. Okerlund on the document titled: Proposed Amendments to the Olympia Growth Area Joint Comprehensive Plan, Oly-1. Mr. Okerlund had asked the Planning Commission to approve the following additional changes to the document titled: Chapter Seven: Parks, Arts and Recreation:

- Page 7, Policy PAR 1.3: add a second sentence to read: *Work cooperatively with Thurston County to find an equitable method to fund neighborhood parks through developer contributions.*

- Page 9, Policy PAR 4.7: add a sentence to read: *Collect SEPA based mitigation fees from developers in the Olympia Urban Growth Area for parks and open space.*

**Commissioner Bower moved to include Policy PAR 4.7, and to not include Policy PAR 1.3 of the Proposed Amendments to the Olympia Growth Area Joint Comprehensive Plan, Oly-1. Commissioner Cole seconded. Motion carried.***
6. **Set Hearing for Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Commissioner Lyman requested a motion to set a public hearing on June 18, 2003 concerning the Comprehensive Plan Amendments OLY-1, OLY-2, QJ-4, QJ-5, CO-2, CO-3 and CO-4. Commissioner Roper and Commissioner Cole stated that they will be unable to attend this public hearing.

*Commissioner Lovrien moved to set the Public Hearing. Commissioner Ottavelli seconded. Commissioner Roper and Commissioner Cole abstained. Motion carried.*

7. **Staff Updates**

Mr. Knostman stated that he would meet with Cindy Wilson to discuss setting up a presentation by her concerning SEPA at a regular Planning Commission meeting tentatively in August.

Mr. Knostman asked the Planning Commission if they would like to schedule a special meeting to discuss the Chapter 9 amendments. The Planning Commission decided not to set a special meeting at this time.

Mr. Knostman provided the Planning Commission with two handouts for their 2003 Comprehensive Plan binders:

1. Replacement for attachment F in QJ-1 (tab 7)
2. Replacement for Tab 2

8. **Calendar (Tentative)**

Commissioner Lyman asked if all members will be attending the regular meeting on May 21, 2003. All members will be present.

9. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Liz Lyman, Chair
Mark Lovrien, Vice Chair
Thurston County Planning Commission

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
SUMMARY SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF REQUEST</th>
<th>ISSUE/REQUEST</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2003</td>
<td>Mr. Sonnen will gather additional information concerning no-cost presentations of a county Plan by consulting firms</td>
<td>Commissioner Ottavelli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>