1. **7:00 PM CALL TO ORDER**  
Vice Chair Ottavelli called the July 18, 2007 regular meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 7:00 PM. Commissioners provided self-introductions.  
**Attendance:** Vice Chair Craig Ottavelli, Commissioners Scott Nelson, Tom Cole, Kathleen O’Connor, and Liz Meyers  
**Excused:** Chair Joyce Roper and Commissioner Liz Kohlenberg  
**Staff:** John Sonnen, Nadine Romero, Brad Zulewski, Cindy Wilson, and Recording Secretary Jessica Tate

2. **7:01 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**  
**MOTION:** Commissioner Cole moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner O’Connor seconded. Motion carried.

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

3. **7:03 PM W: CRITICAL AREAS – CRITICAL AQUIFER RECHARGE AREAS (CARA) AND WETLANDS (time permitting)**

Mr. Sonnen reported general information regarding biosolid was provided in the agenda packet. The issue to discuss is whether any classification of biosolid is safe to apply in any CARA category. Vice Chair Ottavelli commented that the information was very helpful.

*John Libby, Moderate Risk Waste, Department of Ecology (DOE)*, provided a brief overview of biosolid classifications. Exceptional quality reclaimed water must meet required metal criteria for approximately 10 different metals. Most water treatment plants produce exceptional quality reclaimed water.

*Ken Butti, LOTT Alliance*, said exceptional quality biosolid contains a very low level of metals.

Commissioner O’Connor asked for clarification regarding the exceptional quality classification. Mr. Libby explained exceptional quality biosolid must be Class A and meet metals requirements. Currently, LOTT does not produce exceptional quality biosolid. Mr. Butti replied that LOTT has a plan to produce exceptional quality biosolid in its Capital Improvement Projects Program. In approximately 10 years, LOTT anticipates achieving Class A biosolid from Class B biosolid. That process is currently
estimated to cost approximately $15 million to $20 million.

Mr. Sonnen said it is assumed most pathogens from Class B application will not survive. However, long wait periods are required prior to planting root crops. The biosolid system also does not address nitrogen and other potential contaminants. Unknowns remain concerning pharmaceutical contaminants.

Mr. Libby reported an area where biosolid is applied requires nitrogen sampling before and after application and nitrogen monitoring. There is a timeframe from April to September when application is allowed. Buffers for streams and wells are also required.

Commissioner Cole asked whether public notification is required for biosolid application. Mr. Libby replied that there is a public notification process. However, misconceptions about biosolid still exist. Farmers utilizing biosolid applications indicate their crops grow very nicely.

Mr. Sonnen asked Mr. Libby about prohibition of Class B biosolid application in certain CARA categories. Mr. Libby suggested prohibition might be too cautious. However, certain areas should be carefully reviewed and perhaps restricted.

Commissioner Cole asked about requiring a hydrogeologic study in some areas, such as wellhead protection areas prior to application. Mr. Libby indicated it would be warranted.

Commissioner O’Connor asked about the current demand for biosolid application. Mr. Libby indicated most people utilize biosolid application for pastureland used for livestock production. There are currently no applications in Thurston County. Mr. Libby said he doesn’t know of any area in the state where Class B biosolid is used for root crops. However, tree farms could be a potential use. Mr. Butti reported there are no requests in Thurston County for biosolid application. However, there is a composting facility in Lewis County that utilizes biosolid.

Vice Chair Ottavelli said the intent is not to close the door on the issue, but create regulations in CARA areas, such as requiring a hydrogeologic study in CARA Categories I, II, and III prior to application. The difference between CARA Categories II and III is that Category II is a sole water source. He suggested requiring hydrogeologic studies in CARA Categories I and II. Mr. Libby added that the County performs the same scrutinizing process as DOE and there are stiff penalties for violations.

Mr. Sonnen said staff would support prohibiting biosolid application in one-year time of travel and wellhead protection areas.

Commissioner O’Connor said sole source water areas must be conservatively protected; specifically in terms of unknowns such as pharmaceutical contaminants. She suggested prohibiting biosolid application in CRA Categories I and II, and potentially allowing
application in CARA Category III upon completion of a hydrogeologic study. Since there is no high demand for the use, perhaps waiting for LOTT’s upgrade from Class B to Class A biosolid is warranted. Commissioner Lane agreed.

Commissioner Nelson expressed support for prohibiting use of biosolid in CARA Category I, potentially allowing the use in CARA Category II upon completion of a hydrogeologic study, and allowing the use in CARA Category III without the study.

MOTION: Commissioner O’Connor moved to recommend prohibiting Class B biosolid application in CARA Categories I and II, and potentially allow Class B biosolid application in CARA Category III upon completion of a hydrogeologic study and required review and permitting processes. Commissioner Lane seconded. Commissioner Nelson voted against the motion. Commissioner Strub abstained. Motion carried.

Mr. Sonnen referred to Chair Roper’s request at the last meeting for staff to determine whether a state assistance program is available for decommissioning underground tanks. Currently, there is liability insurance available for underground tank replacement, which could fit with Option B on page 5-15. However, the issue regarding the challenge to enforce monitoring will most likely occur.

Vice Chair Ottavelli said the City of Olympia’s perspective is if an underground tank is not leaking now, it will in the future. Decommissioning of all underground tanks located in CARA areas should be recommended.

Mr. Zulewski suggested Option A might be the more feasible approach.

Commissioner Ottavelli asked about the number of existing tanks located in CARA Category I. Mr. Zulewski said the number is currently unknown. Contacting oil distributors might help to determine locations of existing active tanks. Mr. Sonnen said the issue is of considerable concern, as one gallon of gasoline can contaminate up to one million gallons of water.

Vice Chair Ottavelli commented that the practical first step is to contact oil companies to determine an estimate of how many underground tanks are located in Thurston County followed by developing a feasible strategy. Mr. Sonnen acknowledged the request.

Mr. Sonnen referred to Table 5.2 and indicated public comments conveyed concerns that the table threshold might be too low.

Mr. Zulewski explained that there is lower risk associated with buildings that contain a number of small containers of hazardous waste rather than one or a number of large tanks. He described the categories contained in the table.

Vice Chair Ottavelli asked whether “chemical substances” includes petroleum products.
Mr. Zulewski agreed and indicated the focus of concern seems to be with container size.

Vice Chair Ottavelli asked whether a 30 or 55-gallon threshold is more viable. Mr. Zulewski replied that 30 gallons would eliminate common household use. Mr. Sonnen suggested adding a cumulative aspect to address the number of smaller containers. Commissioner Lane commented that a 30-gallon threshold appears too low and recommended 150 gallons for the cumulative threshold. Vice Chair Ottavelli suggested 120 gallons for the threshold, which would be four times the 30-gallon threshold. Commissioner Nelson added that he has a 150-gallon diesel tank in his truck and 55-gallon tanks for different types of oil. Vice Chair Ottavelli suggested exempting vehicle-type storage.

Commissioner Strub said determining thresholds depends on the type of hazardous material in the tank.

Vice Chair Ottavelli suggested creating a separate category in Table 5.2 for petroleum distillates. Commissioner Strub suggested adding an exclusion for carbon and hydrogen.

Commissioner Cole commented on the challenge of enforcement in homes and garages. Commissioner Lane clarified that the regulations enable concerned citizens to report potential violators.

Mr. Zulewski clarified that Article 6 of the Thurston County Code mandates proper storage and disposal of products and contaminated soil.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Strub moved to add a separate line for petroleum distillates to Table 5.2 with the exemption of vehicle-mounted tanks, and to create a 30-gallon threshold for large tanks and a 120-gallon cumulative threshold for small tanks. Commissioner Cole seconded. Motion carried. Commissioner O’Connor abstained.

Mr. Zulewski asked for feedback on secondary containment requirements. He suggested requiring engineered container building designs and parking lot catch basin designs for new vehicle repair and servicing/body shops. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Sonnen referred to Item #8 Monitoring on page 5-19. Public comments suggested more specification regarding required monitoring intervals. Ms. Romero suggested revising the item to state, “Monitoring. The approval authority may require monitoring wells, to the extent necessary to determine if pollution is occurring, a minimum of quarterly monitoring, and remedial action if the monitoring reveals that groundwater contamination is occurring.”

Mr. Ottavelli suggested revising Item G #5 on page 5-21 to state, “Leak detection. Leak detection devices shall be required for all tanks.” Mr. Sonnen acknowledged the request. Mr. Zulewski indicated he will provide further information regarding various quantitative...
Mr. Sonnen referred to Item H #4 on page 5-21 and suggested revising it to state, “Waiver. The approval authority shall grant a waiver…” Item I #2 on page 5-21 should be revised to state, “Process water. All process water from production pouring, recycling, and equipment cleaning activities shall be…”

Ms. Romero referred to Item L #3 and recommended revising the last line of the paragraph to state, “The approval authority shall require a hydrogeologic report to include soil testing for suspected toxic chemicals and other contaminants on the site.”

Mr. Sonnen referred to Item O on page 5-24. DOE recommends tabling the issue until additional information is received. A recommendation is anticipated in late September 2007.

Vice Chair Ottavelli asked that LOTT Alliance representatives continue receiving the information to provide assistance during the Commission’s review. Mr. Sonnen acknowledged the request.

Ms. Romero referred to Item A #2 on page 5-28 and requested revising it to state, “Hydrogeological report. In addition to specific requirements for individual uses in this Section, the approval authority may require a hydrogeological report and adequate contour maps, site maps, and hydrogeologic cross-sections.”

Ms. Wilson reported she will provide a summary of court updates to initiate the Wetlands discussion at the August 1, 2007 meeting.

4. CALENDER (TENTATIVE) AND ATTENDANCE
   • August 1, 2007: W: Critical Areas - Wetlands

5. STAFF UPDATES

   The Thurston County Board of Commissioners will vote on the rural rezone issue for final assessment and code amendments on July 23, 2007.

6. 9:17 PM ADJOURNMENT

   With there being no further business, Vice Chair Ottavelli adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

____________________________
Craig Ottavelli, Vice Chair