1. **6:30 PM CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Lane called the November 5, 2008 regular meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

**Attendance:** Chair Chris Lane, Commissioners Tom Cole, Liz Myers, Liz Kohlenberg and Scott Nelson.

**Excused:** Commissioners Joyce Roper and Kathleen O’Connor

**Staff:** Scott Clark, Jeremy Davis, Cynthia Wilson and Recording Secretary Cami Petersen.

**6:31 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MOTION: Commissioner Cole moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner Nelson seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Nelson requested the agenda be amended to reflect the correct public hearing time beginning at 7 p.m. instead of 6:45 p.m. as shown on the agenda. The public hearing was advertised to begin at 7 p.m. The Planning Commission (Commission) requested that future agendas provide the specific section of the Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) and/or other documents so the Commission can prepare and bring the appropriate paper work to the meetings.

Motion carried as amended.

2. **6:32 PM PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS (Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)**

There were no public communications.

3. **6:32 PM APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved to approve the October 15, 2008 minutes and accept the audio as the official recording. Commissioner Myers seconded.

4. **6:35 PM STAFF UPDATES**

Mr. Clark stated that a briefing was held with the Board of Commissioners (BOCC) on November 3, 2008 concerning the Chehalis Tribe Grand Mound 10 year rezone plan. Mr. Clark stated that the BOCC ordered staff to proceed with this project on the 2009 docket, and staff has scheduled the Tribe to attend the November 19, 2008 regular meeting to brief the Commission on the project.
Mr. Clark stated that a briefing was held with the BOCC on November 5, 2008 concerning integrating shorelines and watershed characterization grants. A new work plan will be created to show what has been done by previous staff as well as the new science that comes from watershed characterization and how this can be used with shorelines. The intent is to prevent redundant staff work and process. Staff has decided that it would be beneficial to both staff and the public to condense both topics into one public hearing process.

Mr. Clark explained that the Long Term Ag (LTA) mailing has been sent out, the website has been updated, public notices are complete and the final mapping is finished. The BOCC guidance to staff was to prepare a methodology for those parcels that do not meet the soil depth requirements. The property owner must be able to demonstrate this to staff in order for those parcels to be removed from the LTA designation. Mr. Clark explained that due to the time of year, the costs involved in the analysis needed to complete this task, and current economic conditions, this project will be kept open for an additional year. The maps will be adopted this year, and changes will be considered as the analysis is completed. This would allow parcel owners an opportunity to change their designation if they do not meet the soil depth criteria. Mr. Clark stated that an open house is scheduled for LTA on November 19, 2008 at Swede Hall in Rochester. The BOCC will then hold a public hearing on December 8, 2008, and staff will provide a follow-up briefing to the BOCC on December 9, 2008. Adoption of the maps will be scheduled for December 22, 2008. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Clark stated that the BOCC and Commission meeting will be held on December 2, 2008 at Apollo’s restaurant in west Olympia at 6 p.m. Mr. Clark stated that if the Commission would like to acknowledge Commissioner Diane Oberquell’s upcoming retirement to let staff know and staff can assist as needed.

5. **9:20 PM** CALENDAR (Tentative) AND ATTENDANCE
   - November 19, 2008: Draft 2009 Docket; Critical Areas Ordinance work session
   - December 2, 2008: Annual Dinner Meeting with the Board of Commissioners
   - December 3, 2008 – Critical Areas Ordinance work session
   - December 17, 2008 – Critical Areas Ordinance work session
   - January 27, 2009 – A short course on Local Planning will be given to the Board of Commissioners and the 2009 docket will be introduced at that time

6. **6:44 P.M.** COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS PUBLIC HEARING
   *(Staff: Jeremy Davis)*

   Mr. Davis provided the Commission with a handout containing the following:
   
   a) Comment Memorandum from Jim Bachmeier, Water Resources Programs Manager, Water and Waste Management.
   b) Public comments
Commissioner Kohlenberg arrived.

Mr. Davis provided an overview of the handouts provided which contain the comments received on the Comprehensive Plan amendments before the Commission for review and public hearing. Mr. Davis stated that Water and Waste Management has changed their previous recommendation. Mr. Davis explained to the Commission that the public comments received have been provided in the handouts with an additional matrix outlining these comments. A discussion ensued.

6:44 P.M. Chair Lane stated that the purpose of this public hearing is to take testimony regarding the three proposed amendments to the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan for the Joint Plans in the Urban Growth Areas of the City of Olympia, the City of Tumwater and the City of Lacey. A public hearing is required prior to the Planning Commission making a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Chair Lane stated that sign-in sheets are located at the entrance of the room for the public to sign in if they wish to testify. Each person wishing to testify will be allowed three minutes, and Chair Lane asked that redundant testimony not be given. The Applicant will be given time at the beginning of each proposal.

Chair Lane asked the audience how many were going to testify for each of the proposals this evening.

Chair Lane opened the public hearing on the A-3 amendment at 7:08 p.m.

Mr. Davis provided the public with an overview of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment A-3: UGA Review, 93rd Avenue Area.

Walt Jorgensen, 9633 Brooks Lane SE

Mr. Jorgensen stated that he currently owns ten acres of fully forested property containing one single family residence. The property is currently zoned 1 unit per 10 acres, Mr. Jorgensen stated that this zoning has served him well even though it is not exactly rural, but it certainly is not urban. Mr. Jorgensen stated that moving to a more intense zoning at this time would tend to subvert the long term planning of the area. Mr. Jorgensen stated that land on the peripheral of the city boundaries is potentially transitional, and he believes the transitional nature is misunderstood. By gradually increasing the density without guidance of a longer term vision does not properly prepare rural land for urban use. Mr. Jorgensen stated that a 1:5 zoning would allow upwards of 128 structures per square mile with little control as to how they were located one to another. By the time you wind your way around critical areas and other natural landscape features, and political constraints such as easements and setbacks, the building, and especially the roads that connect them, will not lay the groundwork for a reasonable street grid or even a cul-de-sac configuration. Mr. Jorgensen does not believe you should arbitrarily frustrate some land owners ability to develop their property, but believes they should bend over backwards to accommodate an individual by compromising an overall land use plan, a product of wise and professional considerations. Mr. Jorgensen stated that no one has inherent right to make money from their real estate holdings; it is a calculated risk like any other investment. One of the variable of this type of investment is how the land is zoned, to best serve the needs of the larger community. Mr. Jorgensen stated that his advice is to continue this zone and 1:10 designation, and if any changes are made at all it should be kept less dense to preserve the
options for the future. Mr. Jorgensen asked the Commission to please consider the economic self interest of any individuals giving the Commission advice on this proposal. Mr. Jorgensen stated that he hopes the Commission will listen to comments on how to formulate the best public policy rather than how to affect the value of any particular property.

Les Reynolds, 811 93rd Avenue SE
Mr. Reynolds stated that he recently move to this area from the Pierce County area and in his retirement years he would like to see this area stay as urban as possible. Mr. Reynolds stated that he supports the proposed 1:10 designation.

Vince Gatone, 9525 Brooks Lane SE
Mr. Gatone stated that he lives south of the area proposed for rezone and has made many comments on this proposal. Mr. Gatone supports the 1:10 acre proposal, and believes that if there were another density under consideration such as 1:5, this would be similar to a LAMIRD, such as the one removed in this area about a year ago. Mr. Gatone would like to see this rezone enacted.

Chair lane closed the public hearing on the A-3 amendment at 7:14 p.m.

Chair lane opened the public hearing the B-2 amendment at 7:16 p.m.

Mr. Davis provided the public with an overview of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment B-2: Olympia UGA, MC Construction.

Steve Yester, a representative of the Applicant, MC Construction, provided the Commission with the following two items:
a) November 5, 2008 Letter from John Cook, Perkins Coie
b) November 5, 2008 Letter from Steve Yester, MC Construction, including attached map of proposal area

Mr. Yester stated that he would like to answer a question that has been proposed to him by staff concerning why the R4:8 zone was requested. Mr. Yester stated that he believes that there was an error made previously in the mapping of Green Cove Basin. Prior to this the property in question was zone 4:8, and then it was down zoned because it was mistakenly believed to lie in the Green Cove Basin. Mr. Yester stated that he believes it makes the most sense to return this to the zoning it previously had which was 4:8. Mr. Yester looked at surrounding properties both in the UGA and outside Green Cove, and 4:8 zoning is consistent with the zoning of those properties.

Mr. Yester stated that the applicant’s intentions are not to develop at R4:8, but will ask for a variance from the minimum density. The applicant was not concerned about that because frankly there is an allowance to do so in recognition of site constraints, which should be pointed out on this property. Mr. Yester stated that the map provided with the November 5, 2008 Letter was submitted with the rezone application and it has some additional information. The shaded areas on the map are easements that were granted for the development to the north, which was developed by the applicant. This created an appropriate buffer between the urban
setting and a more dense development. The applicant believes that this shows an intention that it had and is not new information, but an intention to respect that.

Another item Mr. Yester pointed out on the map is the adjacent storm pond from the development of Wood Trails. The applicant is aware of concerns about stormwater and stated that additional information is provided in the November 5, 2008 letter from the applicant. The applicant believes that because of inaccurate mapping, which shows this property as part of Green Cove, when the adjacent property was being developed, some of the water which used to flow in one direction on the applicant’s property is now collected in a storm pond and is being released on the other side of a little ridge on the property. Mr. Yester stated that the applicant has spent several years developing the Woodlands End PRRD development to the north and has looked at the drainage pattern. The applicant actually did an enhancement project along one border, increased some channelization, added vegetation and a buffer to the original drainage pattern. Mr. Yester stated that this new one is going in a little bit of a different direction potentially from that other development. The applicant has discussed with the developer of Wood Trails the ability to reanalyze this and to possibly expand their storm pond onto the applicant’s property as shown as a dashed line on the map provided with the November 5, 2008 letter from the applicant. Mr. Yester stated that this would provide more of a buffer to that adjacent development, and if anything, the applicant feels confident that they can not only mitigate their impacts on the adjacent development, but actually improve the existing condition.

Mr. Yester stated that the final picture provided with the applicant’s November 5, 2008 letter shows a street scene of the Wood Trails development. The southern end of the applicant’s property has all municipal utilities stubbed to it, and while the applicant recognizes the appropriateness of having a buffer against the neighbor to the north, it makes sense to have more houses than one per ten acres, utilizing that infrastructure that has been provided on the other end of the property. Mr. Yester stated that the applicant would like to accommodate both a buffer of approximately 50% of their property, and develop something probably less than four to one acre on the southern portion. The applicant supports the R4 zoning which is actually more in line with what the applicant would like to do and it doesn’t give the applicant the problem of having to argue for something less than the minimum.

Tom Gygi, 3001 33rd Lane NW  
Mr. Gygi stated that he is the neighbor to the north and is representing four property owners. Mr. Gygi stated that was interesting to listen to what MC Construction had to say, but they are still scared to death because he has lived through one winter there. These are brand new houses that have just been put in and there is a ton of water that goes through this area. Mr. Gygi does not know how to measure that, but he does know that the water table itself comes up into his homes crawl space and there is no room for any water to go down into the ground once it starts running. If it is zoned 4:8 it scares him that that much impervious surface will dump that much water onto the asphalt, dumping that water down to the hillside, which goes right towards them and they would have to figure out a way to channel it behind their homes. Mr. Gygi stated that he understands the channel runs behind one of the houses that was put in as an improvement, but the retention pond that is there already cannot hold all of the runoff from Woodland Trails at the other end on Kaiser and Cooper Point. Mr. Gygi stated that how this stormwater pond was designed we are not sure, he guesses it was suppose to release the water to the wetlands behind his home, which doesn’t run to Green Cove, it runs right behind his
Mr. Gygi stated that it overflowed the system and what they put in did not handle the last winter. Mr. Gygi stated that this is with one development and is afraid that if there is another development next to it, he is unable to see how that area can handle this much runoff. The road is something that can be addressed once a proposal is put it, but Mr. Gygi states that this is a dark, narrow road, and to have it as an access to a neighboring development does not seem feasible. Mr. Gygi stated that the staff report recommends that this parcel not be zoned 4:8 because it is too intense, and that they are here to tell the Commission that it is too intense and they would like to see the recommendation go forward and study the Butler Cove and Butler Creek area more, and the Deschutes tributary. Mr. Gygi would like to see that studied to its fullest before they move forward and come up with a zoning designation.

Karl Geissler, 3409 Cooper Point Road NW
Mr. Geissler stated that he has submitted a comment email with photos attached, that basically shows some of the issues of ground water and storm runoff that he had dealt with. Mr. Geissler point to the map, showing his one acre property, where he has resided for eighteen years, and also the neighboring lots that he also owns which are rental properties. Mr. Geissler stated that in the eighteen years that he has lived there, there was none of this development. Mr. Geissler stated that both he and his children have spent a lot of time in the subject property and he would also refer the Commission to a letter that he submitted when MC Construction wanted to develop a neighboring property. Mr. Geissler explained that at that time a lot of his concerns were addressed on a creek to divert some of the water around his properties, but it was inadequate its design because it all drains down to a spreader device. Mr. Geissler stated that in the rains that occurred last year it was completely overwhelmed. The property developed to the north by MC Construction, which the neighbors testified their concerns this evening about ground water, this ground within the next month or two becomes completely saturated and when the rainstorms of January and February come this will be completely overwhelmed. Mr. Geissler stated that when the property is overwhelmed the water goes into the wetland and last year he had a gigantic backup where there is a culvert that goes under Cooper Point, and if you look at the soils, it is currently draining into a tiny little pond. The water was actually spilling over into Woodlands End and there is a tiny culvert under Cooper Point where the water must flow and eventually runs into Budd Inlet. Mr. Geissler stated that there is a bottleneck at the culvert, and when the Country Club did improvements last year, drainage was not addressed so he is ending up with a flood if there is more impervious surface allowed. Mr. Geissler stated that the current drainage pond is inadequate and the spreader device is also inadequate and needs to be improved. Mr. Geissler stated that he agrees with MC Construction that if this could somehow be improved into a better retention for stormwater then he is ok with additional homes being placed there, but in the meantime he believes they are in trouble because they cannot get flood insurance because they are not in a flood zone. Mr. Geissler asked that the Commission slow the process down and make sure it is done accurately.

David Hall, 3240-A Cooper Point Road
Mr. Hall stated that there is a lot of traffic on Cooper Point road and is very difficult to get in and out because there is no traffic control up and down the road north of Kaiser. Mr. Hall stated that what the proposal looks like is that traffic can access through U Trails, which is the existing development to the south and his point is that if all of these new homes are going to exit onto Cooper Point Road it will make traffic worse than it already is.
Chair lane closed the public hearing on the B-2 amendment at 7:33 p.m.

Chair lane opened the public hearing the C-1 amendment at 7:35 p.m.

Mr. Davis provided the public with an overview of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment C-1: Lacey UGA, Carnel Custom Homes.

Dave Burns, principal planner for the City of Lacey, provided the Commission and the public with an overview of the City’s comments. Mr. Burns stated that he has been coordinating with Mr. Davis on this proposal, and would like to share what the City of Lacey has come up with. Mr. Burns explained that this is not the normal process and that this action would normally be taken by the City and the County in the same year. But because of the recent crisis that the Counties have had with land use this is being brought forward at this time. Mr. Burns stated that a few months ago they were concerned that the County would not be doing long range planning because of staffing issues and they are glad to see that long range planning now has staff. The City would typically provide these amendments to the County by June, but it was unable to do that this year because of major updates on their Comprehensive Plan that were needed. Mr. Burns stated that the City Council has taken action on the Comprehensive Plan Amendments in September and state law only allows the Comprehensive Plan be updated once a year.

Mr. Burns explained that when they learned that joint planning could be done on this proposal, it was taken to the City Planning Commission and a land use committee for review. Mr. Burns stated that if the Commission decides to move forward with this amendment they the City will put this on their 2009 docket and take official action then.

Mr. Burns stated that this property was designated at a much higher density a number of years ago, but because of significant drainage issues and wetlands in this area a density of six units per acre would not work so this was down zoned in 2005 to low density 0:4. The Lacey Comprehensive Plan discusses what types of properties should be designated at 0:4, which were intended for properties with sensitive areas and drainage issues. Mr. Burns has had email discussion with staff concerning the availability of sewer service to this area and some of that information has been provided to the Commission in their review packets. Mr. Burns explained that sewer will not be extended to this area for at least 15 years because there is nothing in this area driving the extension of sewer. A minimum of two sewer lift stations would be needed and this is not economically feasible at this time.

Mr. Burns stated that in a perfect world this would be down zoned because it is a better zone for it, but, the 0:4 zoning under current conditions would allow an applicant to get a septic system and drainfield permit and this would cause problems with well water and pollution because of the conditions of the property. The City would not like to see private wells and drainfields in this area.

Mr. Burns explained that another concern is if you are trying to get GMA densities in this area,
what you would most likely end up with is a few large homes with septic and drainfields and not the type of GMA density you would expect. While 0:4 would be a good density for this area, there are three concerns of septic and drainfield, private wells and what type of density should be in that area for long term.

The City of Lacey Planning Commission discussed the fact that in order to reach the 0:4 density sewer would need to be extended to this area. The City of Lacey Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code would prefer to see cluster type development in areas of this type to allow some development in the interim period before sewer and water becomes available.

Mr. Burns stated that another option for this property is to re-think whether or not this should remain in the UGA because it may take many years for sewer and water extended to this area, and because of the drainage issues.

Mr. Burns explained what the City of Lacey Planning Commission discussed the options for development if a down zone is given to this area. The City of Lacey Planning Commission recommends that this be zoned 0:4 with the following conditions attached:
1. Limit the division to four lots.
2. Limit the number of wells to four with the requirement of abandonment when water is extended.
3. Onsite septic systems would be required to be abandoned when sewer and water is extended to the area.
4. An LID waiver protest so future owners could not protest when future utilities are extended.
5. Development would have to be positioned so that the land can be further subdivided at a later date. This can be stated on the face of the plat to show the required location of the home.
6. The conditions would be protective covenants and located on the face of the plat.

A member of the public, Jerry Unmuth, asked Mr. Burns if the City has discussed the installation of any sewer facilities anywhere near this parcel with Thurston County, and has the City Public Utility section discussed putting in a lift station nearby. Mr. Burns stated that the County was looking at a potential project in the Woodland Creek area, but in looking at the surrounding areas public works said that a lift station would not help at all and that two lift stations would be required. There currently is nothing out there driving the need for that. Mr. Unmuth asked whether the Woodland Creek neighborhood would drive that. Mr. Burns stated that because of the topography and location of that neighborhood to the area in question, it would still require two lift stations which would not be economically feasible.

Tony Balmelli 7411 Prine Drive SW
Mr. Balmelli, a representative of the applicant for this proposal, stated that he concurs with Mr. Burns and the City of Lacey’s assessment of the site.

Jerry Unmuth, 1620 Legion Way SE
Mr. Unmuth stated that he is very familiar with this area. Mr. Unmuth explained that the reason he asked Mr. Burns about the Woodland Creek neighborhood is that he has had recent discussion with the City of Lacey. Mr. Unmuth agrees with much of what Mr. Burns stated,
but he believes there have been discussions concerning installing a lift station at Woodland Creek, which contains approximately 150 houses. Mr. Unmuth stated that he is aware of several studies on the Woodland Creek area such as the Woodland Creek Pollutant Load Reduction project, a study concerning load reduction performed by the Department of Ecology, and a Nitrate Study which can be found on Thurston County Environmental Health Department’s website, which describes the affects of septic systems on wells in that area. Mr. Unmuth stated that this did happen to the Woodland Creek neighborhood and the City of Lacey did provide water to that neighborhood later down the road, which caused the people 25 years later to pay for it rather than it being paid for up front. In other words, are you going to pay me now or pay me later.

Mr. Unmuth stated that the Pollution Load Reduction study did come up with a recommendation for reducing that pollution in that creek and Henderson inlet by extending sewer services, and one of the benefits of that study is that now Thurston County can asked for funding. Mr. Unmuth asked if we want to jeopardize our ability to get that funding and do we want to tell the state to please give us money to extend sewer systems but in the meantime install more septic systems and wells in the area. Mr. Unmuth stated that in his opinion this would send the wrong message to the state. The application for this rezone states that it is because sewer and water is not available and Mr. Unmuth stated that he believes that they are not delivering water rights to the area. Mr. Unmuth hopes that we can be patient with a neighborhood like this because it is close to St. Peters hospital, shopping, I-5 and business districts. Mr. Unmuth stated that to take this out of the UGA would be a mistake and that the value of the property is its proximity to services and we can work around the other issues.

Allan Pap, 2820 Jorgenson Road NE
Mr. Pap stated that he lives to the north of the proposal and is in favor of the down zoning. Mr. Pap provided written testimony to the Commission from his wife who was unable to attend. Mr. Pap stated that he is also in favor of further down zoning this to 1:5 as his property is zoned. To remove this parcel from the UGA would also be acceptable to he and his wife. The drainage path is a great concern to he and his neighbors and that Jorgenson Creek in the area is fish bearing.

Tom Todd, 2812 Jorgenson Road NE
Mr. Todd stated that he is the owner of property to the north of the subject property and that his driveway is within 10-12 feet of his property line. Mr. Todd stated that he has noticed standing water on the northeastern portion of the subject property. He has not noticed standing water on the southeastern portion of the property, by has noticed plants that you would expect to see if there is water in that area. Mr. Todd stated that he is concerned with the septic system issues and the fish and runoff issues in that area. Mr. Todd and his wife feel strongly that a property owner should be able to develop their property, but the lower the density the better for the neighborhood. Mr. Todd stated that he and his wife are in favor of this down zoning and would even like to see this zoned even lower.

Lois Pospisil, 2835 Jorgenson Road NE
Ms. Pospisil stated that everything that has been mentioned she says also.
Paul Winder, 2710 Jorgenson Road NE
Mr. Winder stated that he built house with MC Construction nearby a few years ago. Mr. Winder stated that his neighbors are having issues with septic systems there. Mr. Winder explained that he has young children and would like to point out the issue that Pleasant Glade Elementary is nearby and there is no bus service in this area and that any development would cause there to be a tax assessment and he would like that to be considered. Mr. Winder stated that he is in favor of the down zoning but would not like to see a lot of homes there because there are no sidewalks.

Gayle Bundt 4526 Pleaseant Glade Road
Ms. Bundt stated that she lives south of proposal and that she planted trees in 2001 and those did not need to be watered because in the winter because there is water that flows through the parcel in question. Ms. Bundt explained that approximately two years ago there was so much water that went through the corner of Abernathy and Pleasant Glade their yard was taken out because the water went right through there. Ms. Bundt stated that there is always water through this area because the neighbor has ducks for about four months out of the year. Last year one portion of her property was under water. Ms. Bundt stated that she believes that this location was a lake at one time because there is sandy soil and there is always water there in the winter time. Ms. Bundt stated that she will be concerned if houses are built there and she is not sure if she is for or against the downzone but she does favor have sewer extended to this area.

Bonnie Blessing, 6123North Hill Drive
Ms. Blessing stated that she is in favor of the down zone and that this is a salmon bearing stream. Ms. Blessing stated that she believes Thurston County should assess whether or not this area is in a flood plane and fill should not be brought into an area of a salmon bearing stream.

Barbara Treadway,Res4530 Pleaseant Glade Road
Ms. Treadway stated that she is for the down zoning because she believes that there is no way it can support more than that. Ms. Treadway stated she is concerned about developing at all in that section and she sympathizes with the property owner but is concerned with how they would have access to any homes because this area is lowland with the critical course running through it. Ms. Treadway stated that she has lived in the are prior to the easter parcels being developed and she has witnessed a lot of geese and there was a wetland designated area and now there is only a very small amount of wildlife currently. Ms. Treadway is concerned with the use of chemicals in the area and what it is doing to the wildlife there.

Toby Juit 5011 Pleasant Glade Road
Mr. Juit stated that he is the owner of a thirty one acre farm to the south of the subject parcel and has farmed in this general area and there is a lot of water that moves through this property. Mr. Juit stated that the amount of water that moves through this property should be looked at and he is in favor of the downzone.

Elsa Mcdonald, 2930 Jorgenson Road
Ms. McDonald stated that her family has owned 10 acres at this location for 40 years and she is in favor of the downzone because there is a lot more water coming up in this area then before. Ms. McDonald stated that water has run across the road in some areas now and it was never
like this before. Ms. McDonald also stated that there used to be a lake in that area and the area now is changing and there is a lot of wildlife and fish in the creek. Ms. McDonald stated that the traffic is different now and there is a plan to extend the road to Carpenter Road, but that the road is not wide enough and access is an issue.

Curt McDonald, 2930 Jorgenson Road
Mr. McDonald stated that he walks in this area at night and the road and grass in that area gets very saturated. Mr. McDonald stated that he is always concerned where the water runs off to and that instead of down zoning to 0:4 it should be zoned one unit per acre. Mr. McDonald asked if the issue of salmon has been looked at.

Chair lane closed the public hearing the C-1 amendment at 8:15 p.m.

The Commission took a short break.

The Commission asked questions of staff concerning the issue of salmon on Jorgenson creek that was raised during the public testimony. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Clark stated that the County is planning to seek a Centennial Grant in order to place a lift station that would service Woodland Creek Estates, but there is no plan for anything beyond that. A discussion ensued concerning the issues of this property.

The Commission discussed the additional choice that Mr. Burns and the City of Lacey offered which was to remove the entire area of the proposed Comp Plan Amendment C-1 from the UGA by denying this proposal and then removing it from the UGA at a later time.

Commissioner Nelson stated that the public was told that the Commission would deliberate over the public testimony received this evening at the next regular meeting on November 19, 2008, and that the Commission should not continue to deliberate this evening because the majority of the public has left this meeting. The Commission agreed.

Staff was asked to find out what the soil types are in the area of the proposed C-2 amendment because of the issue of high ground water that was raised during public testimony. Mr. Clark explained that the soils in this area are glacial till with little infiltration. A discussion ensued.

Staff was asked for clarification concerning the proposed C-1 amendment as to whether or not septic systems would be allowed with development of that area as proposed if this is approved. Mr. Davis stated that approval of this proposed amendment would possibly allow septic systems to be installed.

7. **8:30 P.M. (W) CRITICAL AREAS ORDINANCE**
   *(Staff: Cynthia Wilson)*

   The Commission asked staff what section of the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) they would be reviewing this evening. Ms. Wilson stated that the General Purposes and Definition sections were scheduled for this evening’s Worksession and those sections were provided in a previous
mailing to the Commission. Ms. Wilson left the meeting to make copies of those sections of the CAO for the Commission.

**Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment continued discussion:**
The Commission again discussed the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment C-1, specifically, that the approval would come with specific conditions and whether or not those conditions would accomplish the goal of the Commission to protect Woodland Creek, future availability of sewer and water in that area, and whether or not this would meet urban density requirements. Staff was asked whether or not there has been any development in the area of the proposed amendment. Mr. Davis explained that there has been no development on this site.

**CAO discussion:**
Mr. Clark stated that he is going to recommend to the BOCC that the entire CAO be re-written to an eighth grade level to make this an easier document for the public to read and understand. The Commission explained to Mr. Clark that this was recommended two years ago, and it was agreed that it would be better to make this change during the next update period because the Commission would have to re-review the entire CAO because the new version would be so different. A discussion ensued. The Commission suggested to staff that this should either be done in two years during the next update, or create a readers guide as a companion to the current CAO. Mr. Clark stated that he will provide the Commission with some options on this issue for discussion before taking this to the BOCC.

Ms. Wilson returned and provided the Commission with the following:
- Thurston County Planning Commission Public Hearing Draft, Amendments to the Critical Areas Regulations, TCC 17.15.100 General Purposes and TCC 7.15.200 Definitions
- CAO Chapter: 17.15.200 Definitions table containing issues and comments, draft dated November 5, 2008

Mr. Clark asked that the Commission be prepared for the November 19, 2008 meeting to discuss and make a recommendation to the BOCC on the Comp Plan Amendments, and then review the CAO Definition chapter. Mr. Clark will reschedule the Chehalis Tribe briefing that was scheduled for the November 19, 2008 meeting to a later date.

**Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment continued discussion:**
Commissioner Cole asked if the Commission is permitted to add the conditions associated with the C-1 Comp Plan Amendment. Mr. Clark stated that the prosecuting attorney’s office has said that conditions can be added.

9. **8:45 PM ADJOURNMENT**
With there being no further business, Chair Lane adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

________________________________________
Chris Lane, Chair

Prepared by Cami Petersen, Recording Secretary