1. **Call to Order**

Chair Kohlenberg called the special meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

a. **Attendance**

Members Present: Liz Kohlenberg, Joyce Roper, Craig Ottavelli, Liz Lyman, George Darkenwald (7:10 p.m.), Tom Cole, Margaret Paradise, Bob Musser, and Chris Lane.

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Nancy Pritchett and Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President, Puget Sound Meeting Services.

b. **Approval of Agenda**

Commissioner Ottavelli moved, seconded by Commissioner Lyman, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

2. **Public Communication Not Associated with Topics for Which Public Hearings Have Been Held**

There were no public comments.

3. **Approval of Minutes – February 16, 2005 and March 2, 2005**

Commissioner Lyman moved, seconded by Commissioner Ottavelli, to approve the February 16, 2005 and March 2, 2005 minutes and accept the tapes as the official record.

The following corrections were requested to the minutes of February 16, 2005:
• On page 2, in the second bullet on the page, the second sentence should be revised to read, “Presumed if it is handheld and hand powered it would be ok.”
• On page 3, the third bullet should be revised to read, “Is allowing existing agriculture uses subject only to best management practices consistent with the WEAN decision?” Do we need to put data in the record that we analyzed the impacts of allowing the existing agriculture?”
• On page 3, the first sentence should be revised to read, “The Commission added a provision to O on page 35 of the draft allowing replacement of docks and piers provided that they are not expanded.”
• On page 3, in the second paragraph, the second line should be reformatted to reflect 5,000 instead of a break of 5, and 000 in the sentence structure.
• On page 3, in the third paragraph, “elimianteing” should be corrected to read, “eliminated.”
• On page 3, in the fifth paragraph, the paragraph should be revised to read, “Planning Commission members decided to form a subcommittee to review the entire draft for consistency and format prior to releasing the draft to the public. Commissioners Roper, Lyman, and Kohlenberg agreed to serve on the subcommittee.”
• On the last page of the minutes under “Request for Information Summary Sheet” “Wein” should be corrected to read “WEAN.”

The following corrections were requested to the minutes of March 2, 2005:

• On page 3, the last sentence in the third bullet should be revised to read, “The Planning Commission decided to refine this item to say that fencing will be required if the distance is a quarter mile or less and string and staking will be required if the distance is greater than a quarter mile.”
• On page 4, in the third bullet under section 17.15.980 Mitigation for Wetland Impacts, the entire paragraph should be revised to read, “Commissioner Lyman requested that the following language from CTED be added to the Wetlands chapter: No net loss of functions or values of critical areas. Uses and activities carried out pursuant to this chapter shall result in equivalent or greater functions and values of the critical areas associated with a proposed action, as determined by the best available science. All actions and developments shall be designed and constructed to avoid, minimize, and restore all adverse impacts. Applicants must first demonstrate an inability to avoid or reduce impacts before restoration or mitigation of impacts will be allowed. No activity or use shall be allowed that results in a net loss of functions or values of the critical areas. It was agreed that this paragraph should be added to the Administrative Section so that it will apply to all chapters of the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO).”

The motion carried as amended. Commissioner Roper abstained.

Commissioners discussed the practice of receiving the meeting tapes for meetings they did not attend. The Commission requested staff provide tapes to members absent from a meeting.
Commissioner Darkenwald arrived at 7:10 p.m.

Members provided self-introductions. Commissioners welcomed new Commissioner, Bob Musser. Commissioners shared information about their professional and educational background as well as their particular interest for serving on the Commission.

4. Briefing: Critical Areas – Geologic Hazards

   Staff: Nancy Pritchett

Ms. Pritchett briefed members on critical areas - geologic hazard areas within the following Geologic Hazard Areas materials mailed to members on March 11, 2005.

- Committee Draft – Best Available Science/Guidance Geologic Hazard Areas
- Landslide and Marine Bluff Hazards – Table comparing current definitions and proposed changes
- Landslide and Marine Bluff Hazards – Table comparing current definitions with definitions found in WAC 365-190-080(f)(d), King County and Pierce County ordinances
- Geologic Hazard Areas – Draft Definitions.

Members have received briefings since early spring 2003 on different segments of the Critical Areas Ordinance. For the geologic hazard section, a subcommittee of two Planning Commission members, a geotechnical engineer, a geologist with the Department of Natural Resources, and a planner from the County spent several months reviewing best available science for each hazard area.

Ms. Pritchett began the review on page 6 – Erosion Hazard Areas. The WAC definition for erosion hazard areas is at least those areas identified by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service as having a “severe” rill and inter-rill erosion hazard. Thurston County’s current definition is similar, but the County does not have any standards nor recording requirements for erosion hazard areas. The County defines erosion as surface and water erosion. Staff recommends defining erosion hazard as surface erosion or water hazard erosion. She indicated she spoke with Brian Thompson, Thurston Conservation District, to better understand the Thurston County Soil Survey. Most soils in the County are mostly stable unless on slopes of at least 15 percent or more. Water erosion hazards in the Soil Survey are classified as slight, moderate, or severe. Staff recommends a table of soil types on page seven of the draft.

Chair Kohlenberg asked for inclusion of the name of the soil type on the table as well.

The table reflects that most of the water erosion hazard occurs when slopes are at least 30 percent.

Ms. Pritchett reviewed the proposed revised definition on page 8 and recommended adding language that states, “When they occur on slopes of 15 percent or more.” She recommended not including the table within the ordinance and instead refer to the Thurston County Soil Survey. Commissioners questioned how the recommendation was determined for erosion hazards pertaining to slopes of at least 15%. Ms. Pritchett said the recommendation is based on Mr. Thompson’s working knowledge.
of the types of soils in Thurston County. Mr. Thompson believes that for erosion hazards in general for Thurston County, the County does not have the soil types that have much of an erosion problem unless there is at least a 15 percent slope.

Commission discussion ensued on soil types and the percent of slope.

The following documents the Commission’s discussion and/or recommendations pertaining to pages 8 through 19.

- On page 8, under *Proposed revised definition: “Erosion hazard areas”*: Commissioners generally agreed to use the slope percentage within the Thurston County Soil Survey. Commissioners asked for additional information about the percentages of slopes identified as “moderate risk.” Commissioners agreed with retaining language indicating, “…with a water erosion hazard of “severe.”
- On page 8, under section 3. Landslide Hazard Areas/Marine Bluff Hazard Areas: Commissioners reviewed Appendix A: Summary of Best Available Science – Landslide and Marine Bluff Hazard Areas and a spreadsheet dated 3/11/05 of a comparison of the current CAO and proposed draft for landslide hazard and marine bluff hazard including language recently adopted by King and Pierce Counties.
- On page 16, under *Proposed revised definition: “Landslide hazard areas”*: One primary proposed change to the definition is changing slopes from 30 percent to 20 percent. Commissioners and staff discussed the ManTech 1996 study and the Swanston 1980 study. Staff proposes changing slopes from thirty to twenty percent or steeper under section 1.a. Commissioners discussed the risk associated with the slope percentage and acknowledged the WAC speaks to using the conservative approach if adequate data is unavailable. Commissioners discussed the lack of data for Thurston County and the difficulty of making a recommendation based on limited or no data. **Motion: Commissioner Paradise moved, seconded by Commissioner Cole, to revise item 1.a. under Proposed revised definition (page 16) for Landslide hazard areas to read, “Slopes of fifteen percent or steeper and recommend that when funds become available, studies should be initiated that are needed to lower the standards.” Motion carried (5-4).**
- Ms. Pritchett referred members to “vertical height” within the first paragraph under *Proposed revised definition* for “Landslide hazard areas” on page 16. She suggested also considering marine bluff hazard areas with a vertical height of fifteen feet for consistency. Members discussed benches (terraces) within slopes and cited the example of the Carlyon Beach slide. **Motion: Commissioner Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Roper, to recommend vertical relief of at least fifteen feet for both steep slope and marine bluff areas as proposed by staff. Motion carried (6-3).**
- Ms. Pritchett referred to item 2 on page 16 pertaining to *Steep Slopes* and the recommended change stating, “Steep slopes of forty percent or greater.” Commissioners discussed the difference in units of measure between percentage versus degree. Commissioner Ottavelli asked staff to provide a table reflecting the equivalent between degrees and percentages.
- Ms. Pritchett reported staff proposes deleting Table 6-3 (page 50), which is a list of
landslide soils in Thurston County derived from the Thurston County Soil Survey. Commissioners discussed including the table of soil types within the erosion hazard section. Ms. Pritchett said some language is recommended for inclusion under the definitions for *Landslide* and under *Marine Bluff* that picks up known hazard areas, such as historic failures, etc.

- On page 17, under the *Proposed revised definition: Steep Slope*, the old definition included a break of more than fifteen feet. Staff proposes removing the language because it creates situations where building might occur on a bench of less than fifteen feet. Commissioners discussed the basis for the standard and for the proposed changes to the paragraph. Commissioners agreed to delete the last sentence of the paragraph stating, “This can also include a slope of twenty to thirty nine and nine-tenths percent which is defined as a “landslide hazard area” (refer to Figures 3 and 4).” Commissioner Lyman noted the ordinance includes references to both “vertical relief” and “vertical height.” She asked about the difference, and if there is no difference, which term should be used. Commissioners suggested using “vertical height” if there is no difference in the terms.

- Commissioners were referred to page 18, under *Proposed revised definition: “Top of Slope.”* Commissioners expressed concerns about the definition in terms of comprehension by the reader. A suggestion was offered to include a diagram of an example for “Top Slope.” Commission discussion ensued on the size of a bench where development would be prohibited as well as the term “bench.” Commissioner Ottavelli diagrammed several examples during the discussion and said the concern to be captured should include setting a parameter for the size of the shelf rather than referring to an interruption in slope and measuring the top of the slope dependent upon the shelf meeting a specific depth. Commissioners discussed the suggestion. Commissioner Lyman recommended staff provide a schematic that is attributed to the language. The Commission agreed. The sentence within the definition stating, “This can also include a slope from twenty to thirty nine and nine-tenths percent, which is defined as a “landslide hazard area” (refer to Figures 3 and 4)” was also recommended for deletion.

Ms. Pritchett reported said she will provide information and diagrams on toe and top of slope. Future review will begin with *Marine bluff hazard.* She asked members to bring their original draft to the next meeting.

5. **Annual Dinner with Board of County Commissioners**

Commissioner Lyman reported no new topics for discussion have been recommended by the Commission with the exception of a suggestion by John Sonnen to include a discussion on the Critical Areas Ordinance. Commissioner Paradise reported she is unable to attend the dinner but would like a discussion on long-range planning included rather than catch-up planning. Chair Kohlenberg requested Commissioners provide suggestions on other discussion topics.

Commissioner Lyman reported prior to the previous dinner, the Commission provided an agenda to the Board of County of Commissioners. Chair Kohlenberg recommended sending a copy of the previous joint meeting agenda to members.
6. Staff Updates

- Commissioner Lyman reported on John Sonnen’s earlier update to the Board of County Commissioners on the CAO. The Board requested information about the County’s public outreach efforts due to questions to the Board is receiving from citizens because of recent press coverage involving King County’s CAO. Commissioner Ottavelli reported the Board also received a document outlining many of the important issues. Commissioner Macleod had also suggested ensuring the public is aware that efforts in protecting wetlands and critical areas pertain directly to protecting water quality and that the issues are intertwined and part of the larger issue.

- Commissioner Lyman reported on her meeting with Michael Welter. Interviews for the position of Development Services Advanced Planning & Policy Manager will be held on Monday, March 21 2005, and might possibly continue to Tuesday, March 22, 2005. The meeting was to receive information from the Commission on what characteristics the Commission is seeking in a new planning manager. Members discussed the possibility of entering into an executive session to discuss the characteristics of the future planning manager. Commissioner Lyman shared information on the makeup of the interview panel. Half of the applicants have been eliminated and the interviews will be conducted with six applicants. The final two or three finalists will meet with the Planning Commission. She noted she has not received any questions or recommended qualifications for the planning manager position from the Planning Commission. She asked members to submit information to her in time for the interviews on March 21. She suggested the Commission should hold an executive session. A copy of the applications will be provided to her for the interview; however, she is unsure whether the applications can be shared with members. Members agreed to defer to Commissioner’s Lyman knowledge pertaining to the questions to ask of the candidates as well as any other questions submitted by Commissioners in addition to basic questions.

- Ms. Pritchett distributed copies of notice of public hearing for the Board of Commissions on April 4, 2005 on the renewal of Interim Ordinance No. 13030 – affecting mineral extraction and asphalt production activities in Thurston County.

- Ms. Pritchett said she will provide new information on buffers to the Commission.

7. Calendar

Who will be attending the following upcoming Planning Commission meetings?

March 30, 2005 – Briefing: Critical Areas – Geologic Hazards (Commissioners Cole and Paradise will not be attending)

April 6, 2005 – Briefing: Critical Areas – Administrative Sections (Commissioner Paradise will not be attending.

April 20, 2005 – Briefing: Critical Areas – Follow up topics (Commissioner Ottavelli will not be
NOTE: The following Parking Lot Issues were added at the meeting:

1. Contact property owners to ascertain how steep their slope was before it slid. This assumes property owners will have accurate knowledge about how steep the slope was.
2. Add discussion about how to notify property owners of known landslide risks in a particular area, such as Carlyon Beach.

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

Liz Kohlenberg, Chair
Tom Cole, Vice Chair

Prepared by: Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President, Amended April 20, 2005
Puget Sound Meeting Services

Thurston County Planning Commission
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF REQUEST</th>
<th>ISSUE/REQUEST</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/26/05</td>
<td>Field Trip when begin working on Development Code Docket or at least comprehensive maps</td>
<td>Chair Kohlenberg</td>
<td>Advanced Planning Staff/N. Pritchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/05</td>
<td>Commissioner Cole has concerns for citizens and how they can find out if there are impediments as to what can be done with a piece of property</td>
<td>Commissioner Cole</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/05</td>
<td>TCPC participate in the CFP process or comments</td>
<td>Commissioner Lyman</td>
<td>John Sonnen/Mark Swartout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/05</td>
<td>Balancing GMA goals with the Wein decision</td>
<td>TCPC</td>
<td>J. Sonnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/05</td>
<td>Requested advice on whether legal council should be present at public hearing</td>
<td>TCPC</td>
<td>J. Sonnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/05</td>
<td>Revised Draft Work Plan for Advance Planning</td>
<td>Commissioner Kohlenberg</td>
<td>J Sonnen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>