1. **6:03:58 PM CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Roper called the December 20, 2006 regular meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 6:04 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

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

**Excused:** Commissioner Rhenda Strub

**Staff:** John Sonnen, Diana Smith, Celinda Adair, Cinde Donoghue, and Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren

**6:04:27 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Cole moved to approve the December 20, 2006 agenda. Commissioner Lane seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** The Commission deferred approval of the November 15, 2006 minutes and acceptance of the audio to the next meeting.

**Agenda approved as amended.**

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

**6:06:29 PM Commissioner Kohlenberg arrived.**

3. **6:06:38 PM W: RURAL REZONE**

**Staff:** Diana Smith, Celinda Adair

**ITEM:** Rural Rezoning Project: Review maps and draft Zoning Code amendments for Options 1, 2, and 3. Finalize mapping changes for Lacey urban reserve (Option 1 map). Discuss contents of transmittal letter to Board of County Commissioners.

**HANDOUTS:**
- Contents of Rural Rezoning Draft Options for Planning Commission Worksession December 20, 2006 document
- Number of Acres and Estimated % of Rural Lands Per Zone table
DISCUSSION: Ms. Smith reviewed the discussion agenda of reviewing and revising draft zoning code amendments for Options 1, 2, and 3; completing the consideration of revisions to Lacey urban reserve; and recommending the rural rezoning proposals to the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC).

6:08:57 PM Ms. Adair reviewed three TCPC Rural Rezoning Options 1, 2, and 3 draft 12/20/06 display maps and changes since the last presentation. For Option 1, the current 1-2% margin of error will be corrected prior to forwarding the map to the BoCC. A mapping mistake involves the Nisqually Bluff. It is shown as 1/20 and should have remained 1/10. For each option, staff discussed the total number of acres proposed for rezoning and the total estimated percentage rezoned for each option.

6:12:47 PM Ms. Adair noted the yellow shown on the legend for the Option 2 map should be Rural 1/10 and not Rural Protection.

6:16:00 PM Chair Roper recessed the meeting from 6:16 p.m. to 6:22 p.m. to review the three display maps.

6:22:49 PM Ms. Adair and Commissioners discussed the total number of acres and total estimated percentage of lands rezoned under each of the options.

Commissioner Ottavelli left the meeting at 6:24 pm

6:24:31 PM Ms. Smith and Commissioners reviewed “Draft Zoning Code Amendments: Rural Rezoning Options 1, 2, and 3.”

Commissioners and staff discussed item #4 under Primary Uses on page 2 of Option 1 for the proposed new Rural Protection (1/10) District. One issue is the threshold or controls that should apply to the type of research permitted. Natural resources include mining. Mr. Sonnen said absent any limitation, research that is consistent with the primary use is authorized. Concerns addressed included research not inconsistent with preserving rural protection that is non-intrusive and not disruptive, and is consistent and legitimate with the purpose statement. Developing criteria or thresholds about the amount of material or establishing a parcel size was discussed and what triggers the critical areas ordinance (CAO) or State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review.

6:36:05 PM Commissioners discussed revising item #4 to read similar to, “Research limited to non-intrusive and non-contaminating to the land, and subject to County approval consistent with the purposes of this chapter.” Mr. Sonnen said staff will draft wording and present it to legal counsel for review. Staff will provide the revised language to the Commission prior to forwarding it to the BoCC.

6:39:08 PM Discussion ensued about the definition for “recreation, passive.” Commissioner Kohlenberg suggested the definition read similar to, “Passive recreation means low intensity recreation activities that are minimally disruptive to the natural environment.”
Ms. Smith referred to item #6 on page 2. In response to concerns about ensuring parcels are not released from any of the special requirements of the McAllister Geologically Sensitive Area (MGSA) zoning district and including limits on special uses, staff reviewed two zoning options as follows:

- **Option 1A:** Converting the MGSA zoning district to an MGSA overlay zone. All parcels would be zoned at the appropriate density. The overlay ensures that all affected properties are subject to existing restrictions for the underlying zone designation. Staff prefers this option based on elegance and ease of administration.

- **Option 1B:** Zoning all parcels at the appropriate density. Text from the MGSA District would be added to the new zoning districts. In addition, a footnote would be added to the special uses table in order to limit special uses for all parcels within the MGSA to those allowed in the MGSA District.

The Commission concurred with staff and preferred the Option 1A approach. Commissioners reviewed the MGSA overlay district language beginning on page 29. Discussion ensued on Section 20.23.027, “Family member unit” and whether some of the language shown in strikethrough, such as, removal of the unit when the family member no longer occupies the family member unit is included elsewhere in the code. Ms. Smith replied that the language is included in the 1/10, 1/20, and 1/5 underlying zoning districts. Discussion followed about whether additional housing units are allowed for agriculture workers. The Commission retained the revised first sentence under family member unit stating, “Family member units may be located on lots within the overlay zone on a minimum lot size eligible for placement of a family member unit, which is one acre.”

Commissioners discussed the special design standards proposed for the MGSA overlay zone. The Commission deleted design standard items 1 through 5 and retained items #6 and #7. Additionally, Commissioners changed the section heading from “design standards” to “impervious surface and open space.”

Chair Roper referred to section 20.23.040, “Additional regulations” on page 32 and asked whether the additional regulations trump those provided within the overlay zone. Commissioners struck the language under “Additional regulations” and replaced it with, “Where these regulations conflict, the more restrictive shall apply.”

Concerning “Accessory uses” on page 3, Chair Roper asked if comments submitted by the Agriculture Committee were incorporated into the draft regulations. Ms. Smith indicated they were not included because of time constraints. Staff recommends considering the input at a later time for all the zoning districts. Mr. Sonnen conveyed that staff should add a note under “Additional regulations” on page 9 referring to the MGSA overlay.
7:10:54 PM Ms. Smith noted Option 1B will be deleted from the “Special uses” section on page 3.

7:12:25 PM Discussion followed about impervious surface coverage limits for new development. Ms. Smith noted the County’s Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual regulations also apply. Commissioners expressed concerns about the lack of a coverage limit proposed for lots less than five acres in size, for properties that contain A or B soils, or for other large lot subdivisions and new construction. Mr. Sonnen said staff could pull in the Green Cove impervious surface thresholds for C and D soils. There is a current limit of 60% for “coverage by structures” in rural residential districts.

Commissioner Ottavelli rejoined the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

Mr. Sonnen said if the Commission wants to restrict the amount of impervious surface to maintain rural character in the residential context, 60% is a reasonable threshold. The Commission agreed a 60% impervious surface coverage threshold for A and B soils is appropriate and a 45% threshold for parcels less than five acres with C and D soils is reasonable.

7:30:51 PM Staff presented the proposed new Rural 1/20 and Urban Reserve 1/20 code changes. Staff will make the same changes the Commission directed for the RP 1/10 zone as appropriate. Ms. Smith said the “future development plans” section on page 21 was derived from an older draft that went to public hearing with some minor changes to clarify the language.

Ms. Smith reviewed the changes to the Rural Residential/Resource—One Dwelling Unit per Five Acres (RRR1/5) zone beginning on page 26. Mr. Sonnen noted that changes to the impervious surface coverage are necessary based on prior discussions during the meeting.

7:36:15 PM Commissioners discussed the special uses chapter. Ms. Smith noted “academic schools” was deleted from the long-term and Nisqually agriculture districts following review by legal counsel. Also, a number of special uses were omitted from the RP 1/10 zone, which provides consistency with all three mapping options and zoning districts. Ms. Smith reviewed changes to the special uses matrix since the last draft. “Wireless communications facilities” was deleted from the RP 1/10 zone by error.

Discussion ensued about rendering facilities allowed in the 1/20, 1/5 and light industrial zones. Staff will follow up with legal counsel about prohibiting the use in the 1/5 zone. The Commission asked staff to delete the use from the 1/20 zone. Commissioners concurred that greenhouses – wholesale should be allowed in the 1/20 and UR zones. The issue should be placed on the Commission’s work docket for further review. It was noted that “forest management activities” are currently allowed in the UR 1/20 zone.
Daycare and family daycare centers and nursing/convalescent homes were discussed next. The Commission wants to allow daycare centers in both 1/20 zones, and long-term care facilities (nursing/convalescent homes, skilled nursing facilities, boarding homes) in the UR and R1/20 zones.

The Commission concurred to include veterinary clinics in the UR1/20 zone.

Chair Roper recessed the meeting from 8:03 p.m. to 8:22 p.m.

Commissioners discussed the “Number of Acres and Estimated % of Rural Lands per Zone” table distributed by staff.

Commissioners and staff reviewed draft code amendments for Option 2 beginning with the proposed new Rural 1/20 district. Staff will incorporate the changes as discussed in Option 1 in Option 2 as appropriate. Discussion ensued about purpose statement #1 and whether there are other environmentally sensitive and hazardous areas in addition to the Nisqually Bluff, Salmon Creek Basin, and Black River Corridor. The Commission agreed to include the following additional purpose statement from the 1/10 district, “Protect agricultural operations from nuisance complaints while allowing nonagricultural land uses which are compatible with resource uses,” to the purposes on page 2.

Discussion followed about including and cross-referencing the Growth Management Act (GMA) definition for rural character in the zoning code amendments. Ms. Smith said that staff will follow up.

Commissioners reviewed the special uses chapter on page 29. Specific to athletic facilities and the potential to drain a swimming pool within an aquifer recharge sensitive area, Mr. Sonnen suggested addressing the issue through the CAO update. Staff will also follow up with Environmental Health. Commissioners asked staff to ensure the Option 2 special use chart mirrors Option 1. The Commission requested the following additional modifications:

- Treat day care centers and nursing homes the same as Option 1 within Option 2
- Feed lots should be an allowed use in long-term agriculture
- Add churches and community center/clubs as allowed uses within the R1/20 zone
- Allow academic schools in the R1/20 zone

Commissioner Ottavelli suggested deleting “residential” within the first purpose statement for all three zoning code amendments.

Ms. Smith and Commissioners reviewed Option 3 draft zoning code amendments. Discussion ensued about the first purpose statement and whether to define the combination of characteristics, including a footnote defining the combination of characteristics at the end of the chapter, or defining environmentally sensitive and...
hazardous areas in the comprehensive plan. The Commission asked staff to revise the purpose statement to read something similar to, “Protecting public health and safety by minimizing development in environmentally sensitive and hazardous areas containing a combination of two or more characteristics including but not limited to: the Nisqually Bluff; Salmon Creek Basin; Black River Corridor; rural character; and areas overlying sensitive aquifers.”

9:08:51 PM Commissioners discussed the Rural 1/10 amendment and purpose statement #1. The Commission replaced “as well as” within the third line with “or.”

9:10:06 PM Specific to the special uses chart, the Commission asked staff to incorporate the same changes made to the Options 1 and 2 special use tables to Option 3.

9:14:33 PM Commissioners revisited consideration of revisions to “Lacey urban reserve” (Option 1 map). The specific area discussed is located east of Marvin Road NE immediately adjacent to Lacey’s UGA boundary. Discussion ensued about Lacey not having an adequate water supply to serve its growth area and that Lacey is currently buying water from the City of Olympia to meet immediate needs. Lacey is pursuing additional water rights from the Department of Ecology (DOE).

Discussion followed about justification to expand the growth area to meet future population allocations, lack of water supply and sewer service to serve the area under consideration, saltwater intrusion issues, the effect of urbanization on existing wells, and proposed zoning for the parcels.

Mr. Sonnen presented another display map of wellhead protection and critical aquifer recharge areas.

9:40:37 PM Following an informal vote, the Commission, in a split vote was unable to forward a recommendation in support of, or opposed to, Lacey’s UR request.

9:43:54 PM Commissioner Kohlenberg moved, seconded by Commissioner Ottavelli, to forward all three rural rezoning proposals to the Board of County Commissioners for their consideration, incorporating the changes to Options 1, 2, and 3 as discussed. Motion carried unanimously.

9:44:25 PM Ms. Smith said staff will draft a transmittal letter to the BoCC. Commissioners recommended including the following within the transmittal letter:

- Highlight the significant policy differences between the three proposals.
- Whether the BoCC wants to consider rural character as a reason to downzone properties?
- Highlight areas where there was agreement by the Commission, such as protect environmentally sensitive, cumulative impact, and aquifer recharge areas.
- Commissioners disagree about the description of “rural character.”
• The percentage of rural lands proposed for rezoning by other counties that the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB) found acceptable; however, the amount of properties proposed for rezoning should not be a decision point for the BoCC.
• There is considerable development pressure in Thurston County. The Puget Sound area is a desirable place to live.
• The question of rural character is the fundamental difference between the proposals.

9:46:16 PM  Ms. Smith reported the Board briefing is scheduled for January 24, 2007 at 2:00 p.m.  Staff can include the number of acres proposed for rezoning and the percentage data as an attachment to the transmittal letter. The variety of zoning densities is based on a jurisdiction’s particular circumstances. Staff will forward a draft letter to the Commission prior to the end of the year. The deadline for the Commission’s comments is January 10, 2007. Mr. Sonnen asked that an advocate for each option attend the Board’s briefing.

4. 6:05:39 PM CALENDAR (Tentative) and Attendance
• January 3, 2007:  Election of officers; finalize the rural rezone letter to the Board of County Commissioners; revisit Don Krupp’s idea – Quorum confirmed

5. 9:55:38 PM STAFF UPDATES
Staff:  John Sonnen
Mr. Sonnen reported The BoCC adopted the 2006 Comprehensive Plan amendments. The Board agreed to expand Tenino’s UGA to only include the 20-acre sewer treatment facility site.

Chair Roper asked if additional resources for long-range planning staff were earmarked in the 2007 budget. Mr. Sonnen indicated not at this time. Development Services will move to the future Mottman Road facility. Funds for design work for a new County facility was approved in the 2007 budget.

6. 9:56:52 PM ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, Chair Roper adjourned the meeting at 9:57 p.m.

__________________________
Joyce Roper, Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services
<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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requester</th>
<th>Notes</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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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 Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/06</td>
<td>Research with legal staff what the distinction</td>
<td>Commission Legal Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is of agriculture occurring on designated agriculture resource lands and agriculture on other lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Originator</th>
<th>Responsible Person</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>
<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>
<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/Lyman</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>
<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>
<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>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>