1. **7:01:21 PM CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Roper called the November 1, 2006 special meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

**Attendance:** Chair Joyce Roper, Commissioners Tom Cole, Liz Kohlenberg, Liz Lyman, Bob Musser, Scott Nelson, Craig Ottavelli, and Rhenda Strub

**Excused:** Commissioner Chris Lane

**Staff:** John Sonnen, Katie Knight, Diana Smith, Celinda Adair, and Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren

**7:02:23 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Kohlenberg moved to approve the November 1, 2006 agenda. Commissioner Ottavelli seconded. Agenda approved.

2. **7:02:37 PM PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS** *(Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)*

There were no public communications.

3. **7:02:46 PM W/A: MONITORING OF OPEN SPACE APPLICATIONS**
   
   **Staff:** Katie Knight

   **ITEM:** Staff provided the Planning Commission with information about monitoring the Open Space Tax Program and what constitutes an ineligible application.

   **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Knight referred to a memorandum staff included in meeting packets that answers questions Commissioners posed at a prior meeting. The open space tax agreement requires owners to comply with conditions attached to the conservation or agriculture farm plan submitted with the application. The plans are binding. Commissioners suggested asking the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) to review the 64 properties to determine if owners are in compliance with the plans and whether other factors could deem lands ineligible to participate in the program.

   **7:06:07 PM Commissioner Strub arrived.**

   Discussion of the open space application fee increase from $260 to $2,360 followed. Mr. Sonnen said staff will brief the BoCC about actual recovery costs. Staff is currently evaluating opportunities to administratively streamline the program. The Commission
directed staff to draft a letter to the Board asking that it explore options, partner with the Assessor’s Office, and lower the current fee structure. Staff will present the draft letter to the Commission for review prior to sending it on to the Board.

4. **7:14:39 PM W: RURAL REZONING**  
   *Staff: Diana Smith, Celinda Adair*

   **ITEM:** Rural Rezoning Project: Complete review of site-specific public comments on public hearing draft zoning map. Review and make final changes to three rezoning options maps, which will be recommended to the Board of County Commissioners.

   **HANDOUTS:**
   - Revised theme booklets
   - Comments and map for comments RL21; RL22; RL23; T61
   - Comments and map for comments RL42;
   - Comments and map for comments RL160, T1; RL103, RL83, RL84, T22
   - Comments and map for comment RL24
   - Comparison of zoning densities: Option 1 compared to Options 2 and 3

   **DISCUSSION:** Staff and Commissioners reviewed a worksession agenda. The goal is to complete review of the site-specific comments, mapping changes to Options 1, 2 and 3, and discuss possible changes to the draft comprehensive plan and zoning code amendments based on public comments.

   Commissioners and staff discussed Theme 1 comments within the City of Rainier vicinity. Dialogue about placing Urban Reserve (UR) along the eastern boundary in place of Rural 1/20 (R1/20) zoning followed. Ms. Smith explained the initial boundary decision for UR; however, Rainier’s wellhead extends south. The critical aquifer recharge areas include wellhead protection areas. Staff provided a “Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas & McAlister Springs Geological Sensitive Area” display map. Ms. Smith explained if a parcel is partially encumbered by an aquifer sensitive area, the entire parcel was picked up. Conversation about the difference between R1/20 and UR zoning as they relate to the interim clustering regulations, Rainier’s identified wellhead protection area, future plans for sewer to serve Rainier, and a boundary for UR 1/20 zoning followed.

   **7:45:33 PM** The Commission agreed to leave the area in R1/20, including the 38.47-acre parcel.

   **7:45:59 PM** Commissioners discussed site-specific comment #RL42. Ms. Adair explained staff applied the 60% rule to the parcels between the river and the road. Only 41% of the parcels are 10 acres or greater. The Commission agreed to recommend 1/5 zoning for the parcels south of the river and north of the road.
7:49:38 PM Staff and Commissioners reviewed site-specific comment RL24. Photocopies of the maps Lacey submitted outlining the areas they would like zoned UR were attached to the theme packet. Ms. Smith reported much of the area consists of wetlands and is not proposed for UR zoning because of the environmental concerns. Ms. Adair pointed out the area shown in purple on the maps is already proposed to be designated UR. Discussion ensued about the smaller lots immediately west of the UR zoning designated Rural Protection 1/10 (RP1/10), concern about designating lands above critical aquifer recharge areas UR, zoning other parcels UR and removing the proposed UR zoning for parcels within the critical aquifer recharge areas, the accuracy of the “circles” (which are wellhead protection areas) reflected on the map, and not removing information from the map just because it is not precise. Ms. Smith said staff could prepare a larger scale map for the November 15, 2006 meeting that shows Lacey’s UR request in its entirety. A majority of the Commission indicated they would like staff to provide the additional mapping information prior to making a decision.

8:12:35 PM Commissioners reviewed site-specific comment RL160, the Michigan Hill area. Ms. Adair reported after using the 60% analysis, only 35% of the parcels within the area bordered by Michigan Hill and Lundeen Roads are 20 acres or greater. Discussion ensued about using the Chehalis River as a boundary for 1/10 zoning to the south and 1/20 zoning to the north. The Commission agreed to recommend 1/5 zoning for the area between the two roads, as well as for parcels between the Chehalis River and Lundeen Road, up to the point it meets Independence Road at the northwest point and generally bounded by the five-acre parcel to the east.

8:21:04 PM Ms. Adair reviewed Commission direction for Options 2 and 3, which was to double-check criteria layers for each independent parcel patch to ensure no mapping errors. The revised site-specific theme packet outlines the zoning criteria for Options 2 and 3.

8:23:36 PM Ms. Smith reported there are four potential mapping changes to Options 2 and 3:

- Showing the “Option to rezone to Parks, Trails, and Preserves” on the Option 1 map, and carrying it over to Options 2 and 3. The Commission directed staff to pull out and identify the parcels identified as “Option to rezone to Parks, Trails, and Preserves” on the Option 1 map and apply the “Parks, Trails, and Preserves” zoning designation to the affected parcels on Option 1, 2, and 3 maps.
- Correcting mapping of Fort Eaton Monument and, if appropriate, rezoning the parcel incorrectly identified as Fort Eaton on the currently adopted Zoning Map and Important Greenspaces Map. Ms. Smith explained the Fort Eaton Monument has been identified as a large parcel on the Important Greenspaces Map. However, Fort Eaton is actually a less than 1-acre parcel. The Commission directed staff to correct the mapping error on all three option maps.
- Proposing rezoning McLane Creek Nature Trail to a lower density or “Parks, Trails, and Preserves.” The Commission directed staff to apply the “Parks,
Trails, and Preserves” zoning for the McLane Creek Nature Trail on all three option maps.

- **8:31:52 PM** Proposing rezoning of other Evergreen State College (TESC) lands that are not currently proposed for rezoning on Options 2 and 3. Ms. Smith reported TESC lands were pulled in to Option 1 and proposed for rezoning at 1/10. TESC parcels are not proposed for rezoning on Options 2 and 3. Currently, the lands are zoned 1/5. An option is to apply the Rural 1/10 zone to the parcels for Option 2. Some of the properties are currently proposed for 1/20 zoning for Option 2. Commissioners and staff discussed the options. Approximately half of the properties contain aquifers. Commissioners agreed to apply 1/20 zoning over the aquifer areas and apply 1/10 zoning for the remaining parcels for Options 1 and 2. For Option 3 the aquifer areas are zoned 1/10, with 1/5 zoning on the other TESC parcels.

- **8:40:01 PM** Ms. Adair referred to a comparison of zoning densities display map. She explained what the different colors on the comparison map represent. Ms. Adair reviewed the data contained in handout #5, “Comparison of Zoning Densities: Option 1 compared to Options 2 and 3.” Commissioners discussed whether 1/10 zoning is the appropriate density to protect critical aquifer recharge areas for Option 1, agricultural uses on aquifer lands, difficulties associated with manure application, and other variables that could lead to elevated nitrate levels. Ms. Smith said that in Options 1 and 2 the Commission has two options that take two different looks at the issues. A majority of the Commission expressed a preference for applying 1/10 zoning for aquifer recharge areas.

Discussion ensued about reaching consensus for rural character, proposed zoning for the Salmon Creek basin, Nisqually bluff, and the Black River corridor, and whether rural character should be defined as 1/10 or 1/20. Ms. Smith said changes to the criteria being discussed by Commissioners will require significant changes to the mapping and comprehensive plan and zoning code proposals. Discussion of combining Option 1 and 2 maps followed, such as bringing some of the 1/20 zoning down to 1/10, and what constitutes “rural” density. Chair Roper suggested proposing 1/20 zoning for properties identified as cumulative impact areas on Option 2, with aquifers and rural character zoned 1/10. Commissioners conveyed the same could be done with Option 3.

- **9:15:39 PM** Ms. Smith said staff has developed comprehensive plan and zoning code amendments based on the three options. The Commission doesn’t have to combine them into two. Some Commissioners expressed an interest to forward two very distinct options to the Board. Ms. Smith reviewed the major differences between Options 1 and 2. Discussion followed about incorporating a 1/20 zone on Option 2 as a buffer between long-term forestry, agriculture, and mining. Ms. Smith noted a substantial difference between Options 1 and 2 is the absence of UR in Option 2. Ms. Adair said staff could cull Option 1 by removing rural character or 1/20 zoning for parcels less than 20 acres, or parcel patches less than 40 acres.

- **9:30:15 PM** Ms. Smith summarized the Commission’s suggestions to change the options to make Options 1 and 2 more consistent with one another. Additional discussion about single parcels less than 20 acres and parcel patches less than 40 acres, which represents a
3% difference between Options 1 and 2, followed. Commissioners directed staff to cull the rural character layer in Option 1 to remove single parcels less than 20 acres and parcel patches less than 40 acres.

9:48:08 PM The Commission agreed to apply resource land buffers, zoned 1/20, to Option 2; to, in Option 1, only rezone the portions of Green Cove basin rezoned in Option 2; and to rezone Black River Corridor and Salmon Creek basin 1/20 in Option 1.

5. 9:50:50 PM CALENDAR
- November 8, 2006: CANCELLED
- November 15, 2006: W: Rural Rezoning – Comprehensive Plan (Commissioners Ottavelli and Lyman unable to attend)
- November 29, 2006: W/A: Rural Rezoning – Zoning Code (Commissioner Strub attending another event)

Commissioner Strub reported Thurston Regional Planning Council is hosting a special event on November 29, 2006 about the impact of growth.

9:55:03 PM Ms. Adair distributed a “Number of Acres of Habitat Encompassed in the Option” matrix document.

6. 9:49:45 PM STAFF UPDATES

Staff: John Sonnen

Staff will provide the Commission with a transmittal letter for the comprehensive plan amendments on November 3, 2006. The Commission needs to turn it around by Friday, November 10, 2006. The Board briefing for the rural rezoning project has been changed from December 19 to December 20, 2006 at 3:00 p.m. The date for the comprehensive plan briefing has not changed.

7. 9:55:23 PM ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Roper adjourned the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

Joyce Roper, Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services
Corrections made 11-28-06 by Cami Petersen.
<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</td>
<td>Chair Kohlenberg</td>
<td>Advanced Planning Staff/N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comprehensive maps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pritchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/05</td>
<td>Commissioner Cole has concerns for citizens and how they can find out if</td>
<td>Commissioner Cole</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there are impediments as to what can be done with a piece of property</td>
<td></td>
<td></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”</td>
<td>Commissioner Lyman</td>
<td>N. Pritchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who refuse to work in Edgewood because they claimed their liability insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>carrier would not allow them to issue a letter or report without the hold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>harmless clause.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/05</td>
<td>Third Party Review report should include questions that should be addressed,</td>
<td>Chair Kohlenberg</td>
<td>N. Pritchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such as how much additional stormwater will be introduced into the slopes by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the proposed development. Chair Kohlenberg agreed to work with staff and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draft some questions to include as part of the report requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/05</td>
<td>Obtain a more definitive answer about whether gravel resources are used from</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>J. Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the mine in recycling operations.</td>
<td></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. 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 the document is organized and then test the response to see if the person can work through and understand the document. The Staff J. Sonnen
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 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 Commissioner Lyman Commission

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

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 Commission Staff

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

2/22/06 Research with legal staff what the distinction Commission Legal Staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</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>
</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, 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, 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>