THURSTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes
February 15, 2006

1. Call to Order

Chair Roper called the February 15, 2006 regular meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. Everyone provided self-introductions.

   a. Attendance

   Members Present: Chair Joyce Roper, Commissioners Tom Cole, Liz Kohlenberg, Chris Lane, Bob Musser, Scott Nelson, Craig Ottavelli, and Rhenda Strub

   Members Excused: Liz Lyman

   Staff Present: John Sonnen, Jennifer Hayes, Diana Smith, Celinda Ramsey, and Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services

   Members welcomed newly appointed Planning Commissioner Scott Nelson.

   b. Approval of Agenda

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

2. Public Communications (Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)

   There was no public communication.

3. Rural Rezoning Study Areas
   (Staff: Jennifer Hayes, Diana Smith, and Celinda Ramsey)

   Ms. Hayes introduced new Development Services intern Celinda Ramsey. Commissioner Cole complimented staff for the comprehensive rural rezoning study areas information packet.
Ms. Hayes reviewed an agenda for the rural rezoning study areas briefing; i.e., purpose of the briefing, project timeline, synopsis of public input, how other counties do it, preferred path options, maps and options for drawing rezone study areas, Q&A discussion, and choosing a preferred path.

The purpose of the briefing is to discuss the results of the public input, review potential rezone study area lands based on the input, determine the Commission’s need for additional information in order for it to make decisions and develop recommendations for the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC). Future briefings are planned for the Planning Commission’s March 1 and 15, 2006 meetings.

Ms. Hayes distributed copies of the project timeline with updates shown in “yellow.” Staff anticipates conclusion of the first phase of the rural rezoning study areas project and the Commission forwarding a proposal to the BoCC in March. Phase II of the project begins in the spring with refining the study areas, researching density/development standard options for new zoning districts, and developing a public outreach strategy once the study areas have been identified. The Commission will draft and refine the details of a new ordinance during its upcoming briefings. A public hearing is planned before the Commission in July. A progress report is due to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB) on July 27, 2006. Ordinance adoption is due by November 30, 2006 and a compliance report is due to the WWGMHB by December 7, 2006.

Ms. Smith reviewed Prioritization of lands selected by small workshop groups. A total of four workshops were held resulting in 28 small workshop groups. There were 23 groups that did a prioritization exercise. The remaining five groups discussed kinds of lands but did not complete a prioritization exercise. Staff analyzed the output from the small, facilitated workgroups and digested it into a new format, Rural Rezoning Public Input: Prioritization of Lands by Workshop Groups. The graphic shows the prioritization of kinds of lands that the public felt should be studied for rezoning. Twenty-two out of 28 groups talked about “unbuildable lands” and felt they should be rezoned. “Unbuildable areas” is followed by rural character, volunteered lands, aquifer recharge/sensitive areas, marine conservation, and habitat. Over 700 people attended the workshops and approximately 350 provided input in creating the graph. Ms. Smith briefly reviewed elements of the analysis.

Ms. Smith summarized the remaining sections of the rural rezoning project packet: summary of letters, e-mails, and comment cards received during Phase I Public Outreach, July 5, 2005 through February 1, 2006; workshop facilitator summaries; letters about specific geographic areas/sites; letters about kinds of lands; letters with how-to ideas; and letters concerning “not my property”.

Ms. Hayes distributed a grid showing how other counties in western Washington have handled the rural rezoning study areas project; i.e., Snohomish, Kitsap, Lewis, Pierce, Island and Skagit counties. The data is broken down into six categories:

- Rural zoning districts and densities
• Percentage of rural areas at each represented density
• Legal action taken against county regarding rural zoning
• Criteria for lower rural density designations
• Usage of cluster bonuses and open space incentive programs
• Protections, design standards, and limitations affecting zoning district designations

Staff and Commissioners spent some time talking about the percentage of rural areas at each represented density statistics. Kitsap County did not include percentages with their data. Ms. Hayes commented Futurewise would like Thurston County to use Lewis County as a model. However, Thurston is very different from Lewis County. Lewis is a larger county with a smaller population, slower rate of growth, and more resource lands. Several of the counties allow cluster development and incentive bonuses.

Commissioner Cole asked how many other counties Futurewise has challenged. **Ms. Hayes said she will check with legal staff and follow up with the Commission at a future meeting.** Commissioner Strub conveyed the information is available on Futurewise’s website. A discussion of the dates when various county legal cases were resolved ensued.

Commissioner Ottavelli said it would be helpful to include Thurston County on the grid analysis for comparison purposes. Ms. Hayes replied approximately 95% of Thurston County’s rural lands are zoned one-unit/five acres. A dialogue concerning limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRDs) followed.

Ms. Hayes presented Preferred Path Options:

• Option A. Draw rezone study areas. Staff will brief the BoCC on March 7, 2006 on the rural rezoning project. A briefing is also scheduled for March 15, 2006 regarding the current moratorium. The Commission can recommend different study area options, such as options that would rezone high, medium, and low amounts of land. Option A maintains the current timeline.

• Option B. Draw rezone study areas and request authority to seek volunteers countywide. Staff referred to a memorandum from Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Allen Miller regarding spot zoning. Legal staff has concluded that rezoning specific rural parcels to lower densities does not constitute spot zoning, based on certain criteria including keeping the basic land use the same (low density residential). Option B could add some time to the schedule related to seeking volunteers and processing that information.

• Option C. Ask to seek volunteers before drawing study areas. The option would cause a significant delay in the timeline, approximately six to eight weeks.

• Option D includes ideas from the public such as assigning citizen committees in different areas of the County that would identify rezoning proposals for their own areas, and conduct a countywide survey. Option D cannot meet the WWGMHB timelines. Another option is to consider all 1/5 lands as part of the rezone study areas, which keeps everyone under the current moratorium and is a controversial approach.

Ms. Smith explained staff has taken the Prioritization of lands selected by small workshop
groups and translated the results into map layers. Most information the Commission has seen before; however, it is organized differently based on public preferences. She reviewed a display map titled, Parcel Analysis, Rural Parcels & Residential Zoned Properties, Resource Use Parcels, Vested and Potential Projects, Designated and Mine Location and its legend. The map also shows where those who attended the workshops are from by a “pin” placement.

Staff presented several additional display maps based on the six different lands categories.

- **Map 1:** Unbuildable Areas. Staff highlighted with a laser parcels 20 acres or greater affected by a 100-year flood zones, steep slopes, landslide hazard areas, public and nonprofit easements, and/or wetlands. Map 1A, Unbuildable Areas Refined, attempts to show those parcels that are unbuildable and 100% encumbered by one or more of the “hazardous lands” listed above. Statistics reveal landslide hazard areas account for 5% of the rural county, steep slopes 9%, 100-year flood zone 25%, wetlands 13%, and public nonprofit easement ownership 13%. Parcels 100% encumbered in the rural area equals 3% of the county compared to parcels 75% encumbered at 8%.

- **Map 2:** Rural Character. The map shows designated forest parcels, open space tax program lands, lands bordering long-term forestry, agriculture and Nisqually agriculture, mines, and Alternative I parcels, which include parcels bordering urban growth areas (UGAs) and other parcels that have rural character values. An additional element reflected on the map is lands with good soils as defined by the 2004 Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) prime and important soils list. Map 2A, Rural Character Refined, reveals 45% of the county is rural character. In reply to a comment from Commissioner Ottavelli, staff will check to make sure the refined map is looking at 20 acre or greater parcels.

- **Map 3:** Aquifer Recharge/Sensitive Areas. The map defines aquifer recharge areas #1 and #2 in “yellow” and areas with high chloride/saltwater intrusion problems. Map 3A, Aquifer Recharge/Sensitive Areas Refined, shows parcels greater than 20 acres in size and partially encumbered in “red”; these make up 8% of the County. In reply to an inquiry from Chair Roper, Mr. Sonnen said the saltwater intrusion area is a salt deposit at Offut Lake. The MGSA area is shown as well.

- **Map 4:** Marine conservation areas consist of shellfish protection districts/areas in “light green” and parcels 20 acres or greater along a marine shoreline in “dark green.” Map 4A, Marine Conservation Refined, reveals the marine shoreline parcels greater than 20 acres in size makes up less than .01% of the rural County where the shellfish protection districts/areas account for 3%.

- **Map 5:** Habitat. Lands found by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) eco-regional habitat assessment to have high habitat value are shown in “purple.” There is an outline of parcels greater than 20 acres that are partially encumbered by high habitat value area; this represents 33% of the rural County.

Staff reviewed a final map that combines the individual maps of what workshop small group
participants drew on maps. Ms. Smith pointed to common rezone areas suggested by multiple workshop groups.

Commissioner Strub asked if all of the maps are drawn at the same scale. Ms. Smith replied yes, and presented a final map layer based on letters and emails from the public. “Blue” areas represent non-property owner requests for rezones. “Green” illustrates parcels requested for rezone by the property owner. Parcels shown in “black” represent property owners that are not interested in a rezone no matter what.

**Chair Roper recessed the meeting from 7:55 p.m. to 8:17 p.m. so that members could spend time reviewing the maps.**

Following review of the display maps, staff and members entered into a question and answer session.

Commissioner Kohlenberg commented that a number of the parcels appear on several maps. She asked if staff has evaluated combined sets of criteria. Ms. Hayes said staff did that to create Alternatives 1, 2, and 3; the public did that as reflected in their consolidated small group maps. Staff can create map combinations based on what the Commission wants to see.

Commissioner Ottavelli said he is interested in a map combining aquifer recharge/sensitive areas, unbuildable areas, and rural character. Commissioner Strub agreed she’d like to see that combination and add marine conservation lands. Commissioner Kohlenberg conveyed she’s interested in Commissioner Ottavelli’s suggested combination without rural character to see how the rezoning study areas look.

Discussion of whether Geodata could provide an interactive workshop ensued. Staff explained a presentation showing several map combinations would prove overwhelming for the software in terms of the memory required to assemble the different map combinations. Mobilizing the hardware to one location to accomplish such a presentation is also difficult. **However, staff could pose the question to Geodata and/or GIS staff.** It is a significant task to organize and put in place between now and March 1, 2006.

Chair Roper inquired whether the map requested by Commissioner Kohlenberg could be revised to include open space agriculture parcels due to concerns with potential implications related to designating additional long-term agricultural lands. Ms. Hayes said it’s the BoCC’s call whether the lands the Planning Commission decides to include in the rural rezone study areas is enough to allow release of other lands. A brief dialogue concerning risks associated with releasing large blocks of agricultural lands from the moratorium versus other types of land use parcels followed. Ms. Hayes said the WWGMHB focused on the County’s designation policies. She suggested the Commission could ask for a legal opinion related to risks associated with removal of large areas of agricultural lands from the rezone study areas project. Chair Roper suggested retaining the large parcels of 20 acres or more of open space agricultural lands in the rezone study areas. Commissioner Cole agreed.
Ms. Hayes said it is common for counties to rezone lands bordering UGAs to lower densities. If the UGA expands in the future, the lands can be part of an urban area because the properties have not been further subdivided. A consideration is how urban reserve lands or parcels bordering UGAs fits with the rural rezoning work. The urban reserve lands are shown in “yellow” on the rural character map. Commissioner Lane said rezoning growth boundary properties to lower densities adds to urban sprawl. If the county down zones lands to 1:20, it’s pushing people outside to properties that may be zoned 1:5.

Chair Roper expressed her interest in a map combination that keeps the farmland/current use of agriculture data in for parcels greater than 20 acres for the one that removes the remainder of rural character property types. Further discussion of rural character lands ensued.

Commissioner Nelson asked how much of the open space program lands make up the rural character category. Ms. Hayes replied most are in existing open space programs; i.e., agriculture and timber. The map serves as an indicator of where those types of activities are taking place.

Commissioner Kohlenberg said it is important to her that the Commission uses the process to identify areas that should see less development.

**Commissioner Ottavelli moved, seconded by Commissioner Strub, to direct staff to gather the data and create a map combination for 20 acres and greater parcels that includes aquifer recharge/sensitive areas, marine shoreline/conservation, and unbuildable land areas (maps 1, 3 and 4).**

Commissioner Cole said he is interested in a map combination as suggested by Commissioner Ottavelli pulling agriculture out of rural character lands. Commissioners Strub and Ottavelli requested Commissioner Cole make a separate motion.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Commissioner Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Kohlenberg, to direct staff to overlay agriculture on maps 1, 3 and 4. Motion carried.**

Commissioner Nelson conveyed he’d like a rural character map that takes out lands that are included based solely on the fact that the lands are in an open space tax program. Discussion of open space programs ensued. Commissioner Nelson clarified his request concerns lands in open space programs solely because the owner doesn’t want to pay higher property taxes, but is looking to develop the property in the future. Ms. Hayes summarized what will be included in the two map combinations already requested by the Commission. Ms. Smith explained what is included on the rural character map: tax programs shown are open space agriculture, open space timber, and designated forestry; parcels 20 acres or greater that border long-term agriculture, forestry, Nisqually agriculture, designated mineral lands; parcels greater than 20 acres in size that border UGAs; and lands with prime and important farmland soils.

**Commissioner Nelson moved, seconded by Commissioner Kohlenberg, to direct staff to**
combine maps 1, 2, 3 and 4 and remove any lands included simply because the parcels are in a tax program. Motion carried.

Staff and Commissioners considered the last rural rezoning study areas agenda item choosing a preferred path. Commissioner Ottavelli said he’s interested in an option that looks at volunteered lands for rezoning, as it was the top public priority across the board.

**Commissioner Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Kohlenberg, that the Commission recommend to the BoCC preferred path Option B: draw rezone study areas, and ask the BoCC for authority to seek volunteers.**

Commissioner Ottavelli commented 18 out of 23 workshop groups were in favor of volunteered lands (lands that are volunteered for rezoning by their property owners). It should be part of the preferred path process. Commissioner Cole commented that Option C extends the project timeline.

Commissioner Strub spoke against the motion. The Commission and staff asked the public what it wanted to see. There was overwhelming public input asking the Commission to first and foremost talk to volunteers. Drawing rezone study areas and soliciting volunteers along the way is unresponsive to the public input. Commissioner Cole countered that Option B doesn’t require seeking volunteers first. It is his intent to overlay the volunteers once the study areas have been identified. There may be volunteers outside of study areas but that doesn’t stop the Commission from considering all of the volunteers. As the Commission identifies the rezone study areas, it will take into consideration all of the volunteered lands. Ms. Hayes added Option B includes drawing rezone study areas for the BoCC’s consideration and provides options for releasing lands outside of the study areas. Identifying the study areas doesn’t mean all of them will be rezoned.

Commissioner Ottavelli suggested the Commission could draw the rezone study areas and strongly encourage the BoCC to consider a parallel volunteered lands tract. Commissioner Strub said she understands pressures related to lifting the moratorium. However, workshop participants didn’t indicate there was a rush to lift the moratorium. Workshop participants did talk about the Commission talking to volunteers first.

Commissioner Cole said the Commission could look at volunteered lands in tandem with drawing the study areas.

Chair Roper said members did hear workshop participants say they wanted to develop their land, they want to retire now, and that the county is stopping them. It was the public’s way to indicate its interest in lifting the moratorium.

Commissioner Nelson said providing density bonuses for clustering on properties that are proposed for rezoning could encourage additional volunteered lands. Ms. Hayes said density bonuses for clustering could be part of a recommendation package the Commission forwards to the BoCC. However, at this point the Commission has no information concerning density
bonuses. Chair Roper said she might prefer the ability to sell development rights, which could prove a better option. Ms. Hayes said density bonuses and development rights discussions are part of Phase II of the project.

Discussion of the motion ensued. Commissioner Strub suggested forwarding a recommendation to the BoCC contingent upon it authorizing the Commission to solicit volunteered lands. Commissioner Cole said if such a recommendation were possible, he would accept it as a friendly amendment. Chair Roper expressed a concern of how the BoCC would perceive the recommendation. Commissioner Strub offered a friendly amendment to the motion and change the wording to say the Planning Commission recommends volunteered lands to the BoCC and while that is being developed, it recommends the Board further study “these” areas.

Commissioner Cole said the Commission could reinforce its recommendation and explain it is concerned about adding an additional two months to the process. If the BoCC does not accept volunteered lands, the Planning Commission may have to consider Option C. The Commission prefers an option that maintains the timeline. He said he agrees with Commissioner Strub and also feels strongly about volunteered lands.

Commissioner Musser said people are upset with the 1/5 zoning because they were hoping to develop their properties at a higher density.

**Commissioner Cole restated the motion, the Planning Commission recommends to the BoCC preferred path Option B, and strongly recommends simultaneously taking volunteers along with drawing the rural rezone study areas. The Planning Commission feels strongly about volunteers and doesn’t want to extend the timeframe an additional two months, thus the reason for its recommendation.** Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Ottavelli asked that staff provide the Commission with a recommendation concerning a protocol for drafting a volunteer program. Ms. Hayes replied staff will present preliminary ideas at the next meeting. Commissioner Strub suggested the County also work with the Farm Bureau. For the record, she complimented staff for its work organizing the rural rezoning workshops and preparing the workshop materials.

4. **Critical Areas – Identify Information Needs (for Important Habitats and Species)**  
   (Staff: John Sonnen)

Chair Roper expressed her desire that the Commission conduct a detailed review of the Important Habitats and Species chapter at a future meeting except riparian, as the upland habitats and priority species draft was not examined in detail by the Planning Commission unlike any of the other draft critical area amendments. Mr. Sonnen asked the Commission to identify its information needs in preparation for ordinance review. Following is a summary of the discussion points and identified information needs.

**Page 1**
- Check to see whether the Department of Agriculture treats organic pesticides any differently in response to the issue organic growers should be given more leeway. Further, is there a
question about the County’s ability to develop additional regulations if the Department of Agriculture preempts local authority?

**Page 3**
- *CAO and Forest and Fish rules* is a new issue. Is the County interacting properly or improperly with forestry and fisheries? Commissioner Strub commented the issue is under the *Legal* heading. Mr. Sonnen said staff will provide the information to legal staff. Legal staff would then provide a response.

**Page 5**
- Did the Commission address *add estuarine and near shore habitats for protections* in the *Wetlands* section? A discussion followed as to how estuarine wetlands are classified. Mr. Sonnen said the issue is estuarine areas and near shore habitat protection. The regulations do not address estuarine as a habitat and the marine estuaries are not identified as a discreet habitat. Staff will clarify the issue.

**Page 9**
- The last sentence of the “third bullet” talks about ways to use management zones rather than just buffers. The comment should be included with the riparian information and discussion of the options.

**Page 14**
- The “first bullet” under *Policy* contains a discussion of species of concern within 800 feet of a property and the last discussion was 300 feet. Where did the 800-foot requirement come from? The subcommittee talked about a 300-foot requirement, which was a reduction from the current 600-foot restriction.

**Page 15**
- Under the “second bullet” in the last block the statement, *The problem here is there is no BAS that supports the listing of the animals.* Is that true or not? Chair Roper requested staff talk with her about the Douglas Squirrel.
- Consider whether combining the definitions for federal and state listed threatened and endangered species and their habitats, species identified on the WDFW PHS list, and species designated as locally important is appropriate. What have other jurisdictions done?

The Commission stopped at page 15 and will revisit identifying information needs for *Important Habitats and Species* at a future meeting. A discussion of the focus of the February 22, 2006 meeting ensued. Mr. Sonnen reported Joe Butler with the Department of Ecology (DOE) will attend the next meeting to answer questions.

5. **Staff Updates**

Mr. Sonnen reported the BoCC completed three meetings concerning the Comprehensive Plan docket for the next year taking on only the mandatory projects reviewed with the Commission previously. The BoCC will address street standards for the Grand Mound area next year. The
docket is out for public comment. Comments from the Planning Commission are welcome.

Chair Roper asked members to bring their calendars to the next meeting to discuss a date for its annual dinner with the Board.

6. **Calendar (Tentative)**
   - February 22: W: Critical Areas – Flooding
   - March 1: B: Rural rezoning study areas; B: Three open space applications; W: Critical areas Flooding (if needed); Critical Areas – Geologic Hazards

7. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Roper adjourned the meeting at 9:26 p.m.

Joyce Roper, Chair
Liz Kohlenberg, Vice Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services
*Corrections made by Cami Petersen on March 9, 2006*
**Thurston County Planning Commission**

### REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
**SUMMARY SHEET**

<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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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                                   | TCPC                         | Staff                        |
final draft to the task force for review

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 N. Pritchett

6/22/05 Third Party Review report should include 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.

Chair Kohlenberg N. Pritchett

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

Commissioner 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 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 J. Sonnen

7/13/05 Discussion of an appropriate buffer width

Commission J. Sonnen
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/13/05</td>
<td>The Commission requested staff investigate how to allow fish hatcheries without impacting the natural resources the County is attempting to protect.</td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/05</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/05</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/05</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/05</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Commissioners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

12/7/05 Various requests regarding LAMIRDS:
- Interest in viewing analysis for all LAMIRDs including Grand Mound.
- Suggestion to include intervening properties between the areas shown in yellow to the left of #53 (Maytown Road SE area)
- Supply larger maps for the open house on December 8, 2005
- Determine what is located on the area located within the tribe’s UGA

12/7/05 Commitment to the BoCC to provide a companion piece in addition to the proposed draft (CAO) to help the Board to determine the range of science and options