THURSTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes
May 3, 2006

1. Call to Order

Chair Roper called the regular meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m. Everyone provided self-introductions.

   a. Attendance

   Members Present: Commissioners Tom Cole, Liz Kohlenberg, Chris Lane, Liz Lyman, Bob Musser, Scott Nelson, and Joyce Roper
   Members Absent: Commissioners Craig Ottavelli and Rhenda Strub
   Staff Present: John Sonnen, Cami Petersen, Delicia Durden, Katie Knight, Jennifer Hayes, Diana Smith, Celinda Ramsey, and Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services

   b. Approval of Agenda

   Commissioner Cole 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 April 19, 2006

Commissioner Lyman moved, seconded by Commissioner Cole, to approve the minutes and accept the tapes of the April 19, 2006 meeting.

The following corrections were requested to the April 19, 2006 minutes:
- On page 4, within the third sentence of the last bullet, insert “or removal from the rezone” between “zoning” and “may.”
- On page 6, revise the last sentence to read in part, “Commissioner Nelson said scientists provided good examples…”
- On page 7, revise the first sentence to read in part, “incentives; however, Commissioner Lyman said the scientists were not familiar…”

The motion as amended carried. Chair Roper abstained.

4. **B: Critical Areas – Reasonable Use Exception**  
(Staff: John Sonnen)

Mr. Sonnen reviewed background information on the Board of County Commissioner’s (BoCC) request concerning the Reasonable Use Exception section of the proposed Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). The Hearing Examiner is recommending the BoCC modify language on page 4-9, item B 1 and remove the word “economic.” The issue is if someone buys a lot at fair market value, they can use “reasonable economic use” as an argument to build on a lot. Eliminating the word “economic” allows the Hearing Examiner to avoid situations where it’s imprudent to allow a use through the reasonable use exception criteria. The BoCC requests the Commission forward a recommendation on that section of the proposed CAO prior to the Commission’s completion of its work on the CAO.

Discussion of the term “minimal reasonable use” followed. In reply to an inquiry from Chair Roper, Mr. Sonnen conveyed legal staff reviewed the draft ordinance in its entirety.

Staff and Commissioners reviewed pages 4-8 through 4-11 of the proposed CAO and relevant public comments about the reasonable use exemption section. Chair Roper said she is not familiar with the term “minimal.” She suggested that “no practical reasonable alternative exists” is more common language.

The Commission agreed to strike the word “minimal” within the third sentence of section 17.15.460 on page 4-8, and within the third sentence of item B 1 on page 4-9.

Commissioners discussed the rationale used to eliminate the term “economic” in the third line of item B 1 on page 4-9, and how it relates to existing agriculture uses. Commissioner Nelson expressed concerns about striking “economic” from the reasonable use exception language. He noted references to “existing agriculture” are prefaced with the wording “potential probable impacts.” His best argument for a “reasonable use exception” is related to economics. The Commission responded that striking the reference to “economic” does not restrict anyone from making an “economic” argument.

A majority of the Commission agreed to remove the word “economic” within the third line of item B 1 on page 4-9, and noted there are also minority concerns from several Commissioners. The Commission asked staff to strike the word “minimal” throughout the
reasonable use exception section as appropriate.

Commissioner Lyman asked about the language stating, “… reasonable use of the property as a whole” within the third line of section B 1 on page 4-9 and the language “developed under regulations in effect prior to (the effective date of this ordinance)” in the same paragraph. Mr. Sonnen explained what is meant by “as a whole.” He indicated staff will revise the last sentence under B 1 to read in part, “… on surrounding properties shall not be a basis for granting a reasonable use exception.”

Commissioner Lyman asked if “threatened or endangered species in Washington State” language should be included in paragraph #3 on page 4-9. Mr. Sonnen said staff will follow up and if necessary add the reference.

Mr. Sonnen reported a citizen suggested adding the following language to the last sentence on item C on page 4-10 as follows, “provided it does not create environmental impacts or do damage to adjacent property.” Following discussion, the Commission determined no adjustment to the language was necessary.

Staff and Commissioners discussed section D, New and Expanded Structures on page 4-10. Public comments suggest the 1,500 square foot limit is too low and that a 2,000-2,500 square foot building footprint is more appropriate. Chair Roper suggested striking the second sentence in its entirety. Mr. Sonnen reviewed the related comments on page 10 of the Administrative Chapter comment matrix.

A majority of the Commission agreed to strike the second sentence in Section D in its entirety and reword the third line to read, “minimum extent necessary for the reasonable use,” reword the ninth sentence to read, “shall not exceed 5,000 square feet subject to the review criteria found in section B 5,” and make it clear there is a limitation in floodplains.

5. B: Open Space Application (Trowbridge)
   (Staff: Katie Knight)

Ms. Knight presented an Application for Open Space Classification to enroll 84 acres in the Open Space – Open Space Tax Program, consisting of 600 feet of shoreline on the eastern shore of Pattison Lake. The Commission presented no questions to staff.

Commissioner Lyman moved, seconded by Commissioner Cole, to schedule a public hearing on June 7, 2005 at 7:05 p.m. for an Application for Open Space Classification, Case #2006100624. Motion carried.
Ms. Hayes provided a broad overview of the work by the Cluster Development Task Force (CDTF). Ms. Hayes introduced the CDTF members to the Commission: Jeff Pantier, Mark Lovrein, Doug DeForest, Sam Merrill, and Kathleen O’Connor. Ms. Hayes explained the purpose of the briefing. The CDTF will report back to the BoCC in late June with a final report to include code language and background information. It will provide the BoCC with an option to advance the CDTF recommendations as an element of the Commission’s public hearing concerning the rural rezoning project. Ms. Hayes stated that the task force has not yet reached final agreement on its recommendation at this time.

Commissioner Lyman inquired if the CDTF recommendations will come through the Commission for review. Ms. Hayes replied yes, but the timing of when and at what point in the rural rezoning process is unclear. Staff anticipates the BoCC to address timing and process at its June meeting. Commissioner Lyman said a bigger issue is the role of the Commission concerning the review of land use matters.

Discussion ensued concerning how cluster development fits within the critical pathway and the timing difference in separating the rural rezoning and clustering development projects. Ms. Hayes said if the County wants to include cluster development as part of the rural rezoning project, the deadline for completion is November 30, 2006. She described the timeline for the process and the Commission’s review and public hearing. The BoCC appointed a special task force acting in an advisory capacity that has been working on a set of recommendations for the last year and a half. It could be possible for the Commission to advance the CDTF recommendations to a public hearing at the same time as the rural rezoning project. There is a fair amount of interest in cluster development and there is a connection between the two projects.

Staff, Commissioners, and the CDTF reviewed preliminary options for density bonuses, specifically #7 Bonus allowed in 1:10 zone, and #8 Bonus allowed in 1:20 zone. The density bonus for the 1:10 and 1:20 zones are the same in the majority and minority packages; however, there are distinct differences between the two. A bonus not to exceed a net density of 1:6 is proposed for both.

Chair Roper asked if the CDTF revisited rural resource parcel use. Ms. Hayes replied yes, but it is not included in the briefing materials.

Mr. Pantier explained the charge is to develop a set of rules for clustering with the idea that the rules will help preserve rural character. A successful ordinance must pass the legal test, have public support, and be economically viable.

Chair Roper asked what uses of the resource parcels the CDTF determined preserves the rural character. Mr. DeForest replied the task force agreed rural resource parcels should remain as rural resource parcels for three basic purposes: agriculture, forestry, and conservation/open space. The CDTF is refining the details.
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Ms. O’Connor said the CDTF discussed active versus passive use and reviewed the previous list of special uses that were allowed. In order for a management plan to be worthwhile, there must be enforcement and penalties to ensure compliance. Those details have not been developed at this time.

Discussion ensued concerning past problems and issues concerning cluster development west of Tenino, particularly impacts to the wells and drinking water quality and quality on adjacent properties. Mr. Pantier responded the County’s current regulations address the issues. There are strict groundwater quality and quantity standards that all projects must meet. A project with more than four lots undertakes a through State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) determination to ensure septic systems will not adversely impact drinking water from neighboring water supplies. A hydrogeologic assessment is required and must demonstrate that the draw down on the wells is not affected. The Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) requires a water rights permit for any groundwater withdrawal that exceeds 5,000 gallons a day.

Mr. DeForest explained the number of units that can be clustered together is limited to 16. The CDTF is considering a minimum 100-foot buffer between a development and any adjacent property.

Ms. O’Connor commented that there are rules and regulations for development that are not enforced on a consistent basis. Focusing enforcement efforts to clustering could force conventional development in circumstances where a cluster might make more sense to protect certain sensitive areas.

Discussion followed concerning how clustering concentrates the development and impacts to one place, that the impact should be reviewed independent of the existing rules in order to evaluate impacts to adjoining properties, and trade-offs that consist of preserving resource lands, and impervious and vegetation retention limits.

Mr. Merrill said there are professional design standards outlining how cluster development should be accomplished. As an example, if conservation is the focus, one should start by selecting the critical areas and other areas important to preserve, and then determine the cluster location. Additional staff time is needed to work with a developer on the ground. The BoCC should budget accordingly so there is adequate County staff to do the job. It is clear that clustering has strong landuse limitations and therefore is under the purview of the Planning Commission.

Conversation about the proposed density bonus in the 1:5 zone followed. Ms. Hayes conveyed that the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMGH) ruled that 1:5 zoning is rural density but that the County needed to provide a variety of densities. There are counties that have limited bonuses in the 1:5 districts with low impact development.

Ms. O’Connor said it is interesting to note there are several minority opinions. One is to not allow density bonuses.
Staff and Commissioners discussed the minority package options in the 1:10 zone, density transfers, refining recommendations to encourage cluster versus conventional development, and open space tax incentives for resource use parcels.

Ms. Hayes said a final CDTF report will be available a week prior to the BoCC’s June 20, 2006 briefing. The BoCC will make the decision whether to include cluster development with the rural rezoning project. Commissioner Lyman asked Ms. Hayes to seek legal opinion on the issue of taking the Task Force recommendation to public hearing without the Planning Commission having had the opportunity to review it.

7. **B: Rural Rezoning – follow up on sub-areas**  
 *(Staff: Jennifer Hayes, Diana Smith)*

Ms. Smith presented the Budd/Deschutes South sub-area display maps. Discussion ensued as to the review process of the sub-areas. Staff typically presents the Commission with recommendations for consideration. Ms. Hayes reported each profile includes a staff recommendation section. The Commission is identifying areas appropriate for 1:10 and 1:20 zoning densities. The County wants to build a solid record concerning the rural rezoning decision-making process.

Commissioner Kohlenberg relayed that staff has completed excellent work. Chair Roper said she understood the Commission would review the recommendations at a macro level. Ms. Hayes explained staff is working with the BoCC’s recommendations and presenting them to the Commission for input. Without the Commission review’s, staff doesn’t believe an adequate record of the decision is created. However, the Commission has been exposed to all of the sub-area work at this point. If the Commission’s direction to staff is simply to eliminate as many nonconforming lots as possible. The next step is ordinance review in June.

Commissioner Kohlenberg said staff could come back to the Commission with the changes recommended by the Commission.

Commissioner Lyman inquired about how much information the BoCC will want to inform its decision-making. The study areas encompass approximately 40% of the rural residential lands in the County. She asked whether it is the assumption that all the study areas will be rezoned. The Commission didn’t eliminate much from the study areas previously reviewed. Ms. Hayes replied the study areas represent the BoCC’s priorities. Staff is working with the Commission to identify areas appropriate for 1:10 and 1:20 zoning. Staff will then write the codes and policy language to support the zoning recommendations. The proposal is to consider all areas feasible for rezoning.

Additional discussion ensued concerning the BoCC’s expectation that most of the areas within the study areas will be proposed for rezoning and presented during the public hearing and how some Commissioners approached their respective review of the study areas. Ms. Hayes said if there are areas the Commission believes should be rezoned, staff is interested in receiving feedback. If the Commission determines that all conservation and physically constrained lands, mostly owned by federal or state agencies, should be zoned “parks, trails, and public preserves,”
it could be part of its proposal and direction to the BoCC.

Chair Roper said not establishing criteria in advance gives a perception that the Commission is establishing criteria on a case-by-case basis, which is a concern. Ms. Hayes stated she’s heard two main points concerning rural rezoning:

- The Commission trusts staff to remove the small lots and create less nonconformity, apply the “parks, trails, and public preserves” zone to federal or state owned lands, and present final recommendations to the Commission at a future meeting; or
- The Commission is interested in developing criteria to apply to the sub-area maps to identify appropriate zoning densities.

The Commission directed staff to apply the “parks, trails, and public preserves” zoning to the McAllister bluff area and certain lands south of Black Lake, as well as other conservation agency parcels.

Commissioner Lane pointed out on the Budd/Deschutes South display map, small lots south of Rainier where 1:20 zoning does not make sense. The Commission directed staff to apply the 60% rule to the areas with predominantly smaller lots and draw a logical zoning boundary. Staff will present the changes to the Commission at a future date.

Ms. Smith referred to the northern portion of the Nisqually River north sub-area that reflects 1:10 zoning with a question mark, and an area marked UR (20). The UR (20) previously was adjacent to the Lacey urban growth area (UGA). Properties within the 1:10 zoning with a question mark are within the Nisqually reach shellfish protection area. She asked whether the Commission wants to expand the UR (20) to include that area. The Commission determined 1:10 zoning provides better protection and directed staff to change the proposed UR (20) zoning to 1:10.

Ms. Smith directed the Commission’s attention to the Totten-Eld sub-area map and noted some of The Evergreen State College (TESC) lands are in the study area while others are not. Ms. Hayes said TESC is zoned 1:5. The Commission agreed to include all TESC parcels and apply the 1:10 zone designation.

Staff will present additional rural rezoning information and materials to the Commission at its June 7, 2006 meeting.

8. **Calendar (Tentative) and Attendance**

- May 17, 2006: Geologic hazards (Commissioners Cole, Kohlenberg, and Musser unable to attend)
- May 24, 2006: Geologic hazards (if needed); LAMIRDs (Commissioner Cole unable to attend)
9. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Roper adjourned the meeting at 9:34 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 September 6, 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>
<tr>
<td>6/22/05</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Commissioner Lyman</td>
<td>N. Pritchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/05</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Chair Kohlenberg</td>
<td>N. Pritchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/05</td>
<td>Obtain a more definitive answer about whether gravel resources are used from the mine in recycling operations.</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>J. Hayes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

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.  

Commission  
J. Sonnen

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
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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.

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 Strub J. Sonnen

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.

Commissioners Commission Lyman

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.

Staff Staff/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

Planning Commission Staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assignee</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/7/05</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Lyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/06</td>
<td>Follow up with legal staff to ascertain how many other counties have been challenged by Futurewise.</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/06</td>
<td>Staff to check to ensure the refined map (Map 2 Rural Character) looks at 20 acre or greater parcels.</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Ottavelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/06</td>
<td>Interest expressed by several Commissioners to receive a map combining aquifer/sensitive areas, unbuildable areas, and rural character as well as adding marine conservation lands and also the above combination with the exclusion of rural character to ascertain how the rezoning study areas look.</td>
<td>Commissioners</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/06</td>
<td>Ascertain whether it is possible to provide an interactive workshop showing several map combinations.</td>
<td>Commissioners</td>
<td>GIS Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/06</td>
<td>Obtain legal opinion regarding risks associated with large removal of large areas of agricultural lands from the rezone study areas project.</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/06</td>
<td>Staff was requested to provide the Commission with a recommendation concerning a protocol for drafting a volunteer program. Commissioner Strub requested staff work with the Farm Bureau also.</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Ottavelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Commissioner Kohlenberg requested knowing how local species are defined and selected.</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Kohlenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Staff to research public testimony regarding what is the BAS for expanding a list of rare and endangered species as outlined in the amendment.</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Requested staff analysis of the impacts of gravel mining in riparian and management zones concerning important habitats.</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Research with legal staff what the distinction is of agriculture occurring on designated agriculture resource lands and agriculture on other lands.</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Legal Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Provide comparative data for habitat about the impacts of mining similar to data on impacts to wetlands caused by mining</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Ascertain pros and cons for removing beaver ponds versus prohibiting the removal of beaver ponds.</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Discuss clarification of terms related to estuary and estuarine wetlands</td>
<td>Chair Roper/Commissioner Lyman</td>
<td>Staff to add to 3/1/06 agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/06</td>
<td>Commissioners requested a review of frequently asked questions (FAQs) prior to posting online</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/06</td>
<td>Present a list of target interest groups for the Commission’s review for the volunteer rezoning strategy</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/06</td>
<td>Air information on TCTV Channel 3 regarding the Volunteer Rezoning Program</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/06</td>
<td>Staff to provide notice to other river councils and other organizations regarding the Volunteer Program.</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/06</td>
<td>Commissioners to provide feedback and comments by April 5, 2006 regarding the three questions: Do we really want to create a new zoning district in this area? What is the appropriate density? What specific regulatory tools can work here?</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/06</td>
<td>Invite representative from Assessor’s Office to the Volunteer Meeting</td>
<td>Commissioner Lyman</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/06</td>
<td>Staff to e-mail the <em>Residential Subdivision Moratorium – Rural County</em> map to Commissioners.</td>
<td>Chair Roper</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/06</td>
<td>Staff to provide information regarding water availability and areas where there are current drinking water issues.</td>
<td>Chair Roper</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/06</td>
<td>Staff will develop a list of resource materials.</td>
<td>Commissioner Kohlenberg</td>
<td>Ms. Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/06</td>
<td>Staff was asked to e-mail the April 19, 2006 meeting packet Chair Roper, as she will be out-of-town. Commissioners expressed</td>
<td>Chair Roper</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interest in receiving the meeting packet as much in advance of the April 19, 2006 meeting as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/5/06</td>
<td>Staff will contact the City of Lacey and follow up whether the City has water capacity to serve future residential development.</td>
<td>Ms. Pritchett Ms. Pritchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/06</td>
<td>Staff to include the area map for the entire County with future LAMIRDs discussion materials.</td>
<td>Chair Roper Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19/06</td>
<td>Commissioners should review pages 4-8 through 4-11 of the draft CAO ordinance.</td>
<td>Staff Ms. Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/06</td>
<td>Commissioners should review page 10 of the administrative comments in the Reasonable Use Exception section of the CAO</td>
<td>Staff Mr. Sonnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/06</td>
<td>Follow up with Commissioners on alternate date for dinner with BoCC</td>
<td>Mr. Sonnen Mr. Sonnen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>