1. **6:01:04 PM CALL TO ORDER**
   Chair Roper called the September 6, 2006 regular meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 6:01 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

   **Attendance:** Chair Joyce Roper Commissioners, Liz Kohlenberg, Liz Lyman, Bob Musser, Chris Lane, Scott Nelson, Rhenda Strub, Tom Cole (7:03:09 PM) and Craig Ottavelli.

   **Staff:** John Sonnen, Katie Knight, Diana Smith, Nancy Pritchett and Jessica Tate, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services.

2. **6:01:19 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
   **MOTION:** Commissioner Kohlenberg moved to approve the September 6, 2006 agenda. Commissioner Lane seconded. Agenda approved.

3. **6:01:37 PM PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS** (Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)
   There were no public communications.

4. **6:02:11 PM Briefing: Three Open Space Application**
   **Staff:** Katie Knight

   **ITEM:** Staff presented three open space application proposals to the Planning Commission, recommending a public hearing be set for all three applications for October 4, 2006.

   **DISCUSSION:** Staff explained to the commissioners that the copies of the Open Space applications that were mailed to them were missing pages. Staff explained the portions of the applications that were omitted in their copies.

   The Planning Commission indicated that they would like staff to be able to monitor the Open Space Program. Staff stated that they could forward a formal recommendation to the Board. It was requested that a formal action item be placed on the October 4, 2006 meeting agenda to discuss the details of this formal recommendation.

   The Planning Commission asked questions of staff concerning the open space applications before them.
Commissioner Ottavelli moved to set a public hearing on October 4, 2006 for three Open Space applications. Commissioner Kohlenberg seconded. Motion carried.

5. Worksession: Rural Lands: LAMIRDs, Rural Rezone, Ag
   Staff: Diana Smith, Katie Knight, Nancy Pritchett

   ITEM: Review geographically specific comment received at the Rural Lands Public Hearing on August 3, 2006 regarding LAMIRDs.

   DISCUSSION: The Planning Commission and staff discussed the public comments received for consideration of removal of the study areas for the following:

   - South portion of Rochester, located in Rochester Water Association – The Planning Commission agreed that they do not have enough information to consider making this proposed change. The Planning Commission majority agreed to not adjust the LAMIRD boundaries as requested.
   - Review of public comments – Commissioners discussed the option of discussing each comment received. It was agreed that the Planning Commission are comfortable with staff’s review of the comments, and staff’s judgment as to which comments should be brought to the commissioners for specific discussion.

6:49:40 PM ITEM: Long-term Agriculture designation policies: Review public comments regarding Long-Term Agriculture lands from rural lands public hearing and determine any changes to the public hearing draft amendments.
   Staff: Diana Smith, John Sonnen

   Handouts:
   - Thurston County Planning Commission: Rural Rezoning Worksession Schedule Draft – September 8th.

   DISCUSSION: Staff provided two handouts to the Planning Commission which includes three proposed options, and the timelines for each option, for the commission to consider:

   - Option 1: Refine Planning Commission public hearing draft zoning changes by using geographically-specific refinement criteria
   - Option 2: Refine Planning Commission public hearing draft zoning changes by removing one or more set of criteria that were used to create the rezone study area
   - Option 3: Refine Planning Commission public hearing draft zoning changes by removing or altering components of the criteria that were used to create the rezone study area

7:03:09 PM Commissioner Tom Cole arrived.
The Planning Commission discussed all three options. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission move forward with Option 1, whether or not additional criteria or alternatives are added. The Planning Commission prioritized each option category and added additional suggestions to be considered.

PARKING LOT ITEM: Nuisance complaints, subdivision and preservation of farm lands.

The Planning Commission agreed to research Option 1 and the priority criteria and bring their ideas to the next meeting for discussion.

6. **9:40:22 PM CALENDAR**
   - September 13 – Beginning at 6:00 p.m. *All Commissioners will be present*
   - September 20 – Special meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m. *Commissioner Cole will be absent*
   - September 27 – Special meeting *All Commissioners will be present*

7. **9:40:44 PM STAFF UPDATES**
   **Staff: John Sonnen**

   **ITEM:** Mr. Sonnen updated the Planning Commission on the Board of Commissioners discussion on Monday concerning Eco NW’s evaluation of TRPC’s Buildable lands methodology and population forecast. We are also expecting to hear from supreme court soon concerning the appeal decision. Mr. Sonnen will email the Planning Commission as soon as the decision is made.

8. **9:42:57 PM ADJOURNMENT**

   There being no further business, Chair Roper adjourned the meeting at 9:43 p.m.

   ![Signature]
   Chair Joyce Roper

   *Corrections made by Cami Petersen, November 1, 2006*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF REQUEST</th>
<th>ISSUE/REQUEST</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/05</td>
<td>TCPC participate in the CFP process or comments</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/05</td>
<td>Prepare a Countywide map to include all draft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 the distinction Commission Staff/D arrogant
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>Responsible Party</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</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>