1. **7:01:38 PM CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Roper called the January 3, 2007 regular 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, and Rhenda Strub  
**Absent:** Commissioners Chris Lane and Craig Ottavelli  
**Staff:** John Sonnen and Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren

**7:01:53 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
**MOTION:** Commissioner Kohlenberg moved to approve the January 3, 2007 agenda. Commissioner Cole seconded. Agenda approved as presented.

2. **7:02:07 PM PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS (Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)**
There were no public communications.

3. **7:02:17 PM APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
**MOTION:** Commissioner Cole moved to accept the November 15 and December 20, 2006 minutes and the audio as the official recordings. Commissioner Lyman seconded.  
**DISCUSSION:** The Commission deferred approval of the November 15, 2006 minutes pending Commissioner Kohlenberg verifying the last bullet point on page 1 where it states she will follow up with staff about an issue.

The Commission requested striking the words “(laundry list)” within the first line on page 6 of the December 20, 2006 minutes.

The Commission deferred approval of the December 20, 2006 minutes pending clarification of the categories members discussed within the fourth paragraph on page 4 about impervious surface coverage limits and soil types.

**7:09:33 PM** Discussion ensued concerning the attachment to the minutes. Commissioner Cole referred to the second issue/request dated 1/26/05 and said the request is two years old. He said he would like an answer to his concern. Chair Roper conveyed she and staff will update the “Request for Information Summary Sheet.”
Mr. Sonnen described the current process on how citizens can find out if there are impediments about what can be done with a piece of property. Discussion of developing and posting a set of instructions on the website followed. Mr. Sonnen said he will follow up with Permit Center staff and brief the Commission at a future meeting.

4. 7:23:17 PM ELECTION OF OFFICERS
   ITEM: Election of 2007 Planning Commission officers.

   DISCUSSION: Commissioner Lyman reported the nominating committee spoke with all Commissioners. Commissioners indicated they want to nominate Commissioner Roper for a second term as Chair. Members suggested nominating Commissioner Ottavelli or Lane to serve as Vice Chair, with a goal of serving as Chair in 2008. Commissioner Lyman reported Commissioner Lane declined serving as Vice Chair. Commissioner Ottavelli expressed interest in serving as Vice Chair. Subsequently, the Nominating Committee nominates Commissioner Roper as Chair and Commissioner Ottavelli as Vice Chair for 2007.

   Commissioners offered no additional nominations. The Commission unanimously endorsed the Nominating Committee’s recommendation.

   Commissioner Lyman conveyed that several Commissioners are troubled and annoyed by the amount of side conversations occurring at meetings. Commissioners and staff should refrain from speaking unless recognized by the Chair.

5. 7:28:18 PM W: RURAL REZONE
   Staff: John Sonnen
   ITEM: The Planning Commission discussed an alternative proposal for providing a variety of rural densities. They also reviewed and discussed two alternative versions of a letter transmitting their recommendation regarding rural rezoning to the Board of County Commissioners.

   HANDOUTS:
   • November 27, 2006 memorandum from Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) evaluating the effect on residential development capacity of several alternative scenarios to current zoning regulations and critical areas ordinance in the rural county limited to the RR1/5 and RRR1/5 zoning districts.
   • A draft letter to the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) about recommended amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning map to provide a variety of rural densities.
   • An alternate proposal by Commissioner Kohlenberg to the BoCC about recommended amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning map to provide a variety of rural densities.
DISCUSSION: Commissioners and Mr. Sonnen discussed Thurston County Chief Administrative Officer Don Krupp’s proposal concerning the rural rezoning project. Mr. Sonnen reviewed Mr. Krupp’s suggestion and how it relates to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB) mandate that the county provide a variety of zoning. Mr. Sonnen referred to a table on page 4 of TRPC’s memorandum. The general estimate indicates a significant reduction in residential development capacity in the RR 1/5 and RRR 1/5 zoning districts if density calculations are modified to remove critical areas and critical area buffers before dividing by the allowed densities. It results in less buildable lots. Under the current density calculations, the difference between the residential development capacity under the current Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) and proposed CAO is relatively small. However, an increased amount of land area set aside as unbuildable in critical area buffers would result in smaller lot sizes on the buildable portion of a tax parcel. Under the modified density calculations, an increase in critical area buffer widths will decrease development capacity somewhat proportionately, as the area is removed from the density calculation.

Discussion ensued on:

- “Reasonable use exception” and changes made to the language.
- King County’s CAO ordinance.
- Thurston County’s responsibility to protect critical areas, aquifer recharge and cumulative impact areas, and whether the rural rezone project and critical areas belong in the same “bucket.”
- How a hearing examiner might apply the regulations.
- Clustering.
- Mr. Krupp’s proposal addresses the cumulative impact issue where the CAO does not.
- Honoring the public process invested with the rural rezoning work.
- Mr. Krupp’s proposal does not protect wildlife.
- How rural character is defined for Options 1, 2, and 3.

8:06:12 PM Commissioners discussed whether to forward Mr. Krupp’s concept as a fourth option to the BoCC for consideration. A majority of the Commissioners agreed not to reference the proposal in the letter to the BoCC. Staff was asked to draft a response to Mr. Krupp for the Commission’s review.

8:11:15 PM Commissioner Lyman left the meeting at 8:11 p.m. because she was feeling ill.

Commissioner Kohlenberg explained the rationale for the draft letter to the BoCC.

8:12:27 PM Chair Roper recessed the meeting from 8:12 p.m. to 8:23 p.m. to provide an opportunity to read the draft letter proposals.

8:23:05 PM Commissioner Kohlenberg suggested using staff’s draft as an appendix. She
indicated she found it difficult to distinguish the differences between the options when reading staff’s letter. Commissioners discussed a preferred approach and agreed to work from Commissioner Kohlenberg’s draft letter. A summary of the comments and/or modifications include:

- Add, “protect wildlife habitat” to the discussion of rural character and livability.
- The explanatory notes, rationale, pros, and cons provided by staff are useful.
- The preliminary discussion about public input focuses on those that attended the public hearing. The volume of written comments should also be acknowledged.
- Eliminate the concept of the fourth option.
- Add “habitat protection” when referring to rural character throughout the document.
- Note that the buffers along long-term agriculture and long-term forestry are different among the three options.
- Replace the second sentence under “areas of disagreement” with language that talks about the percentage of land proposed for rezone to 1/10 or 1/20. Include a table that breaks down the percentages by zone designation for each of the options.
- Use one term to describe houses, homes, or dwelling units.
- Call out areas of agreement and list them first on the attachment. Describe how the options differ with bullet points and reasons.
- Remove the statements referring to how many homes will be removed from the housing market.
- Move the third bullet point from “areas of agreement” and include it in both Options 1 and 2.
- Rural character picks up the key habitat lands. Include a footnote that defines habitat lands.
- The term “livability” refers to “buffers for long-term agriculture, long-term forestry, and long-term mineral lands.”
- Replace “downzone” with “rezone” throughout the document.
- The third bullet point under “Rural Character Lands” should be a separate main bullet statement.
- The purpose of urban reserve lands is to promote orderly development of urban infrastructure within the urban areas.
- Staff will follow up with whether “areas with elevated nitrate or chloride levels” is pertinent for all three options. A rationale is to preserve drinking water.
- A reason for rezoning is to reduce sprawl in parts of the county that are not developed, which helps to preserve open spaces, and to protect habitat and rural character. Include a cross reference to the Growth Management Act’s (GMA) definition for rural character. Note that the County is undergoing significant development pressure, and that preserving open space and habitat were top priorities identified at the public workshops.
- A rationale for unbuildable lands is the idea of public safety. It was the highest priority coming out of workshops.
Specific to Option 2, the Commission agreed to highlight the key differences between Options 1 and 2. The “omission of the urban reserve designation” paragraph was revised to read something similar to, “An objective is to omit urban reserve because it only temporarily contributes to a variety of rural densities. It is not clear that this designation will be needed anytime soon since the county’s growth management areas are currently oversized. It encourages sprawl in the rural areas with developers ignoring urban reserve areas. The ultimate beneficiary is a lower cost to the eventual developer because infrastructure costs less to construct.”

Related to “omission of unbuildable areas,” revise the second sentence to read, “Reasons: these lands will be largely protected under critical area regulations and rezoning doubles the impact on those property owners.”

The first sentence for “Different zoning densities” was reworded to read in part, “Option 2 rezones rural character and habitat lands to …” The second sentence was changed to say, “Reason: This is subjective – but at least two Commissioners thought 1/10 was sufficient to preserve the rural character and habitat. The proportion of 1/10 and 1/20 zoning is consistent with what neighboring counties have done.”

Include in the “areas of agreement section” that “areas with severe constraints for development or environmental sensitivity” applies to the 1/20 zone for both Options 1 and 2.

Commissioners discussed the Option 3 section and agreed to change the first word in the last sentence under the first bullet point from “Other” to “Some other.” Change “This” at the beginning of the second sentence of the second bullet to “These.” Discussion ensued about “other severe constraints” and “areas with multiple physical constraints for development” language. Staff will follow up and modify the language as appropriate.

The Commission discussed a process to incorporate the changes with review and comment by the Commission in time to meet the January 17, 2007 deadline.

6. **9:37:02 PM CALENDAR (TENTATIVE) AND ATTENDANCE**
   - January 17, 2007
   - February 7, 2007

7. **9:37:26 PM STAFF UPDATES**
   **Staff: John Sonnen**
   The Board’s briefing on the rural rezone project is scheduled for January 24, 2007, at 2:00 p.m. Staff will notice the briefing as a meeting in the event a quorum of the Planning Commission is present.
The “Understanding Growth Forum Plans – Vision/Reality Follow Up” meeting has been rescheduled for the evening of January 10, 2007, at TRPC beginning at 6:00 p.m.

8. **9:39:51 PM ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair Roper adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Joyce Roper, Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services

*Corrections made by Cami Petersen January 31, 2007*
## REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
### SUMMARY SHEET

<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>J. Sonnen (1/3/07)</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.

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
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 Commission Lyman

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

Commissioner Staff Kohlenberg

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
is of agriculture occurring on designated agriculture resource lands and agriculture on other lands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</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 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>