1. **6:30 PM CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Lane called the August 19, 2009 meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

**Attendance:** Chair Chris Lane, Commissioners Scott Nelson, Liz Myers, Karen Rogers, Tom Cole, Kathleen O’Connor, William Jackson and Christopher Earle.

**Absent:** Commissioner Liz Kohlenberg

**Staff:** Scott Clark, Olivia Terwilleger and Cami Petersen

2. **6:31 PM APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

3. **6:32 PM PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS (Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)**

*Sue Danver, Foothills Lane, Olympia*

Ms. Danver provided and read a printed copy of her comments. A copy of her comments are made an attachment to these minutes.

*Commissioner Myers arrived at 6:35 p.m.*

*Commissioner Nelson arrived at 6:38 p.m.*

4. **6:40 PM APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Commissioner O’Connor moved to approve the August 5, 2009 minutes. Commissioner Cole seconded.

The following corrections were made to the August 5, 2009 minutes:
- On page one, line 10, add staff member Molly Levitt
- On page one, line 13, correct the spelling of Commissioner O’Connor’s last name
- On page one, line 39, change the word “are” to “area”
- On page two, line 42, add the word “are” between “analysis” and “used”

**Motion carried as amended.**

5. **6:45 PM BRIEFING: MINERAL LANDS**

*Staff: Olivia Terwilleger*

Ms. Terwilleger provided the Planning Commission (Commission) a copy of comment letters
received from the following:

a. Email from Howard Glastetter, April 13, 2009
b. Tom Cook, August 11, 2009
c. Tom Cook, August 13, 2009

Ms. Terwilleger provided a brief explanation of the process the Mineral Lands Task Force (MLTF) and the Asphalt Advisory Task Force (AATF) have taken to arrive at the Final Reports presented to the Commission tonight. The MLTF provided self introduction. The members in attendance were: Susan Marke, Lester Olson, Mark Segale, Don Leaf, Tom Cook and Dean Smith. Ms. Terwilleger, the Commission and the MLTF went over all recommendations that have been made by the MLTF and the following points were discussed:

- **B-3**: The minority vote which wanted to restrict the designation of new sites to only every seven years during the GMA required periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) instead of doing this on an annual basis was discussed by the MLTF and the Commission. A discussion then ensued concerning mineral lands mapping, Comp Plan review, the designation process for mineral lands and the critical areas involved. The Commission expressed concerns that mapping the mineral resource has still not been done in Thurston County. Mr. Clark stated that only two counties in Washington has been mapped for mineral lands and that Thurston County would not likely have the funds necessary to complete this mapping process for quite some time.

- **B-4 & B-5**: The Commission and the MLTF discussed the proposed 20 year designation, how this number is decided on, and if a larger projected time designation would be appropriate or not. Two processes are referred to in B4 and B5 in which the designation is done. The Commission and the MLTF discussed both options.

- **B-7**: The Commission asked questions about the co-designation of Ag Lands and Mineral Lands, and a discussion ensued concerning the reality of Mineral Lands being in an Ag Land area and the reclamation of that after mining.

- **B-8**: The Commission asked the MLTF how the group determined that Mineral Lands may contain Class 3 & 4 wetlands. A discussion ensued concerning the designation of wetlands today versus when the MLTF met several years ago, and the protective buffer areas. The MLTF expressed that this is intended to be a “screening process” and further detail would be look at on a site-specific basis during the permitting process. Mr. Clark explained that a legal review would occur before the designation criteria were put into affect and the necessary wording changes would be made at that time. Mr. Clark was asked if a map could be created that would remove all properties in the County which would not meet the designation criteria in an effort to show visually how much land would be left for designation. Mr. Clark explained that this was attempted a few years ago and the map was un-readable because of all of the information needed to remove the parcels from the mapping. It was explained that adding the buffers into the mapping created a map that basically was black and showed nothing. A new map could be attempted and Mr. Clark will look into this with his new GIS staff.
• B-13: A concern was raised by the Commission concerning the 500 ft. buffer from residential zoning referred to in Test 3.

• B-15: The Commission asked if this designation criteria, which allows the possible inclusion of important habitats and species would be “trumped” by the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). Mr. Clark explained that it would be and that an individual could request a review of a parcel for site specific conditions. The Commission was reminded that these criteria are looking at the designation of Mineral Lands and not at the actual permitting review process. The designation would be a broader view and the permitting process would review in greater detail each site specific application. The Commission asked if a parcel not designated as Mineral Lands could ask for this designation. Mr. Clark will look at this and provide more information at the next Mineral Lands works session.

The Commission thanked the MLTF for providing additional information to the Commission.

8:18PM The Asphalt Advisory Task Force (AATF) were introduced and the following members provided self introductions. The members in attendance were: Susan Marke, Lester Olson, Mark Segale, Ron Nelson, Don Leaf, Howard Glastetter, Tom Zamzow, Steve Willis.

Ms. Terwilleger, the Commission and the AATF went over all recommendations that have been made by the AATF and the following points were discussed:

• Item 1 – A member of the AATF stated that he would have voted no on this issue if he had been in attendance when this discussion occurred. The title of this topic has recently been changed and should have been titled “Consistent with Comprehensive Plan and Sub Area Plans.” A discussion ensued.

8:20 p.m. Commissioner Rogers left.

The AATF stated that this report should note that not everyone was in attendance so the information contained in this recommendation is most likely inaccurate to the thinking of the entire group. Some items appear to have been changed or items discussed are missing from this recommendation. The AATF had discussed Accessory Use and voted unanimously that an asphalt plant would not be considered an Accessory Use, but would be permitted use.

A Commission member asked that the comments and corrections discussed for this final report at a previous Commission meeting be added to this final report. Mr. Clark stated that this has been done and any other comments from the Commission may be presented in a majority/minority/staff report for the final recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

• Item 6: A member of the AATF stated that this item could possibly conflict with the NPDES permit because this permit states that it must follow the DOE manual and Thurston County may not do that.

• Items 11 and 12: A Commissioner asked why there is such a difference in the distances required from residential district denser than 1/5 versus ½ mile from residences or public gathering places, versus 300 feet from residential areas. It was
explained that the AATF discuss these distances, voted on them, and discussed them again on this report shows the outcome of those discussions. It was also explained that the AATF had a panel of experts come to the meetings to discuss these distances and explain the different buffer requirements due to the newer technology and other experience.

- Item 13: A discussion ensued about reclamation of mines. A member of the AATF stated that a no vote was not listed on this table for this item.

- Item 17: A member of the AATF stated that they are concerned that some of the items in this table have been changed without the group having a chance to review the changes. Ms. Terwilleger stated that this table was created from the minutes of the AATF meetings, which were posted on the website for all members to review. The AATF member explained that the way Item 17 is written is inaccurate and does not reflect a majority opinion of the AATF.

- Item 24: A member of the AATF stated that the concern discussed was not the 5-year review itself, but what would be reviewed and what could be implemented at the 5-year review concerning asphalt plants. Specifically the AATF discussed changes in technology that could require the operator to spend millions of dollars in order to meet changing technological improvements if that were a requirement of a 5-year review.

- Item 25: A member of the AATF stated that this is an item on the table that has been changed from earlier meetings. This item used to say that RAP must be stored under a roof structure. The April 13, 2009 email from Howard Glastetter was referred to. A discussion ensued concerning the covering of RAP.

Ms. Terwilleger stated that the remainder of information in the AATF recommendation contains other comments and considerations that the AATF discussed, but did not vote on.

A discussion ensued about the restrictions, if any, on haul routes.

A member of the AATF requested that the comments and considerations be changed to a minority report, but other members of the AATF explained that most of these comments and considerations were not given the same amount of time for discussion as the items in the recommendation table. The facilitator, after all of these issues were presented and discussed, identified the items in the table in which the AATF would like come to consensus. However, the remainder of the items could be considered a minority report because at least two members agreed on each of the comments and considerations.

The Commission thanked the AATF and the MLTF for the work that they have done and for participating in tonight’s discussion.

5. **9:00PM STAFF UPDATES**

*Staff: Scott Clark*

Mr. Clark provided the Commission with the following staff updates:

- Mineral Lands Work Plan – Mr. Clark stated that the work plan provided by Ms.
Terwilleger is realistic and the next work session will be held on September 16, 2009, and a draft ordinance will be presented at that time. A public hearing will then hopefully be scheduled on October 7, 2009, but this date could be changed if necessary. The moratorium will expire on October 24, 2009 and the public hearing and a decision must be made before that time. Mr. Clark will also ask his new GIS mappers to attempt to create a map removing all areas of the County that would not meet the criteria for Mineral Lands as discussed earlier.

- Critical Areas Ordinance – Mr. Clark stated that Ms. Petersen has cleaned up the strike-out version of the CAO so staff can review this “clean” document to see if it makes sense before starting the seven year update.
- Drainage Manual – Mr. Clark explained that a new Thurston County Drainage Manual has recently been adopted by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), which is similar to that of the Department of Ecology. This new manual will become affective on November 15, 2009.
- Fireworks – The Commission had asked a question at a previous meeting as to whether or not the County could regulate fireworks. Mr. Clark explained that counties are able to regulate the date and times that fireworks can be shot off, but the tribal lands cannot be regulated. The Commission can decide if they want to discuss this and forward a recommendation to the BOCC.
- Strategic Plan – Mr. Clark explained that the BOCC was presented with a methodology and Mr. Clark was asked to now write the Strategic Plan. The Commission will see this in the next few months.

6. **9:07 PM CALENDAR**

   September 2, 2009 – Commissioners Lane and O’Connor may not be able to attend.
   September 16, 2009 – Commissioners Cole and O’Connor may not be able to attend.

7. **9:09 PM ADJOURN**

   With there being no further business, Chair Lane adjourned the meeting at 9:09 p.m.

________________________
Chris Lane, Chair

Prepared by Cami Petersen, Recording Secretary
I observed the majority of the Mineral Lands Task Force meetings and the second half of the Asphalt Plant Task Force sessions. I substituted once for the Asphalt Task Force and perhaps once for the Mineral Lands Task Force.

I support Tom Cook’s analysis and recommendations to the Planning Commission.

I add the following comments:

1) A major component of the Asphalt Task Force was to establish criteria for siting asphalt plants. In fact, the review of code was partially requested by the BOCC because two asphalts plants had applied or were applying to locate near two National Wildlife Refuges in Thurston County.

However, criteria to possibly protecting the most sensitive wildlife habitat in our county were addressed very lightly. A minority of Task Force members recommended a 1000’ buffer from certain wildlife habitat which perfunctorily was rejected by the industry related members of the Task Force. Factors that would support a greater buffer than 300’, the buffer for some critical areas, were not discussed. These factors include, but are not limited to:

- Lights (especially at night),
- Noise (sound berms not required for wildlife, sound almost impossible to enforce),
- Diesel air (from trucks and industrial plants)
- Particulate matter > 2.5 microns
- Particulate < 2.5 microns
- Migration needs of wildlife

I will get copies of an article regarding the dangers of particulate matter from Science News and a chapter of amphibians’ needs of 3 kilometers for migration (from a December 2008 book).

2) The industry assumes and concludes that concrete plants and asphalt plants are logically best located at the site of the aggregate. I believe that this assumption should be studied with models. Since science shows that traffic is the greatest source of PM< 2.5 microns, does it not make sense that plants be located near major arterials, and away from schools, hospitals and wildlife refuges to protect the schools, hospitals and wildlife refuges? Often, industry uses arterials to deliver their product.
3) Economic studies have been done to show the economic values of a healthy ecological wetland, prairie, and/or other critical area. Should not such studies be incorporated into the Task Force Review? The loss of functioning critical areas, especially wetlands, cannot be overlooked.

4) Concrete plants located at aggregate sites are closed when the aggregate is expended. It would be wise to visit whether it might be logical to continue the operation of these plants by hauling in aggregate instead of making an entirely new plant especially if it is near a sensitive wildlife area.

I would hope the Planning Commission would look at these issues. Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Sue Danver