THURSTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes
November 2, 2005

1. Call to Order

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

a. Attendance

Members Present: Tom Cole, George Darkenwald (7:27 p.m.), Chris Lane, Liz Lyman, Bob Musser, Craig Ottavelli, and Joyce Roper.
Members Absent: Liz Kohlenberg and Rhenda Strub.
Staff Present: John Sonnen, Cindy Wilson, Nancy Pritchett, Katie Knight, and Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren.

b. Approval of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Minutes and Acceptance of Tapes from August 31 and September 27, 2005

Commissioner Ottavelli moved, seconded by Commissioner Lyman, to table approval of the August 31 and September 27, 2005 minutes to the next meeting. Motion carried.

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

Scott Nelson, Case Road, responded to the Scatter Creek Aquifer Water Quality handout and presentation to the Planning Commission by Sue Davis, Thurston County Environmental Health Division, at the October 19, 2005 meeting. Mr. Nelson said he contacted Ms. Davis to express
his concerns. Ms. Davis said she would provide him with an updated version of the handout. To date he has not received the updated document. He distributed copies of a November 2, 2005 letter to members and staff.

The handout says, “The most probable cause of the nitrate increase in groundwater as it passed through Violet Prairie is the concentrated agricultural activity occurring there.” Ms. Davis was referring to the area from Tenino to Interstate 5. There are only two dairy farms in the area regulated by the “Confined Animal Feeding Operations Act.” The handout goes on to explain reasons for the high nitrates. While the reasons may be valid, at least two should have included more information. In response to questions posed by the Planning Commission, Mr. Nelson added:

- **Variable nitrate loading.** While most people do not have the equipment to apply the exact amount of manure on each square foot of property, there are ways to ensure an even application. For example, if a farmer uses an irrigation reel to apply liquid manure, the reel can be set to maintain a constant speed across the entire field distributing an even amount.

- **Plants take up the nitrogen from manure at varying rates through the growing cycle.** Dairies are required to apply manure during certain times of the year. The farm plan for the dairy outlines a start and stop date based on several factors, such as crop type and soil type, etc.

Mr. Nelson referred to a statement following a table in the handout stating, “To put the information in the above table in perspective, a 200-cow dairy generates as much total nitrogen per day as 643 residences with four people per residence.” Mr. Nelson said as a farmer, he takes issue with the statement. There is a significant difference between how nitrogen is used by a dairy versus how it is used by septic tanks. Both local dairies separate the manure and the solids are trucked offsite, decreasing the nitrogen. The liquid manure running through an irrigation reel loses a percentage of the nitrogen to volatilization. A farmer should get between 4-5 cuttings of hay per year. Yields will vary based on weather conditions and the moisture content of the crop when it is put up. There is also the issue of fertilizer on lawns. Over-application can lead to leaching of nitrates. Septic systems have varying degrees of effectiveness. Mr. Nelson requested the Planning Commission contact the Thurston Conservation District, RCS, or the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prior to making any decisions based on the handout from Thurston County Environmental Health.

The Planning Commission discussed the following points raised by Mr. Nelson.

- Most of the newer chicken farms completely remove all nutrients. They are not used on-site and are typically hauled elsewhere.
- Specific to dairy farms, regulations ensure the crops are in effect using the amount of nitrates applied to the fields. The Conservation District will develop a farm plan for a farm. The federal government regulates larger farms where animals are confined. The application of manure to fields is at low rates sufficient to prevent excessive leaching.
- There are also two cattle ranches in the area, as well as a horse stable/arena operation.
It is unknown whether dairy versus other agricultural activities will remain under the guidance of the Department of Ecology (DOE).

- Expansion of dairy farms in the County is unlikely, as there is an overabundance of milk production. Another buyout system is underway through the dairy federation or a similar agency. Some farmers are ceasing operations or reducing herds.

4. **Briefing: Jasmer-Davidson Open Space Application**  
   **Staff:** Cindy Wilson

Ms. Wilson reported the property was enrolled in the Current Use-Farm and Agriculture Program. Ms. Jasmer-Davidson was informed she no longer qualifies for the program and requested a transfer to the Open Space-Open Space program. The 33-acre site is located south of the Maytown exit, east of Interstate 5. A separate parcel of 4.55 acres contains the structure and farm/agricultural buildings. Ms. Wilson drew the Planning Commission’s attention to the pictures in the staff report and briefly reviewed the surrounding land uses. Under the Public Benefit Rating System, the property is eligible for 3 points qualifying the property for a 50% reduction in market value. Staff recommends approval of the proposal and requests the Planning Commission schedule a public hearing for December 7, 2005.

Discussion followed about the ponds, depth of the groundwater, and a small wooded area in the southeast corner of the site with wetland characteristics.

5. **Briefing: Deal Open Space Application**  
   **Staff:** Nancy Pritchett & Katie Knight

Ms. Pritchett introduced new Associate Planner, Katie Knight.

Ms. Pritchett reported the application involves 8.35 acres of a 9.85-acre site located southwest of Rochester. The applicant is applying for enrollment in the Open Space-Farm and Agricultural Conservation Lands (FACL) category of the Open Space-Open Space Tax Program. The applicant no longer qualifies to remain classified as Farm and Agricultural Land. The FACL Program provides the opportunity to preserve land for future agricultural use while continuing to receive a property tax reduction. The subject property is zoned Rural Residential Resource One Unit per Five Acres (RRR 1/5) and is surrounded by RRR 1/5 zoning. Current uses include Christmas trees, a hayfield pasture, and horse pasture. The Thurston County Historic Commission has designated the subject property as the Bowman Farmstead on the Historic Register. The applicant has submitted a conservation plan prepared by the Thurston Conservation District outlining current and future management plans in detail.

A brief discussion of delineating the difference of 1.5 acres from the 9.85-acre site followed. Ms. Pritchett explained the Assessor will likely draw an administrative line but probably won’t create two separate tax parcels.

Commissioner Lyman commented it appears a relative owns the tract north of the subject parcel. Ms. Knight confirmed that is the case and that the applicant’s father is currently in the Farm and
Agricultural Land Program and manages that part of the field. Commissioner Lyman stated that it appears from the map that the farm on the subject property is part of the farm on the parcel to the north. She asked staff to check with the Assessor’s Office to determine how the income from the farm operation is apportioned between the two parcels since it takes very little to meet the income threshold to qualify for current use ag status.

**Commissioner Ottavelli moved, seconded by Commissioner Lyman, to schedule the Jasmer-Davidson and Deal Open Space applications for a public hearing on December 7, 2005 at 7:05 p.m. Motion carried.**

Commissioner Darkenwald arrived.

6.  **Updated Reference to Grand Mound Service Area Discussion**

Mr. Sonnen reported at the last meeting that Mr. Clark suggested the Planning Commission defer its recommendation for the Grand Mound Water System Plan (WSP) Comprehensive Plan amendment until a review by a separate committee is completed. A separate review committee has been formed as required by state law that will forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners for its December 6, 2005 hearing. However, Mr. Clark is now asking the Planning Commission to forward a recommendation based upon the record at its public hearing. Commissioner Lyman said the Board of County Commissioners approved the service extension two years ago. Mr. Sonnen added staff does not expect new information as a result of the review committee’s process. Ms. Roper said the Planning Commission raised concerns during its October 19, 2005 meeting. Mr. Sonnen said staff would like the Planning Commission to take action so the recommendation can be included in the transmittal letter to the Board of County Commissions.

**Commissioner Roper moved, seconded by Commissioner Lyman, to recommend denial of the Grand Mound WSP Comprehensive Plan amendment (CO-4) to the Board of County Commissioners.**

At the request of Commissioner Ottavelli, members shared their reasons for recommending denial of the proposal. He’s indicated he is not sure how extending water to the area will adversely impact future planning. The Board of County Commissioners has already approved service to the area.

Commissioner Roper explained that her concerns with the contamination in the area have not been allayed. She said she is against exacerbating an already problematic area where nitrate and fecal coliform contamination already exists. There are many projects proposed in the area. Sewer cannot be extended outside of the urban growth area (UGA). There is interest to construct a water park, which will generate additional commercial and residential development in the immediate vicinity. Nitrate and bacterial contamination issues have not been resolved. Those living in the area should be protected before planning for future development in the vicinity.

Commissioner Lyman said the densities can double with water availability but health code limits
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development to 1 unit per acre. Current densities are limited to 1-6 units an acre. Existing land uses can further densify if water is available. She said she also has concerns about the process. Vice Chair Cole stated there is evidence suggesting there shouldn’t be more building outside of the UGA. The groundwater contamination problem will get worse since sewer will not be extended to those areas.

Commissioner Ottavelli inquired whether the Planning Commission’s level of concern will be relayed in the recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Commissioner Lyman replied the concerns will be shared.

**Motion carried 5-2. Commissioners Darkenwald and Musser abstained.**

Mr. Sonnen relayed that staff will draft language to capture the Planning Commission’s intent and e-mail it to members for review. He asked members to return comments by Monday, November 7, 2005. Commissioner Ottavelli expressed interest in reviewing the final version of the recommendation letter.

7. **Briefing: Critical Areas – Discuss Review Approach and Schedule**

*Staff: John Sonnen*


Vice Chair Cole said a concern is the process as proposed includes, “Meet with knowledgeable representatives of interest groups (e.g. farming, building, mining) to gather more industry-specific information, if needed.” He indicated that in the past the Planning Commission was cautioned by the deputy prosecutor against inviting comments from some people or organizations without including others. Mr. Sonnen said he posed the question to Jeff Fancher. Mr. Fancher has advised that the Planning Commission can communicate with standing County committees, such as the agriculture committee. If the Planning Commission is interested in soliciting clarification or concerns from those who have testified, that is best accomplished by writing and receiving written responses. If not, question and answer sessions with specific groups or individuals are possible. However, question and answer sessions should limit the exchange of ideas.

Commissioner Lyman said the intent is not to receive additional comments about the critical areas, but to receive additional information similar to what Mr. Nelson provided earlier in the meeting. Mr. Sonnen added legal counsel is comfortable with the Planning Commission contacting someone with expertise and asking questions. Legal counsel prefers conducting inquiry and response in writing so it is clearly part of the record and transparent to everyone involved.

Commissioner Roper suggested revising bullet #4 under *Process for reviewing and refining draft CAO* as follows: “Meet with representatives of Thurston County committees, or send specific written questions to groups with specialized knowledge to gather more industry-specific
information, if needed.” Commissioner Roper said the words “industry-specific” could be dropped.

Commissioner Ottavelli suggested encouraging standing County committees to seek input from respective interest groups. The committees could filter and provide the information to the Planning Commission. He suggested submitting a broad written request for industry-specific information. Mr. Sonnen reminded Commissioners the record has officially closed. Commissioners Lyman and Roper said the Commission should develop a list of specific questions to be answered. Commissioner Ottavelli said the County has been criticized for not welcoming outside input or providing opportunities to comment. He questioned the timeframe of the work plan.

Commissioner Roper said there are concerns that there will be a rush to the counter if properties are released from the moratorium early next year. Something should be in place to shield the areas that should be protected. It is possible the Planning Commission may have an idea of the rural rezone areas, which could include critical areas. Commissioner Ottavelli suggested writing a letter to the County Commissioners to convey to them the Planning Commission’s desire to work on the critical areas ordinance (CAO) over the next year. Mr. Sonnen clarified the moratorium applies to subdivisions only.

Discussion of the moratorium ensued. Mr. Sonnen reported the Board of County Commissioners wants to keep all options open to respond to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board. As study reveals areas that will be unaffected, the Board of County Commissioners will consider releasing them from the moratorium. Staff is meeting with the Board on November 23, 2005 to discuss the approach for dealing with the urban growth area evaluation and resizing. Staff hopes to identify areas that could be released from the moratorium. The moratorium formally expires on February 2, 2006. The Board of County Commissioners concurs with the Planning Commission’s approach to hold open house information meetings in December on the rezone issue. The workshops will take place the first part of January. The Board of County Commissioners is aware it will not pull areas out of the moratorium prior to the Planning Commission’s recommendation. The rural moratorium will be extended prior to its expiration for another six-month period. The Board will consider releasing unaffected lands based upon the Planning Commission’s recommendation of study areas. The Planning Commission could also forward a recommendation pertaining to critical areas.

Commissioner Lyman questioned Commissioner Ottavelli’s suggestion for writing a letter to the County Commissioners to request one year for CAO review. She said that the Planning Commission does not currently know how long the review will take. It may take six months or it may take 18 months. Also, the County Commissioners are already aware of the magnitude of the project and are not concerned about the completion date. Commissioner Ottavelli said there is significant work involved. Mr. Sonnen relayed some chapters received relatively minor comments while other comments were substantive. The Board wants the CAO review completed prior to the completion of the Growth Management Act (GMA) compliance work. The Board of County Commissioners directed staff to draft a letter to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board outlining the overall approach and that the work will not be
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completed by January 17, 2006. The biggest piece is the rural rezoning project and staff is hoping that will be completed by the end of 2006. The County can’t finalize the urban growth area resizing until it knows the lost capacity in the rural County. Staff expects to have draft zoning districts ready for a public hearing in June 2006. The intent is to use the draft zoning districts as a basis for running the computer model to determine the lost capacity. The County will then work with the cities and affected property owners to adjust growth areas. The County is unable to accomplish the growth area resizing until final rezoning impacts are identified.

Discussion ensued about the suggestion to ask the Board of County Commissioners for a year to complete the CAO work.

Vice Chair Cole said a major effort involves the format of the CAO. Mr. Sonnen said he’s interested in reviewing the formats used for other county’s critical area regulations. Commissioner Lyman said she has read CAOs from a couple of jurisdictions. Although some are very readable, they tend to be vague about how the regulations would be applied. In contrast, all the details contained in the County’s proposed ordinance may make the document less readable.

Commissioner Roper reported there are organizations that review government documents and “translate” them into something more understandable. It may be worthwhile to approach the Board of County Commissioners with the idea. Mr. Sonnen said it’s difficult to determine whether the structure or the language of the ordinance makes it difficult for the average person to understand.

Commissioner Ottavelli said the solution may lie in a user guide for the ordinance. Commissioner Lyman said she has read several CAOs that are readable, but the regulations are unclear. The County’s proposed ordinance provides much detail. Mr. Sonnen said refinements to make the ordinance more friendly is possible. As an example, the definition section could be moved to back of the ordinance. He asked for volunteers to assist in reviewing the CAO format. Commissioners Lyman and Roper volunteered.

Mr. Sonnen said the December 7, 21, and January 4 meetings could be devoted to the CAO. There have been discussions about extended worksessions during early 2006. The Planning Commission discussed several meeting alternatives to work on the ordinance, which included extended meetings to accomplish more review, meeting on Saturdays, including a consent agenda to conduct regular business to free time for CAO review, determine if the Commission needs additional information based on the comments received, meet more than once a week, including targeted questions and issues on the agenda providing for a more structured meeting format and a focus on policies, recognition that the Commission has other deadlines, delegation of tasks, and appointing a subcommittee to organize a list of issues from the comment letters. Commissioners Lyman and Roper volunteered to participate on a subcommittee.

Mr. Sonnen reported there appears to be three different approaches: Saturday worksessions with a catered lunch, more frequent meetings with a longer duration, or forming a subcommittee to organize a list of issues from the comment letters. He suggested staff poll members about
attendance availability for Saturday meetings during January through March 2006 if Saturday worksessions are needed. The dates could be included on the calendar.

In reply to an inquiry from Commissioner Lane, Commissioner Roper said the subcommittee would distill the material and bring all issues and a list of additional information back to the Commission for review and comment. Commissioner Lyman added nothing precludes members from raising their own questions. The discussions should occur at the meetings so they are part of the record. The subcommittee can sort through the comments and move the process forward.

Commissioner Musser offered to participate on the subcommittee. He suggested an option of including CAO on every other meeting agenda. Discussion ensued about the subcommittee’s function and scheduling additional meetings in January. Members decided against scheduling additional meetings in January because of meeting the rural rezoning schedule.

Commissioner Lyman suggested that the subcommittee report back to the Planning Commission by the end of January. Members could raise their questions or comments to the subcommittee. Commissioner Roper suggested the subcommittee’s work product could include a working paper, such as an issues grid for review by the Commission.

Mr. Sonnen suggested the Planning Commission meet three Wednesdays a month beginning in February (two of the meetings focused on critical areas), or every third Saturday. Commissioners Lane, Musser, Roper and Lyman expressed an interest in meeting every third Saturday for at least four hours including a lunch. Vice Chair Cole suggested Wednesday meetings coupled with Saturday subcommittee meetings is a better solution. Commissioner Roper requested the Planning Commission establish a rule to avoid “back tracking” or reviewing issues that have been decided. Mr. Sonnen added a status check could occur on a monthly basis.

Commissioner Ottavelli asked whether a work product of the subcommittee could entail an outline of the sections that need work with an assigned timeframe. He suggested establishing goals and benchmarks or a Gantt chart with dates and times attached. Commissioner Lyman said that the subcommittee will provide that information.

Mr. Sonnen said the Board does not want the CAO to extend beyond the completion of the rural rezoning work. He said he anticipates the Planning Commission delivering the document to the Board in November 2006 and the Board taking action in early 2007. Further discussion ensued about Commissioner Ottavelli’s suggestion to confirm a defined timeline with the Board of County Commissioners. Mr. Sonnen said that for the Commission to determine the timeline, the Planning Commission must have an understanding of the scope of work involved. Further discussion of the issue could be considered at the Commission’s first meeting in January. Currently, there is insufficient information for a decision. Staff can develop a tentative schedule for discussion at the November 16, 2005 meeting.

The Planning Commission acknowledged it can have no more than four members at one time participating in a subcommittee meeting. Mr. Sonnen said five members can attend as long as the public meeting is advertised. Staff should have the CAO comment summary completed.
within the next several weeks.

Commissioners tentatively scheduled November 19, 2005, as the first subcommittee meeting. Mr. Sonnen confirmed he will e-mail Commissioners to determine who would like to participate at the subcommittee level and which Saturdays are best.

The Commission generally agreed to schedule a subcommittee meeting for November 19, 2005 to begin working through the public comments. Beginning in February, the Commission will hold three meetings, two of which will be devoted to critical areas. Staff will provide an updated tentative calendar at a future meeting. Members agreed with the products that will be delivered to the Board of County Commissioners at the conclusion of the worksessions as outlined in Commissioner Lyman’s suggested work plan document.

8. **Staff Updates**

Mr. Sonnen reported the Board of County Commissioners agreed to use 20-acre parcels as the threshold for the rural rezoning project. Staff will meet with the Board on November 23 to discuss the approach. The Board will be briefed on the comprehensive plan amendments on November 16, 2005.

9. **Calendar**

*Who will not attend the upcoming Planning Commission meetings?*

November 16 – Rural Rezoning; LAMIRDs *(Commissioners Kohlenberg and Lyman unable to attend)*

December 7 – Quorum confirmed

December 21 – Critical Areas *(Commissioner Lane unable to attend, Commissioners Cole, Darkenwald, and Ottavelli tentative)*

10. **Adjourn**

Vice Chair Cole adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

______________________________

Tom Cole, Vice Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services
*Amended January 24, 2006 by Cami Petersen.*
<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 WEAN decision</td>
<td>TCPC</td>
<td>J. Sonnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/05</td>
<td>Requested advice on whether legal counsel 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>
<tr>
<td>5/18/05</td>
<td>Establishment of a subcommittee to study cumulative impacts of development on steep slopes</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>J Sonnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18/05</td>
<td>Consider special management areas the TCPC may want to evaluate for critical areas, infiltration, and development within the UGAs</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>J Sonnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18/05</td>
<td>Requested staff to check on “aggrieved person” within the definition section of the CAO</td>
<td>TCPC</td>
<td>J Sonnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/05</td>
<td>The Commission, after review of the Definitions and Administrative sections of the CAO</td>
<td>TCPC</td>
<td>J Sonnen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
requested numerous changes, deletions, and additions to various provisions within the sections

5/25/05 Commissioners agreed to review the tentative calendar of future meetings and forward suggestions to staff

TCPC J Sonnen

6/15/05 Staff is to provide the following information at the Commission’s next briefing.

- The number of mine sites that are currently less than five acres in size.
- Data from the state related to the timeframe an applicant has to complete the reclamation process.

A countywide map showing available land for mineral purposes after taking critical areas and other overlays into consideration

TCPC Staff

6/15/05 Staff will present examples of how the test has been applied, and rework the language to clarify how it is measured at the next briefing on Mineral Lands

TCPC Staff

6/15/05 Staff requested the Planning Commission review the draft ordinance, the Mineral Extraction Code, and consider the critical areas designation criteria. Staff will e-mail the “homework assignment” to absent members

Staff TCPC

6/15/05 The Planning Commission agreed to send the final draft to the task force for review

TCPC Staff

6/15/05 The Planning Commission requested alternative language to pick from should be shown in a “box” in the draft document.

TCPC Staff

6/22/05 A request was made to identify “certain geologists and geologic engineers” who refuse to work in Edgewood because they claimed their liability insurance carrier would not allow them to issue a letter or report without the hold harmless clause.

Commissioner Lyman N. Pritchett

6/22/05 Third Party Review report should include

Chair Kohlenberg N. Pritchett
questions that should be addressed, such as how much additional stormwater will be introduced into the slopes by the proposed development. Chair Kohlenberg agreed to work with staff and draft some questions to include as part of the report requirements.

6/22/05 Schedule a tour of an extraction operation to attain a better visual sense of a working mineral extraction operation.
Commissioner Ottavelli J. Hayes

6/22/05 Obtain a more definitive answer about whether gravel resources are used from the mine in recycling operations.
Commission J. Hayes

6/22/05 Prepare a countywide map to include all draft layers from the critical areas regulations in addition to other criteria to assist the Commission in its discussion.
J. Hayes J. Hayes

6/22/05 Verify first August meeting date by e-mail to Commissioners.
Commission J. Sonnen

6/22/05 The Planning Commission agreed not to send the final draft of Mineral Lands to the task force for review at this time.
TCPC Staff

7/6/05 Commissioner Cole referred to the Request for Information Summary Sheet attached to the minutes and noted his request on January 26, 2005 about concerns for citizen and how they can find out if there are impediments as to what can be done with a piece of property has not been addressed by staff nor has staff been identified who will address the question.
Commissioner Cole J. Sonnen

7/13/05 Discussion of an appropriate buffer width necessary to protect adjacent properties from fire management practices on prairies and air quality followed. Staff will investigate whether it’s unlawful to burn, and if there are specific things that could be taken into consideration to help establish an appropriate distance. Commissioners suggested staff could confer
with the Fire District or U.S. Forest Service.

7/13/05 The Commission requested staff investigate how to allow fish hatcheries without impacting the natural resources the County is attempting to protect.  

Commission  J. Sonnen

8/31/05 Mr. Sonnen said there were many comments from the public about justifiability of the document (CAO). Staff has received several suggestions about how to respond to the complaints. 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.

Staff  J. Sonnen

8/31/05 Mr. Sonnen offered a suggestion of a test with staff and with frequent users of the CAO 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.

Staff  J. Sonnen

8/31/05 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  J. Sonnen

Commissioner  J. Sonnen

8/31/05 Staff 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.

Staff  J. Sonnen

8/31/05 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 develop a response.

8/31/05 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.

9/21/05 Staff and Commissioners discussed scheduling one-half or longer day sessions to address critical areas rather than scheduling additional evening meetings. Chair Kohlenberg suggested staff follow up with members via e-mail on which Saturdays and/or evenings in October would work best.

9/21/05 Commissioners asked Commissioner Lyman to draft a letter to the County Board of Commissioners requesting the Board intercede on behalf of the Planning Commission to receive additional legal support.

10/12/05 Staff asked members to consider an option of forming task forces to focus on key topics such as agriculture, mineral extractions, etc. The task force could consist of two or three Planning Commissioners and those with technical expertise to help address issues raised by the public. Additionally, consider examining how other jurisdictions have addressed similar issues. The task forces could make recommendations to the Planning Commission.

10/12/05 Commissioner Lyman said Commissioner Oberquell has requested a letter from the
Planning Commission addressing the names of the invited participants within the CAO process so she can provide answers when she receives queries. Commissioner Lyman offered to work with staff and draft a letter to Commissioner Oberquell. The draft will be circulated to the Planning Commission before it is forwarded to Commissioner Oberquell.

10/19/05 Mr. Clark requested the Planning Commission defer its recommendation of the Grand Mound WSP amendment until it has the findings from the review committee. He anticipates a staff recommendation for the Planning Commission’s November 2, 2005 meeting.  
S. Scott  S. Scott

10/19/05 Mr. Sonnen offered to draft the Planning Commission letter to the BOCC. The letter will be presented to the Planning Commission for review.  
J. Sonnen  J. Sonnen

10/19/05 Request for legal counsel to attend a future meeting and/or clarify in writing the public record disclosure requirements specific to the Planning Commission. Also provide written guidance as part of the orientation materials provided to Planning Commissioners.  
Commission  Staff

11/2/05 Poll Commissioners for availability of a Saturday meetings in January through March.  
J. Sonnen  Staff

11/2/05 Provide the Commission with a monthly status check on the Commission’s subcommittee work on the CAO review.  
J. Sonnen  J. Sonnen

11/2/05 Develop a tentative schedule for the CAO review for the Commission’s review and input at its November 16, meeting.  
J. Sonnen  J. Sonnen

11/2/05 E-mail Commissioners to ascertain interest in attending November 10 CAO subcommittee meeting.  
J. Sonnen  J. Sonnen