1. **7:00:49 PM CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Roper called the October 25, 2006 regular meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

**Attendance:** Chair Joyce Roper, Commissioners Tom Cole, Chris Lane, Liz Kohlenberg, Scott Nelson, Liz Lyman, Craig Ottavelli, and Bob Musser.
**Absent:** Commissioner Rhenda Strub
**Staff:** John Sonnen, Diana Smith, Celinda Adair, and Recording Secretary Jessica Tate.

2. **7:00:38 PM PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS** (*Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.*)
There were no public communications.

3. **7:00:48 PM APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
**MOTION:** Commissioner Lyman moved to approve the September 6, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Commissioner Ottavelli seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** The following changes were requested to the September 6, 2006 minutes:
- Substitute the word “was” under Public Communications on page 1 with “were”
- Delete “(e.g.” at the end of the Option 3 paragraph at the bottom of page 2
- The meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m. rather than 9:37 p.m. as shown on page 3
**Motion carried as amended.**

**7:02:56 PM MOTION:** Commissioner Cole moved to accept the September 13, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Commissioner Lyman seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** The following change was requested to the September 13, 2006 minutes:
- Within the next to the last paragraph on page 3, within the third line, change “refinemed” to “refined”
**Motion carried as amended. Commissioner Ottavelli abstained.**
7:04:12 PM MOTION: Commissioner Lyman moved to accept the September 20, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Commissioner Ottavelli seconded. Motion carried.

7:05:57 PM MOTION: Commissioner Lyman moved to accept the September 27, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Commissioner Ottavelli seconded.

DISCUSSION: The following change was requested to the September 27, 2006 minutes:
- At the end of the third paragraph from the bottom of page 3, delete “(Cami – I don’t know what time this was)”
Motion carried as amended.

7:07:08 PM MOTION: Commissioner Lyman moved to accept the October 11, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recording. Commissioner Cole seconded. Motion carried.

4. 7:07:56 PM W: Rural Rezoning
Staff: Diana Smith, Celinda Adair

ITEM: Rural Rezoning Project: Review site-specific public comments on public hearing draft zoning map (first of two meetings). Discuss site-specific comments that raise additional questions/issues. Approve format for writing draft proposed comprehensive plan and zoning code amendments for Options 2 and 3. Decide how to proceed with possible additional option using critical areas-based zoning

HANDBOUTS:
- Another version of the site-specific comments printed using a larger font with staff comments

Ms. Smith reviewed the site-specific comment themes, and the process staff used to analyze the comments.

Commissioner Lane left the meeting at 7:11 p.m. due to a family emergency.

Staff has reviewed the site-specific comment to determine whether specific parcels meet the existing criteria for proposed rezoning. Ms. Smith reviewed the criteria used to create the three rural rezoning draft options:
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- Option 1: TCPC Public Hearing Draft Zoning Map
- Option 2: Aquifer, Cumulative Impact & Rural Character Areas
- Option 3: Aquifer, Cumulative Impact & Multiple Benefits Areas

Commissioner Kohlenberg arrived at 7:16 p.m.

Ms. Smith reviewed the Rainier City Council’s request for urban reserve zoning, its rationale for the proposal, and how the request relates to the draft options. Members talked about an appropriate buffer width between long-term forestry and the urban growth area (UGA). It was noted that the Rainier urban reserve zoning proposal abuts long-term agriculture and is partially encumbered by a sensitive aquifer area.

7:30:26 PM Ms. Adair stated that staff had reviewed site-specific comments as per the Planning Commission’s direction and highlighted site-specific comments for parcels that do not meet the criteria or raise questions about additional refinement of options 1, 2 and/or 3. Discussion ensued about how to proceed with considering the site-specific comments that raise questions about additional refinements. Discussion also ensued about the Commission as a whole analyzing comments for and moving each option forward even if all members who initially advocated for a particular option are not in attendance.

Members decided to review the “donut hole” (“Swiss cheese”) parcels first. Ms. Smith conveyed properties within Green Cove and Salmon Creek Basins were retained in option 1 regardless of parcel size and other issues. Making a change at this point is a departure from the policy choice. Discussion followed about how staff applied the 60% rule. Ms. Smith stated the 60% rule was applied to discreet areas where staff and/or the Planning Commission could draw logical zoning boundaries (e.g., areas bounded by streets, bodies of water, other zoning districts). The Commission asked staff to look at the composition of the site-specific areas, apply the 60% rule, and bring the results back to the Commission. Ms. Adair explained staff did break blocks of parcels down and applied sizes to determine if there were small parcel blocks. These have been highlighted. Dialogue followed about equity issues related to down zoning the larger tracts of land versus parcels that are already developed, water rights, and limited groundwater areas.

Regarding comment RL24, the City of Lacey requested that an area that includes the parcels discussed in the comment letter be zoned Urban Reserve 1:20. Discussion of wellheads in the area followed. Members expressed interest in revisiting Lacey’s request. Staff conveyed it would bring information about the Planning Commission’s decision regarding the Lacey urban reserve request and critical areas to the next meeting.

8:32:41 PM Ms. Adair summarized additional criteria identified by Commissioners, and options for the comments members have talked about. Discussion followed concerning “nearest neighborhood analysis” used in for refining of the options maps.
8:41:21 PM Chair Roper asked members by a show of hands who would leave comment RL108 alone. Five Commissioners raised their hands.

8:42:04 PM Commissioners and staff considered comment RL21. Commissioner Ottavelli proposed to either leave the zoning at 1:20 in option 1, or consider including the large parcels to the east of Rainier, and working north up through the area in question in Urban Reserve 1:20 rather than the proposed 1:20 zoning, but not including the aquifer recharge or critical areas. Commissioners concurred with the proposal.

8:45:11 PM Dialogue followed concerning comment RL50 and whether to remove small parcels within the Green Cove Basin. Ms. Smith conveyed members could point out in the letter it forwards to the BoCC that Green Cove Basin in option 1 contains many small parcels the Board may want to look at. The letter could also outline the Commission’s logic for not including Green Cove Basin in options 2 and 3.

8:52:49 PM Concerning RL160 and RL03/RL83, staff will run the 60% rule and present the results at the next meeting.

8:53:33 PM The Commission decided to apply 1:10 zoning for the Weyerhaeuser ownership as outlined in comment RL86.

8:53:51 PM Concerning comment RL95 (Grand Mound), members determined that 1:5 zoning is appropriate for the two parcels north of the road that are less than 20 acres.

8:54:33 PM For comment RL42, staff will apply the 60% rule for all of the small parcels between the river and the road and bring the results back to the Commission. Staff will also provide additional critical area information.

8:56:53 PM Staff will provide the Commission with more information concerning comment RL24, which is the City of Lacey’s request members previously discussed.

8:57:27 PM Members decided to not make any changes related to comment RL108.

8:57:49 PM A majority of the members decided to leave the smaller parcels alone as shown on options 2 and 3. Discussion ensued about identifying parcels proposed for a lower density in options 2 or 3 compared to option 1.

9:03:11 PM Ms. Smith and members engaged in a comprehensive plan and zoning code discussion. Staff will present additional information to members at the next meeting about the testimony taken at the hearings concerning the option 1 comprehensive plan and zoning code. Regarding options 2 and 3, staff will create new draft comprehensive plan and zoning code sections. Staff proposes 1:10 and 1:20 zoning districts that are similar to option 1. The purposes for options 2 and 3 will be different, however.
Ms. Smith and members discussed the upcoming meeting schedule and agenda topics. Because of difficulties associated with adequate time for legal counsel to review draft comprehensive plan and zoning code amendments, staff proposes to cancel the November 8, 2006 meeting and schedule a special meeting for November 29, 2006.

Conversation about when the Commission will receive a draft of the letter to the BoCC regarding the comprehensive plan amendments followed. Mr. Sonnen indicated he will follow up. Mr. Sonnen noted the Board briefing on the comprehensive plan is scheduled for November 21, 2006 at 2:00 p.m. and the hearing is scheduled for November 27, 2006.

Ms. Smith presented staff’s research of what’s involved in analyzing Don Krupp’s proposal. The proposal is to retain 1/5 zoning throughout rural portions of the County and require calculations for subdivision to be based on net lot size. Net lot size is number of acres unencumbered by critical areas and buffers. Ms. Smith stated if the Commission wants to explore Mr. Krupp’s proposal, it will have to be at the expense of one of the other options. A suggestion is the Commission could convey to the Board it sees value in exploring Mr. Krupp’s suggestion, but it does not have the time available to pursue it. Conversation ensued about considering the net density proposal as part of the Commission’s upcoming work on critical areas, that an analysis based upon current critical areas regulations might be fruitless, and additional matters to consider. Four of the members expressed an interest to move ahead, and direct TRPC to conduct the analysis based on both the current and proposed critical areas regulations.

**5. 9:08:55 PM CALENDAR**

- November 1, 2006: W: Rural Rezoning
- November 8, 2006: W: Rural Rezoning - CANCELLED
- November 15, 2006: W: Rural Rezoning (Commissioners Ottavelli and Lyman unable to attend)
- November 29, 2006: Special Meeting tentatively to begin at 6:00 p.m. (Commissioner Cole’s attendance tentative)

**6. 9:04:50 PM Staff Updates**

*Staff: John Sonnen*

The Court of Appeals set a date for oral arguments on November 27, 2006. The earliest the County will receive a decision is three months after the oral arguments date. The BoCC decided not to go forward with a public hearing for LAMIRDs, and it wants to defer all action on the GMA compliance work to after the first of the year. The briefing date to hear the Planning Commission’s proposals was changed from November 22, 2006 to December 19, 2006 from 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
7. **9:39:34 PM ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair Roper adjourned the meeting at 9:39 p.m.

________________________  
Joyce Roper, Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services

*Corrections made by Cami Petersen on January 12, 2007*
<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

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

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

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

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

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>Description</th>
<th>Signatures</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 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 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 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 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 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 Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Requested staff analysis of the impacts of gravel mining in riparian and management.</td>
<td>Commission Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Staff</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>