1. **6:57:34 PM CALL TO ORDER**
Acting Chair Lyman called the August 30, 2006 special meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 7:02 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

**Attendance:** Commissioners Tom Cole, Chris Lane, Liz Lyman, Bob Musser, Scott Nelson, Craig Ottavelli, and Rhenda Strub

**Absent:** Commissioners Joyce Roper and Liz Kohlenberg

**Staff:** John Sonnen, Katie Knight, Diana Smith, Nancy Pritchett, Cami Petersen, and Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren

2. **6:58:04 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
MOTION: Commissioner Lane moved, seconded by Commissioner Cole, to approve the August 30, 2006 agenda as presented. Motion carried.

3. **6:58:21 PM PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS** *(Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)*

There were no public communications.

4. **6:59:05 PM APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
MOTION: Commissioner Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Lane, to accept the July 19, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Motion carried.

MOTION: Commissioner Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Lane, to accept the July 26, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Motion carried, Commissioner Nelson abstained.

MOTION: Commissioner Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Strub, to accept the August 3, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Motion carried.

5. **7:00:41 PM Worksession: Rural lands: LAMIRDs, Rural Rezone**

**Staff:** Diana Smith, Katie Knight, and Nancy Pritchett

**ITEM:** Review geographically specific comments received at the Rural Lands Public hearing on August 3, 2006 relating to LAMIRDs.

**DISCUSSION:** Staff and Commissioners began review of Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRDs) starting with page 2 of the “yellow” document titled “Public Comment Summary: Thurston County Planning Commission Public..."
7:02:58 PM Staff reviewed the general LAMIRD criteria developed last fall. Legal counsel reviewed the criteria again following the August 3, 2006 public hearing, and staff was advised to not change the criteria. There is some discretion related to creating logical boundaries and providing for some infill without allowing additional low-density sprawl in the rural areas. Existence of a water service plan should not be used as a criterion for delineating LAMIRD boundaries.

7:06:01 PM Staff presented a display map highlighting the Rochester LAMIRD boundary. Staff would like to include “this little corner” within the proposed LAMIRD. Ms. Pritchett noted the “dots” represent property owners that provided comment at the public hearing concerning specific parcels. Staff presented options related to providing a more logical boundary to the north and south of the LAMIRD without allowing too much infill and/or “outfill”:

- Scenario 1: Extend the boundary further south and include all of the area zoned higher density, which would potentially add 152 lots with 1:1 zoning
- Scenario 2: Extend the boundary on the south creating the potential for 58 additional lots assuming a density of 1:1

Staff provided a display map that outlines the infrastructure in the ground in “red”, and the “blue” lines indicate the water service area. Issues discussed by members and staff included the legal definition for LAMIRDs, the rationale for excluding the areas initially, areas currently and/or anticipated for service by the Rochester Water System, whether the County opens itself up to legal challenge by expanding the perimeter of the LAMIRD, additional wells needed to serve development, water quantity and quality, additional individual septic systems, not creating “donut holes”, and environmental impacts from additional septs on the groundwater and private wells existing in the area. Staff presented an additional display map showing the aquifer recharge areas.

7:21:09 PM The Commission decided to adopt Scenario #2 as presented by staff that provides for limited expansion of the southern portion of the LAMIRD. (Note: see page 3. The decision was reversed at 7:36:22).

7:21:45 PM Staff reviewed options concerning the northern portion of the LAMIRD:

- Scenario 1: Draw the line “straight across here” adding 30 infill lots
- Scenario 2: Extend the boundary further north following 176th and up Pendleton over to Littlerock Road, creating the potential for 63 additional lots

Discussion points included the probability of the Health Department requiring lots to hook up to water, that the Rochester Water System has the required water rights to serve its planning area using a 20-year horizon, proposed 1:1 zoning, concerns related to the
potential for water quantity and quality problems, and not having enough information to support altering the northern LAMIRD edge. Staff presented another map outlining the Rochester Water Association’s existing service area shown in a “dashed blue” line, and the “yellow” boundary indicates the 20-year service area per its comprehensive plan.

7:36:22 PM Members were not comfortable making a decision without further information, and requested staff provide additional data related to both the north and south boundaries at the next meeting; i.e., data from the Rochester Water Association and County Health Department related to water quantity and quality, soil susceptibility as it relates to water quality, and potential impacts to those already served by private wells if the boundary is expanded.

7:41:28 PM Staff distributed the following additional handouts:

- A LAMIRD near Grand Mound showing the corrected boundary for the Le Net Mobile Home Park on 191st Avenue
- A vicinity map showing an area outlined in “black” with the notation “remove” located between South Bay Road NE and Lilly Road
- An aerial photograph of LAMIRD study area #13 on Gull Harbor

Staff proposes to include the entire Le Net Mobile Home Park within the LAMIRD boundary. **Commissioners concurred.**

7:43:36 PM The Commission previously discussed the parcels located between South Bay Road NE and Lilly Road on April 5, 2006 and staff mapped the boundaries incorrectly for the public hearing maps. The parcels noted by the word “remove” should not be included. **Commissioners acknowledged the mapping error and concurred.**

7:44:01 PM Property owners on Gull Harbor request the County create a LAMIRD to retain the higher density zoning. The Gull Harbor plat was subdivided in 1959. Ms. Pritchett provided a history of the properties, and pointed out the conservation easement that surrounds the Gull Harbor boundary. She noted “vested” does not translate to “built” as it relates to the LAMIRD criteria. Discussion ensued concerning any benefit associated with creating a LAMIRD. **The Commission decided creation of a LAMIRD in this area does not meet the criteria.**

7:50:01 PM Ms. Knight handed out the following maps:

- A map of LAMIRDS 9 and 9b, with “x’s” indicating comments received from the property owners at the public hearing
- A map of LAMIRD 17 showing a proposed expansion to the east and south of the existing boundary
- A vicinity map of LAMIRD 51 with a proposed addition indicated by a “dashed blue line”
Ms. Knight provided a history of the Johnson Point shoreline LAMIRD #9 designated in December, and LAMIRD 9b identified in April based on water system data. The property owners are requesting the County join the two LAMIRDs, which will provide for an additional five infill lots. Staff reviewed the acreages of the parcels involved, and determined an additional lot would result from a boundary line adjustment by combining the 5.56 and 7.29 acre parcels. **The Commission decided to combine the two LAMIRDs into one, identified as LAMIRD #9.**

7:57:25 PM Staff reviewed LAMIRD 17 located off of Boston Harbor Road and 36th Avenue NE. The boundaries were drawn based on the build out in 1990. The parcel shown by an “x” consists of 4.63 acres, and is surrounded by lots that cannot be further subdivided. Staff’s proposal is to amend the boundary and include the lots that cannot be further subdivided. Discussion of the rationale for not including the parcels to the north and east of the “blue dotted line”, and the size of the lots followed. **Members decided to not adjust the initial LAMIRD boundary.**

8:03:00 PM Staff and members discussed LAMIRD 51 located on Waddell Creek Road. A property owner (marked with an “x”) within the suggested expanded boundaries has requested inclusion. The proposed boundary expansion results in the potential for three additional infill lots. Staff reviewed the parcel sizes and densities, and stated the “yellow line” indicates what was built out by 1990. Properties within the “dashed blue lines” were not developed by 1990, and that is why staff did not include the parcels initially. Current zoning in the study area is 1:2. **The Commission concurred to expand the boundary as suggested by staff, and as shown by the “blue dashed line.”**

8:10:33 PM Staff and members reviewed a map showing parcels located south of 81st Avenue, east of Interstate 5, and north of 93rd Avenue, in the vicinity of Littlerock Road. Ms. Knight noted the area in green is proposed for 1:20 zoning, and was initially part of a LAMIRD study area zoned 1:2. She noted it does not meet the 60% rule for 1:20 zoning. The proposal is to rezone the areas shown in “green” from 1:20 to 1:5. The areas shown in “blue” will remain at 1:2 zoning. Discussion ensued concerning high groundwater concerns, and current zoning of the urban growth area (UGA). Staff presented a “High Groundwater Hazard Areas and 300 Foot Buffer – Salmon Creek Basin” display map for review. Ms. Smith provided information related to agriculture and open space tracts, and the rural rezoning criteria related to 320- and 200-acre parcel “patches.” She emphasized the majority of the rezone study areas exceed 320 acres; however, staff did not use patch size criteria exclusively when refining the study areas. Dialogue related to zoning the northern sections 1:20 or 1:10 followed. Staff noted the areas shown in “yellow” are zoned 1:10. Mr. Sonnen suggested Commissioners consider the proposal as part of the rural rezoning project. **Members concurred.**

8:21:47 PM Ms. Knight distributed a map of the Carpenter Road and Hawks Prairie vicinity. A 29.32-acre parcel shown with an “x” does not meet the LAMIRD criteria. The property owner is requesting 1:2 zoning, or 1:5 zoning if 1:2 zoning is not possible. For the record, the parcel is proposed for 1:10 zoning because it’s within the Henderson Inlet Shellfish District, contains steep slopes, and matches the 60% rule for 1:10 zoning.
when combined with the surrounding area. The Commission decided to take up the issue as part of the rural rezone discussion.

8:23:14 PM Ms. Smith presented a rural rezone worksession schedule for tonight, and the next two meetings; i.e., September 6 and 13, 2006. She referred to a memorandum dated August 16, 2006 from the Agriculture Advisory Committee (AAC) that summarizes policy related issues, and a memorandum dated August 24, 2006 from staff that summarizes the “general” and “other” comments sections of the comment summary matrix. Ms. Smith briefed members concerning “general” comments that consist of the general concept of rezoning, compensation/equity/exemption issues including investigation of transfer of development rights/purchase of development rights and cluster development, grandfather-in current owners under existing zoning, exempt lands that were in the process of preparing for subdivision from the zoning changes, zoning district densities, and process issues such as examining each parcel individually. Ms. Smith noted legal counsel advised staff that neither the “grandfather-in” or “exempt lands” would satisfy the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB) mandate. The AAC is interested in a stronger right to farm ordinance, and developing farmland preservation programs. It was acknowledged that members and staff will discuss the AAC recommendations in further detail next week; however, that “right to farm ordinance” is outside the scope of the Planning Commission’s review.

Discussion ensued concerning the rationale for rezoning rural areas 1:20 and 1:10. Approximately 43% of the County is currently slated for rezoning. Staff distributed a document titled, “Approximate Percentage of Land Allocated for Rural Uses, based on July 11, 2006 Rural Lands map” for member perusal that indicates 31.67% of “rural lands” is proposed for 1:20 zoning. Members referred to a document attached to the August 24, 2006 memorandum from staff titled, “Other Counties’ Rural Zoning Densities and Policies” and reviewed the table. Some members expressed they are uncomfortable arbitrarily rezoning properties to 1:20 unless there are compelling reasons; the percentage of land allocated for rural uses is high, and there is not a reason to burden landowners; the WWGMHB did not provide a target number; perhaps 5-10% is a more reasonable goal for 1:20 or 1:10 zoning; lots will be taken off the market thereby driving up land costs, increasing assessed valuations, and raising property taxes that could drive people out of their homes; the County should keep the percentage as low as possible while still complying with the WWGMHB order; and that the study areas were just that – the most likely candidate areas requiring further evaluation by the Commission.

8:44:54 PM Commissioner Lyman suggested providing the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) with alternatives related to rezoning less of the rural lands, such as prioritizing the rural rezone criteria. Concerns and comments from members included that the options not single out parts of the south County, not abandon the criteria developed as part of the public process, not listening to those that spoke at the public hearing in support of the rezoning project, that the County is mandated to provide a variety of zoning districts and densities; and balance land use policies with private property rights. Commissioner Cole commented the study areas make sense, but the goal was to not rezone 100% of the study areas. Staff noted the Commission reviewed the
study areas and recommended refinements that reduced the study areas. Commissioner Nelson said he’d rather the WWGMHB come back to the County saying not enough of the rural lands were rezoned versus accepting a recommendation that rezones a significant portion of the County.

Ms. Smith conveyed staff could map options using well-defined alternative criteria identified by the Commission further limiting the study areas in time for the September 13, 2006 meeting. Commissioner Lyman stated issues that continue to come up concern environmentally constrained areas, areas where the groundwater aquifers are susceptible to development, and shellfish protection districts. Ms. Smith reviewed the top priorities identified by the public; i.e., unbuildable areas, rural character, volunteered lands, and aquifer recharge areas.

9:02:35 PM Ms. Smith provided members with an additional handout titled, “Public Comment Analysis: General Geographically-Specific Comments, Thurston County Planning Commission Public Hearing Draft Rural Lands Amendments – August 2006.” Commissioner Strub emphasized the Commission has made an extensive and exhaustive decision based on all the criteria that could be considered. It is not appropriate to step back and take a different direction. Further discussion of 1:20 versus 1:10 zoning, and using the list of criteria in a different way may reduce the percentage of rural lands proposed for rezone followed. Commissioner Strub added the Commission is about to review all of the testimony gathered at the public hearing that could result in reducing the scope of the study areas.

9:19:01 PM Ms. Smith said one option is to analyze and refine the study areas, and/or use additional criteria to further reduce the rezone proposal. It was anticipated the Commission would complete the rural rezone work by September 13, 2006. Commissioner Strub asked staff to bring the maps generated last spring to develop the study areas for further evaluation at the next meeting. Members generally agreed the top priority is water quality and aquifer recharge areas, and other factors to consider include unbuildable lands, and areas encumbered by critical areas such as steep slopes and geologic hazards.

9:28:27 PM Discussion ensued concerning the Commission’s meeting schedule, upcoming public hearings for the annual comprehensive plan amendments and rural rezone proposal, and the possibility of scheduling additional meetings. Mr. Sonnen noted the Commission should complete its rural rezone work no later than the end of September in order to have something for the public 20 days prior to the public hearing scheduled for October 30, 2006.

9:31:29 PM Commissioner Nelson requested staff provide members with a list of every criteria used when developing the study areas. Staff noted the criteria used to create the public hearing draft rural lands zoning map is attached as the last two pages to the August 24, 2006 memorandum. Related to how to proceed, Ms. Smith suggested revisiting each sub-watershed and review water quality issues, with the Commission determining whether or not to change the study areas. Commissioner Lyman conveyed the
Commission does not have the time it needs to delineate the study areas based on criteria it may suggest to the BoCC because its access to Geodata is limited owing to Geodata’s work schedule. Her assumption is the delineation would occur at the BoCC level, as the Commission will not have the time based the current deadline to complete the proposal.

9:36:29 PM Mr. Sonnen said members could discuss alternate recommendations for the BoCC to consider at the next meeting. Discussion ensued concerning the topics for consideration at the upcoming September meetings. Staff noted any change in the criteria will affect the comprehensive plan and zoning code amendments.

6. 9:45:08 PM CALENDAR

- September 6, 2006: B: Two open space applications; W/A Rural rezoning, LAMIRDS/AG (Meeting begins at 6:00 p.m.)
- September 13, 2006: Special meeting: Proposed rural rezoning and comprehensive plan ordinance language review (Meeting begins at 6:00 p.m.)
- September 20, 2006: H/W Comprehensive Plan Amendments (including Capital Facilities Plan)
- September 27 – Potential special meeting date

Commissioner Lyman asked staff to notify members concerning the earlier meeting times.

7. 9:46:20 PM STAFF UPDATES
Staff: John Sonnen

Mr. Sonnen reported Eagle Northwest will present its findings concerning an evaluation of Thurston Regional Planning Council’s methodology and assumptions concerning buildable lands and population forecasting on September 5, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., in Room 280.

8. 9:47:06 PM ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Commissioner Lyman adjourned the meeting at 9:47 p.m.

Liz Lyman, Acting Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services

Corrections made by Cami Petersen on October 10, 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>
<tr>
<td>6/22/05</td>
<td>Prepare a Countywide map to include all draft</td>
<td>J. Hayes</td>
<td>J. Hayes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
layers from the critical areas regulations in addition to other criteria to assist the Commission in its discussion.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

2/22/06 Commissioner Kohlenberg requested knowing how local species are defined and selected.

2/22/06 Staff to research public testimony regarding what is the BAS for expanding a list of rare and endangered species as outlined in the amendment.

2/22/06 Requested staff analysis of the impacts of gravel mining in riparian and management zones concerning important habitats.

2/22/06 Research with legal staff what the distinction...
is of agriculture occurring on designated agriculture resource lands and agriculture on other lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 Staff</td>
<td></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 Staff</td>
<td></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 Staff to add to 3/1/06 agenda</td>
<td></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 Staff</td>
<td></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 Staff</td>
<td></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 interest in receiving the meeting packet as much in advance of the April 19, 2006 meeting as possible.</td>
<td>Chair Roper Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>