THURSTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes
August 31, 2005

1. Call to Order

Chair Kohlenberg convened the special meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m. Members provided self-introductions.

   a. Attendance

   Members Present: Liz Kohlenberg, Joyce Roper, Liz Lyman, Rhenda Strub (7:05 p.m.), Craig Ottavelli, Chris Lane, and Bob Musser
   Members Absent: George Darkenwald and Tom Cole.
   Staff Present: John Sonnen, Nancy Pritchett, and Recording Secretary Valerie Gow

   b. Approval of Agenda

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

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

There were no public comments.

3. Approval of Minutes and Acceptance of Tapes from July 6 and July 13, 2005.

Commissioner Musser moved, seconded by Commissioner Lyman, to table approval of the July 6 and July 13, 2005 minutes. Motion carried.

4. Worksession: Critical Areas Follow Up
Mr. Sonnen referred members to additional correspondence in their agenda packets.

Mr. Sonnen commented about the previous public hearings on the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) and advised members when any jurisdiction is dealing with a CAO update at the County level, it can create a contentious situation. He cited the experiences of King and Lewis Counties as examples of the turmoil that the update of the CAO is creating. Approximately one year ago, a staff member attended a CAO hearing in King County. The tone was similar to the Commission’s first hearing on August 24, 2005. No one spoke in favor of CAO and the focus was clearly on property rights with no discussion directed to the proposed regulations. He advised members to keep the issue in context as the update of the CAO can be contentious.

Mr. Sonnen asked members to set a date for the follow-up public hearing. Staff has reserved September 27, 2005 at 6:30 p.m. at the Worthington Center at St. Martin’s University as a possible date. The Commission agreed with scheduling the third public hearing on the CAO on September 27 and to allow written comments until close of business September 30, 2005.

Commissioner Strub arrived at 7:05 p.m.

Mr. Sonnen reviewed how written and verbal comments will be indexed to correspond to the particular issue or concern within the CAO. He advised that it will be a fairly substantial undertaking but will be important for giving consideration to all public comments. Chair Kohlenberg noted it’s important to document the categories correctly. Once the categories are identified it will be easier to assign categories to the comments. Commissioners offered various suggestions to assist staff in compiling the public hearing testimony and written comments. Commissioners generally agreed to forward ideas and suggestions to staff to assist in compiling and categorizing the comments.

Mr. Sonnen referred to Sandy Mackie’s suggestion of having a technical panel of qualified individuals to offer their perspective on best available science. The Commission had asked staff to review the request with legal counsel. Mr. Sonnen said the County’s legal counsel has recommended against such an option due to the difficulty of affording equal time for all viewpoints and participants. Legal counsel has advised it is preferable for the parties to submit their respective comments in writing. From staff’s perspective, it would be helpful for the individuals to provide any supplementary information that they believe is best available science.

Commissioner Lyman said she would like the opportunity to review the information and the source material that will be submitted. Mr. Sonnen advised it is important for the County to document all scientific studies. Some counties have run into problems because the County used some experts that were providing only their perspective on an issue and there were no studies to support the contentions.

Chair Kohlenberg advised she will follow up with Mr. Mackie about his request and ask that he...
submit the information to the County.

Mr. Sonnen said there were many comments from the public about retroactively of the document (CAO). Staff has received several suggestions about how to respond to the comments. He noted each chapter includes a summary that pertains to existing uses that some individuals found helpful. Staff could adapt the information and post it on the County’s website.

Commissioner Lyman advised the document includes complex and technical information and people who are not accustomed to reading such documents could find the information very confusing. Mr. Sonnen agreed and said many individuals were lured to the public hearing based only on a few issues and were surprised to see the enormity of the complete update that entails many issues. Chair Kohlenberg asked about the public tone when the County’s first CAO was adopted. Mr. Sonnen said the tone was also very contentious at that time.

Mr. Sonnen referred to Commissioner Lyman’s suggestion to develop a comparison chart that identifies many of the key code provisions of the current code and the recommended changes to those provisions. Also suggested was development of a users’ guide to guide the reader on how to read the document. Chair Kohlenberg commented that the section on general provisions is very difficult to read. Commissioner Lyman said her suggestion about a users’ guide was meant more to be a companion piece to the document after it is adopted for both staff and the applicant to utilize. Mr. Sonnen said some people also had concerns about the entire format of the document, particularly the tables, as they rely on symbols and text. He suggested not necessarily eliminating it due to some complaints by some individuals who only have a cursory understanding of the document. Many people who are familiar with the document have conveyed how much they are looking forward to using the tables. Mr. Sonnen offered a suggestion of a test with staff and with frequent users of the document by providing an explanation of how the document is organized and then test the response to see if the person can work through and understand the document. The exercise will be in a form of a survey to seek some objectivity about the readability of the document.

Commissioner Ottavelli referred to the suggestion of the users’ guide and said most of the public that will read the document will approach the document as to what it means to them personally. Most people will be looking for a link between their property and the document. Most readers who struggle with the document will not necessarily want a users’ guide but rather how the document will impact them. Mr. Sonnen acknowledged the perspective. Commissioner Ottavelli said many people testified about their personal circumstances with respect to their property and wanted to know how the changes will impact them as a property owner.

Commissioner Lyman pointed out that during her review of the document, it often leads the reader to another section and can lack some clarity for people who will need to use it. Mr. Sonnen agreed and cited the example of a property owner who might have a stream that is also located in a floodplain that also has an associated wetland. The document doesn’t provide an easy answer for those types of situations because each critical area has its own implications and set of guidelines and requirements. Commissioner Lyman said her suggestion for a users’ guide is based on King County’s users’
manual that provides the information in a more user friendly format. Commissioner Ottavelli said his preference is a guide that helps the reader understand that if they have a stream, wetland, and are located in a floodplain, the document will guide the reader in understanding what the requirements are. The information should be a guide to using the document. Mr. Sonnen acknowledged that many people encountered some difficulty in reading the document.

Commissioner Strub requested inclusion of a definition list of all acronyms used in the document for easy reference by the reader. Mr. Sonnen acknowledged the request and suggested including a glossary of acronyms.

Commissioner Ottavelli recommended staff track all changes and improvements to the document as the Commission moves forward with the review of the document. Mr. Sonnen offered some editing suggestions for tracking changes. Commissioner Ottavelli suggested the Commission consider coding all of the steps the Commission takes as well as acknowledging the investment by the Commission of the public comments that have been received to date. To address the public’s view about accessibility, the Commission should add a glossary that is coded and reviewed systematically.

Chair Kohlenberg recommended the Commission and staff discuss how the Commission will respond to the public comments. It is important for how the Commission will respond and it is important that the public believe they are being heard. There could be some things the Commission could immediately undertake to set the record straight. She suggested several web pages that could outline the update process that was undertaken as well as addressing the public’s contention that only a select number of individuals were involved in the update process. She noted when the subcommittees were established, the Commission literally begged some people to participate who in turn were some of the same people who testified about how the Commission was not open to more public participation. Those individuals chose to reserve their comments for the public hearing. It’s not fair for the Commission to be attacked because some people believe the process wasn’t open. It’s important for the Commission to make clear that the process was very open and that the Commission sought as much expertise as possible. Another web page could document the Commission’s next steps as well as several pages about the critical values that have to be balanced and the context of the update. Many people spoke to concerns about preservation for future generations, about the County not enforcing current regulations, as well as many people expressing that the County does not need to make any changes. It is important to understand the context in which the ordinance is being altered. She suggested several pages that address why the ordinance was drafted and the key underlining issues with acknowledgement that the issues are contentious, not simple, and that there are consequences. She offered to assist staff in drafting the documents.

Mr. Sonnen advised that he will update the handouts for posting on the web page as well as adding other materials. He noted the extension for the written comments the Commission previously approved for September 30 will also be updated on the County’s website.

Commissioner Ottavelli commented that the County should be able to track the number of
visitors to the website. There were many questions about public involvement and the website is a means the Commission is relying on to involve and make information accessible to the public. The Commission needs to ensure the website is an effective way for relaying the information. Commissioner Lyman suggested ensuring there is a direct link on the County’s home page. Currently, visitors must access the Development Services Department web page before accessing the critical areas web page.

Mr. Sonnen referred to testimony by several attorneys about a decision issued by the Washington Supreme Court on August 18, 2005 regarding Viking Properties vs. Oscar William Holm, Jr. The decision included reference to balancing GMA goals. He recommended that the County’s legal counsel review the decision to ascertain whether the HEAL decision coincides with the recent decision as well as issue an interpretation of the decision. Mr. Sonnen read an excerpt from the decision citing that the Vikings public policy augment also fails to the extent that it implicitly requires the goal of urban density to the detriment of other equally important GMA goals.

Commissioner Lyman acknowledged the HEAL decision acknowledges the requirement to balance the various GMA goals. However, in terms of best available science, it is difficult to imagine reviewing critical areas and not give primary consideration to best available science.

Mr. Sonnen clarified that there are 10 growth management goals that include such things as economic development, property rights, and other topics. The contention is that consideration for the protection of the environment should be considered in the context of economic impacts and property rights and that it is possible to diminish the importance of environmental protections in balancing the goals. The HEAL decision basically implies that although the goals need to be balanced and considered, it doesn’t give the authority to step outside the realm of what science has indicated is necessary to sustain the environment.

Mr. Sonnen said he will ask legal counsel to review the recent decision to ascertain if the understanding about balancing the growth management goals has changed.

Commissioner Strub referred to a letter from Mr. Wallace that includes some extractions from the recent court decision. She asked for clarification from legal counsel about Mr. Wallace’s interpretation pertaining to the GMA’s 13 non-prioritized goals. Mr. Wallace wrote in the letter, “That the Vikings public policy argument also fails to the extent that it implicitly requires us to elevate the singular goal of urban density to the detriment of other equally important goals. To do so would violate the Legislature’s expressed statement that the GMA’s general goals are non-prioritized.” Commissioner Strub said it doesn’t mean the same to her to say something that is non-prioritized as it is to say that “all must be created equal.” Commissioner Ottavelli said it’s an evaluation of balancing non-quantifiable goals and it can be rather subjective.

Commissioner Lyman suggested the Commission should schedule legal counsel to attend a meeting to respond to the Commissioner’s questions. Responding by e-mail often raises additional questions. The Commission needs legal counsel support. Mr. Sonnen recommended the Commission pose questions in advance to enable adequate preparation time by legal staff to
Commissioner Strub said she would like to know from legal staff that according to Mr. Wallace’s statement, the recent decision finds that the Legislature did not prioritize the 13 goals. She asked staff to address whether that also means the Commission is also prohibited from prioritizing the goals or whether the Legislature left that task to local government. Mr. Sonnen said he understands the argument to be that the jurisdiction has some latitude in balancing the goals in the context of the community and specific circumstances. What has been alleged is that the CAO does not provide balance but rather dictates what is necessary to sustain the environment without any consideration to the other goals.

Staff and Commissioners discussed the response mechanism to the public comments. Commissioner Lyman suggested the Commission should evaluate the public comments and determine what changes are necessary in the draft document to ensure the intent and clarity of the document is understood. Mr. Sonnen advised that the Commission and staff’s obligation is to undertake a reasoned deliberation and consider all comments and give substantive consideration to best available science while balancing the goals.

Commissioners discussed the interpretation of what constitutes “balance” and that it is subjective. Mr. Sonnen provided additional clarification about the HEAL decision and examples of the buffer width issue in the Skagit County case. Based on the HEAL decision and up until the last decision, there was no question about balance and that balance is favored within the parameters of what science indicated is acceptable. The new recent decision implies that it changes the balance. However, it is unknown at this time, how much of the interpretation is fact or argument.

Commissioners discussed the Commission’s role in responding to misinformation and whether it is the Commission’s responsibility to respond to inaccurate assertions. Commissioner Strub pointed out that it is the Commission’s charge to communicate to the public. Several Commissioners agreed that it is appropriate to respond to the disinformation that was distributed. However, it was also acknowledged that more misinformation could be distributed and that the Commission should avoid becoming mired in responding. A preferred method is to prepare “Frequently Asked Questions” materials to address the comments and also provide accurate information in response to the misinformation. Ms. Pritchett said one important basic question that she has been asked several times is, “why are wetlands important?” It is important to give people the tools to access accurate information. It will be important to answer some basic questions about how the regulations impact a typical property owner of five acres who has horses. Chair Kohlenberg suggested basic questions should be posted that can be addressed quickly and that can be linked.

Commissioners and staff discussed the wetland maps. Mr. Sonnen advised it will be possible for staff to link all the maps and that the open house materials can be accessed on the web once staff has had the opportunity to post the information. It was acknowledged that not all wetlands and streams have been mapped. The Commission should avoid putting information on the web that might lead people to a false sense of security that the changes will not impact them. Chair
Chair Kohlenberg offered the suggestion of preparing a communications plan. Mr. Sonnen said he has discussed the issue with the County’s communications staff. Chair Kohlenberg noted it will be important to keep the discussion ongoing and often the right kind of communication keeps the issues alive.

Commissioner Strub inquired whether staff documents how decisions/recommendations are formed. Mr. Sonnen commented on the difficulty of documenting all discussions and decisions and that the charge is to ensure all recommendations are based on science and that the linkage is documented. The record indicates what science was used for the recommendations. The information that was considered is documented through the taping of meetings. If it is appealed, staff references the specific science that justified the recommendation/decision and the taped deliberation.

Chair Kohlenberg asked Commissioners about suggestions they may have to respond to the misinformation. Commissioner Roper said one sentiment that has not been addressed is what the consequence will be to the community if the ordinance is not adopted or if only a minor adjustment is adopted. She said the question should be addressed about what the consequences could be to the County if the ordinance is not adopted. Suggestions offered by the Commission included press releases or coverage by different newspaper reporters. Chair Kohlenberg offered...
that although newspaper coverage is important, the County’s website is the communications plan. It is not the newspaper’s job to make a complex scientific issue understandable, set a context, or explain the process. Mr. Sonnen shared information about media placements to advertise the next public hearing. Commissioners discussed public outreach efforts and agreed it’s not the responsibility of the Commission or staff to aggressively solicit public attendance. Citizens who do not engage for all intents and purposes will likely not engage regardless of public outreach efforts. Public attendance to the two public hearings however was encouraging.

5. **Briefing: Response to WWGHB Decision**
   **Staff: John Sonnen**

Mr. Sonnen briefed the Commission on Western Washington Growth Hearings Board’s (WWFHB) recent decision that the County’s growth areas need to be sized per the GMA and that the County and local jurisdictions must provide for 20 years of population growth as projected by the Office of Financial Management (OFM) with some additional capacity for market factors. The County currently has approximately 38% of capacity, which is considered excess. The County is also supposed to provide for a variety of rural residential districts. Currently, residential zoning within the rural County is one unit for every five acres with the exception of some zoning of one unit per 10 acres for natural shoreline areas. Consequently, the County must rezone some areas of the County to one unit per 10 acres or perhaps one unit per 20 acres.

The County filed a reconsideration and received clarification on one misunderstanding that doesn’t specifically concern rezoning. The Board of County Commissioners is moving to comply with the decision that the WWGHB issued. One main thing that will affect County residents is providing for a variety of rural residential districts. The Board has given general direction of entertaining the possibility of redesignating lands of lower densities if the lands are physically constrained for development, have limited water ability, or there is a physical hazard associated with the property, such as a floodplain. The Board is also interested in land that serves some broad public purpose. Staff is working with a Planning Commission subcommittee to develop an inclusive list what falls within the broad categories before the Board’s consideration on September 19, 2005. The Board will at that point, form a study area for further evaluation of what areas might possibly be rezoned at lower densities.

Mr. Sonnen advised the issue will be just as contentious as critical areas. The interim action was the Board’s establishment of a development moratorium effective August 2, 2005. The public hearing on the moratorium is scheduled for September 12, 2005. The purpose of the moratorium is to ensure the County does not foreclose options that will allow the County to respond to the hearings board decision in the most appropriate way. At the September 19 worksession, the Board will provide guidance on how to proceed, which will come through the Planning Commission. Jennifer Hayes is staff to the subcommittee, which is on a fast track to provide the information to the Board.

Another issue of the hearing board’s ruling is the size of the urban growth areas. Although, the hearings board decision did not specifically indicate the growth areas are too large, it appears the
growth areas are too large. Staff is conducting analysis to evaluate the County’s growth areas. The growth areas relied on 2002 and 2003 data from the population allocations. However, within the last six weeks, the jurisdictions through the Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) adopted a new population allocation, which will be used in consideration for reducing the growth areas. Another issue of importance is the market factor accommodation. There is no specific state law that allows additional acreage to accommodate market growth. The hearings board has consistently used 25 percent as the threshold. The County is currently at approximately 38%. The Buildable Lands analysis completed by TRPC considers vacant and potential redevelopable lots parcel by parcel. Other factors include consideration of wetlands but not the buffers. The hearings board said many of the considerations for concluding the amount of the market factor were already included in the Buildable Lands analysis. The hearings board suggested the County needs to distinguish between the two and then rationalize the extent of the market factor. Staff is working with TRPC to justify the market factor to allow more land beyond the 20 year growth projection. To some extent, it may not be the full 25 percent.

Staff, is also undertaking a regional analysis of critical areas buffers projected in the CAO draft as well as another alternative to learn what the impact the new regulations will have on buildable lands.

With the combined data, staff will attempt to determine how oversized the current growth areas are. The growth trend is occurring from the north. Lacey, even though it has an expansive growth area, is not oversized due to the tremendous growth occurring. Based on current analysis, local jurisdictions’ growth areas that appear oversized include Tumwater, Yelm, Tenino, and Rainier. Prior to the hearings board’s decision the cities of Tumwater and Olympia proposed comprehensive plan amendments and zoning regulations. Olympia proposed removing the Green Cove basin from the urban growth area and Tumwater proposed removal of some areas of the Salmon Creek basin from Tumwater’s growth areas. The Board of County Commissioners didn’t consider the requests due to the pending decision. Consequently, staff has asked both jurisdictions to identify the specific areas so that the areas can be included in the analysis.

Another option offered to the cities is the situation where there are irregular boundaries that often split parcels. This often creates problems when the cities are annexing parcels. Another option Planning Commissioners, staff, and some cities have raised is whether the County should be looking at areas that are not appropriate for urban development and allowing those areas to be removed from the urban growth areas. Some of the areas are physically challenged to accommodate urban density development, which was not understood 10 years ago when the urban boundaries were established. There are compelling reasons to consider the option and the Board will be presented with the option. However, it likely will add six months to the project because it involves the municipalities. The County has historically worked cooperatively with all the cities.

Mr. Sonnen advised the County is considering the minimum that is needed to meet compliance. There are also some opportunities for refinements to remove irregularities with the end goal to
address the issue completely. There are implications on both sides and the Board will make the determination. The Commission will be invited to the Board’s worksession.

With the rural lands work underway, to the extent that it reduces capacity to accommodate growth in the rural area, it means the capacity must be shifted to the urban growth areas. Before the sizing of the growth areas is determined, rural rezoning will need to be completed to take all the other factors into consideration.

Ms. Pritchett briefed the Commission on LAMIRDs (Limited Area More Intense Rural Development). She provided the Commission with the subsection of the RCW and an overview map of the rural development review project. The map highlights areas that are small pockets within the County that are zoned higher than one unit per five acres. Since the County originally adopted the areas, the GMA includes a new section to the RCW for LAMIRDs that require the County to review the criteria within the RCW to designate the areas as LAMIRDs. If they do not qualify as LAMIRDs, the parcels need to be removed and possibly rezoned.

Staff is developing a work program to analyze the areas. It includes developing a checklist to review the 61 identified areas within the County and compare each to the criteria to ensure all of the areas are analyzed consistently. Once that process is completed, staff proposes to split the ongoing work into two phases to accommodate industrial/commercial zoning as well as residential areas. Industrial/commercial zoned areas were not included in the hearings board decision and consequently, staff wants to defer that specific work to phase 2 recognizing the work needs to be eventually completed but not until a future date. Phase 1 will consider all residentially-zoned LAMIRDs with a review of each LAMIRD against the criteria. Some areas will completely fall out and will not qualify as a LAMIRD while other areas will include large parcels that are within LAMIRDs that might require some splitting of the LAMIRD. Some of those areas will be set aside and deferred as areas identified for downzoning. Another component is a comprehensive plan amendment in conjunction with the project to identify goals and policies within the comprehensive plan that are no longer in compliance with LAMIRDs. Additionally, staff will review zoning codes to determine if zoning codes will be retained with the language modified in each of the zoning code chapters to address LAMIRDs or whether staff will need to further analyze zoning codes that are specific to LAMIRDs. Staff is reviewing the timeline for each of the project components and will present a proposed timeline to the Commission in November for approval and referral to the Board in time for a January 2006 adoption to meet the hearings board’s deadline.

Commissioners and staff discussed the criteria defining LAMIRDs. The RCW dictates a county must define what is developed as of July 1, 1990. Platted parcels that have not been developed are not considered developed. The parcels must be developed. Mr. Sonnen said originally, an exercise was undertaken to establish criteria to determine the areas, which included logical boundaries. It was written up as a model for other jurisdictions to use. Some of the areas of higher density development may not have met the County’s criteria. When the areas were originally identified by the County in 1990, the County applied criteria and only designated lands for higher density if some specific percentage of the lots were already developed and a logical boundary could be defined. If there were other areas that didn’t meet the criteria that
were included in the comprehensive plan then those properties did not receive a designation of a higher density zoning and were allowed to continue as non-conforming. Ms. Pritchett said the effort will identify areas that are zoned at a higher density than one to five to see whether they qualify as a LAMIRD. There may be other areas that are developed at a higher density but are not zoned at a higher density. Mr. Sonnen said the hearings board has directed the County to examine the areas and if they don’t meet the LAMIRD criteria that they are redesignated one to five or higher, which precludes any further subdivision within those areas.

Ms. Pritchett said TRPC generated the maps and is working with staff to identify the areas.

6. **Staff Updates**

Mr. Sonnen reported a new employee, Dianna Smith, has been hired for the department and will begin on September 1. Ms. Smith is from Texas and has a master's degree in planning from the University of British Columbia. Ms. Smith has been working in British Columbia.

Katie Knight will replace Ryan Andrews and will begin work on September 19, 2005.

Commissioner Lyman asked that the Commissioner’s contact list also include staff information as well. She asked that staff consider a formal method for notifying Planning Commissioners of the County Board of Commissioners worksession dates involving issues the Planning Commission has referred to the Board. Mr. Sonnen said he will review the Board’s procedures for notification.

7. **Calendar (Tentative)**

Mr. Sonnen advised that the Board has directed staff to give priority responding to the Growth Management Hearings Board appeal and adjust the work program accordingly. The Board has directed staff to set aside the Cluster Task Force. The Mineral Lands work program has also been deferred until the pressing issues are addressed as well as code amendments proposed for 2005 with the exception of manufactured housing, which is required by state law.

**Commissioner Lyman moved, seconded by Commissioner Roper, to set the third public hearing on the Critical Areas Ordinance on September 27, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. at the Worthington Center in Lacey and extend the public comment period to September 30, 2005.**

Mr. Sonnen reviewed the tentative calendar. On September 7, staff proposes a briefing on proposed comprehensive plan amendments and the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). On September 21, the comprehensive plan amendment briefing will conclude to include Lacey’s Joint Plan amendments and a Lacey rezone, which is not controversial. There is also a proposal to amend the comprehensive plan to allow expansion of the Grand Mound Water System to serve some of the surrounding area. The Commission will also be asked to set the public hearing date on September 7 to keep the schedule on track between the CFP and the budget deliberations that will occur in November. The Commission concurred with setting the public hearing on the
comprehensive plan amendments for September 21, 2005. Mr. Sonnen said staff recommends one worksession subsequent to the public hearing and consider taking action at the same meeting. The proposed comprehensive plan amendments are relatively non-controversial and it appears it is unlikely the Commission will need multiple worksessions to complete its recommendations. Mr. Sonnen recommended the Commission conduct worksessions on the critical areas as time permits and that it is likely the October 5 regular meeting will be cancelled to afford staff time to prepare.

In November, the Commission will likely begin to receive briefings on the rural rezone and the LAMIRDs. Given the magnitude of the public comments and the delay in the public hearing, it is likely the CAO will not be adopted by the end of the year. Mr. Sonnen suggested the Commission afford priority to the rural rezone and the LAMIRDs work programs that may entail longer worksessions.

Commissioners and staff discussed the possibility of scheduling daylong worksessions. A potential worksession date could either be October 22 or October 29, 2005.

Commissioners reviewed attendance for upcoming meetings in September.

September 7 – Briefing – Proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments
September 21 – Briefing – Proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments (tentative)
September 27 – Critical Areas Public Hearing

11.  Adjournment

Chair Kohlenberg adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Liz Kohlenberg, Chair
Tom Cole, Vice Chair

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services