1. **7:01:35 PM CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Roper called the September 27, 2006 special meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to at 7:01 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

**Attendance:** Chair Joyce Roper, Commissioners Tom Cole, Liz Kohlenberg (8:25 p.m.), Chris Lane, Liz Lyman, Bob Musser, Scott Nelson, and Craig Ottavelli.
**Excused:** Commissioner Rhenda Strub.
**Staff:** John Sonnen, Nancy Pritchett, Diana Smith, Celinda Adair, and Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services.

2. **7:02:04 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
**MOTION:** Commissioner Cole moved to approve the September 27, 2006 agenda. Commissioner Lyman seconded. It was noted that the September 6, 2006 minutes should be referenced under Approval of Minutes rather than “Correction to July 6, 2006 Minutes.” Agenda approved as amended.

3. **7:02:49 PM PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS (Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)**
There were no public communications.

4. **7:02:58 PM APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
**MOTION:** Commissioner Cole moved to accept the September 6, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Commissioner Lane seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** Commissioners agreed to defer approval of the September 6, 2006 minutes to the next meeting to afford all members an opportunity to review the minutes. The motion to accept was withdrawn.

5. **7:04:44 PM WORKSESSION: LAMIRDS and Rural Rezoning**
**Staff:** Nancy Pritchett, Diana Smith

**ITEM:** Discuss zoning for those areas on the PC public hearing draft zoning map that do not qualify for LAMIRD designation and were proposed to be rezoned to 1/10 or 1/20 under rural rezoning. Because the 1/10 and 1/20 zoning will not be adopted at the same time that LAMIRDS are adopted, an interim zoning needs to be established for these areas until rural rezoning is completed.
DISCUSSION: Staff reviewed a September 21, 2006 memorandum suggesting options for the Commission to consider on how to handle properties that are currently zoned at higher densities but are not proposed for designation as Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDs). A display map showing areas currently proposed for rezoning from a higher density district to one of the 1/10 or 1/20 zoning districts, and the Commission’s public hearing draft display map were available for review. The options for discussion included:

- The Commission can recommend rezoning all high-density areas not designated as LAMIRDS to RRR 1/5.
- The areas that are currently proposed to be rezoned from a high density district to 1/10 or 1/20 could be rezoned to an interim zoning such as RRR 1/5, but remain in the moratorium until final zoning is adopted for them. The areas cannot retain the current high-density zoning if not designated as LAMIRDS.

Ms. Pritchett and members discussed the options.

7:27:33 PM MOTION: Commissioner Lyman moved to maintain the current zoning in the interim that were formerly recommended for repeal, and keep the areas currently zoned at those densities but do not qualify for LAMIRDS, and maintain the moratorium on those areas that are also in the rural rezone study areas until the Commission resolves the rural rezone project. Commissioner Ottavelli seconded the motion. The motion carried.

ITEM: Rural Rezoning Project: Determine what options maps the Planning Commission will continue to take through the mapping refinement process to create draft zoning maps to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners. Determine basic criteria for zoning densities for options.

7:24:34 PM Ms. Smith reviewed an agenda for discussing the rural rezoning component.

HANDOUTS:
- Decision Tree Flow Chart
- A two-page matrix summary of Maps 1 through 5 including percentage and acreage data for each map layer
- Geographically-specific refinement criteria

7:29:23 PM Ms. Smith provided an overview of the Decision Tree document outlining the decisions necessary for each meeting so the Commission can recommend a proposal(s) to the BoCC by November 15, 2006. Decision points include (Option 2) option map to send forward to have geographically-specific refinement criteria applied to it, (Option 2) geographically specific refinement criteria to apply to option map, and (Option 2) criteria (locational guidelines) to use to apply zoning districts to option map.
Ms. Adair reviewed the display maps the Commission requested at its last meeting and individual map statistics:

- Map 1: Aquifer Recharge/Sensitive Areas, Cumulative Impact Areas, and Rural Character Areas (parcels 20+ acres if only in rural character areas) within the TCPC Public Hearing Boundary; with parcels 160 acres or greater in size outlined.
- Map 2: Aquifer Recharge/Sensitive Areas and Cumulative Impact Areas within the TCPC Public Hearing Boundary; with parcels 160 acres or greater in size outlined.
- Map 3: Aquifer Recharge/Sensitive Areas, Cumulative Impact Areas, and 100% Unbuildable Lands within the TCPC Public Hearing Boundary; with parcels 160 acres or greater in size outlined.
- Map 5: Rural Character Areas within the TCPC Public Hearing Boundary; with parcels 160 acres or greater in size outlined.

Chair Roper recessed the meeting from 7:40 p.m. to 7:49 p.m. to review the display maps.

**7:48:57 PM** Staff and members discussed a new “option 2” map to take through the refinement process. Ms. Smith pointed out that the Black River corridor is not reflected on any of the maps, nor parcels encumbered by government or non-profit easement ownership. Mr. Sonnen shared information about an earlier conversation he had with Commissioner Lyman about Green Cove. Members shared their individual ideas for new “option 2” maps. Mr. Sonnen reviewed a proposal suggested by Mr. Krupp, which is to retain 1/5 zoning throughout rural portions of the County and require a net lot size of five acres unencumbered by critical areas.

*Commissioner Kohlenberg arrived.*

**8:30:09 PM** Two Commissioners favored exploring the proposal. Four Commissioners opposed further review of the proposal. Commissioners asked staff to investigate what’s involved with Mr. Krupp’s proposal and provide information at the October 11, 2006 meeting. Staff later stated that, given the Planning Commission’s other information and analysis requests for the October 11, 2006 meeting, and the less time-sensitive nature of the research needed for Mr. Krupp’s proposal, the information regarding Mr. Krupp’s proposal would have to be provided at a later date.

**8:36:32 PM** Ms. Smith recapped the two new map options (called “option 2” and “option 3”, plus option 1 – the Planning Commission public hearing draft map, to take through the refinement process.

**8:43:27 PM** Ms. Smith and Commissioners discussed the geographically specific criteria bullet points outlined in the handout.

**8:54:38 PM** Five Commissioners favored removal of Green Cove from cumulative impact areas (options 2 and 3 maps): Two Commissioners abstained from offering an
opinion while one Commissioner favored retaining Green Cove.

8:56:22 PM Discussion ensued about the option of using a parcel patch size criteria to limit zoning districts. Commissioners agreed to request another map using a 40-acre parcel size for the rural character only (option 2), along with percentage and acreage data.

9:18:12 PM Ms. Adair recapped the additional mapping refinements requested by the Commission, and verified the Commissioners direction to add the Black River Corridor to Cumulative Impact Areas. Staff will present the maps and zoning district proposals at the October 11, 2006 meeting.

6. 9:27:39 PM CALENDAR (TENTATIVE) AND ATTENDANCE

- October 11, 2006: W/A Comprehensive Plan, H/A: Open Space Applications, W: Rural Rezoning (Commissioner Cole not sure he's available)
- October 18, 2006: W: Rural Rezoning (Chair Roper is available)
- November 1, 2006: W: Rural Rezoning

7. 9:28:22 PM STAFF UPDATES

Staff: John Sonnen

Members and staff discussed the importance of speakers properly identifying themselves as well as their respective company or other organization they are representing during meetings.

8. 9:32:13 PM ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Roper adjourned the meeting at 9:32 p.m.

Chair Joyce Roper

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services

Corrections made by Cami Petersen, November 1, 2006
<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 J. Hayes</td>
<td></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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Requestor Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 Strub</td>
<td>J. Sonnen</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 receive additional legal support.</td>
<td>Commissioners</td>
<td>Commission Lyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/05</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff/Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<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 Lyman</td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Commissioner Kohlenberg requested knowing how local species are defined and selected</td>
<td>Commissioner Kohlenberg</td>
<td>Staff</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</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Legal Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</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>
</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>
</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 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 Staff</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>