1.  **6:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER**
   Commissioner Nelson called the June 15, 2011 meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

   **Attendance:** Commissioners, Scott Nelson, Liz Kohlenberg, Christine Spaulding, Jennifer Davis, Kathleen O’Connor, Bill Jackson & Christopher Earle

   **Absent:** Edward Fleisher & Chris Lane

   **Staff:** Andrew Deffobis, Cynthia Wilson, Scott Clark, Scott Longanecker & Paul Brewster – Thurston Regional Planning Council

2.  **6:30 P.M. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

    **MOTION:** Commissioner O’Connor moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner Spaulding seconded. Motion carried.

3.  **6:31 P.M. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS (Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)**

    To hear public testimony please use the following link: http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.html

    No members of the audience chose to speak.

4.  **6:40 P.M. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

    **Commissioner O’Connor moved to approve the May 18, 2011 minutes and accept the audio as the official record. Commissioner Earle seconded. Motion carried.**

5.  **6:41 P.M. Presentation: Natural Hazards Mitigation Planning**

    **Staff:** Paul Brewster – Thurston Regional Planning Council

    Mr. Brewster was introduced by Mr. Clark. Mr. Brewster has written the Hazards Mitigation Plan for the region. Mr. Deffobis also stated that a lot of the critical areas that we regulate under the ordinance are influenced by the hazards that Mr. Brewster will be discussing specifically our land slide hazard areas, frequently flooded areas and volcanic hazard areas. The plan is also available online at the planning website.

    Mr. Brewster started by acknowledging that the Thurston County Emergency Management provided the funding to update Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan and the plan was developed under the management of the Thurston County Emergency
Management Council. Mr. Brewster's presentation ensued. The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 amended the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by: Establishing mitigation funding programs, requiring State, Tribal and Local Governments to have a FEMA-approved mitigation plan in order to receive federal mitigation grants and the plan must be updated, adopted and reapproved every five years. Requirements for local plans are found in 44 CFR Section 201.6. Hazard Mitigation Grant Programs are provided after disaster declaration and available statewide. Pre-Disaster Mitigation funds are provided prior to a disaster and are more competitive as a larger pool of applicants may apply. Flood Mitigation Assistance funds are to implement measures that reduce or eliminate the long term risk of flood damage to structures. There is also Severe Repetitive Loss. Mitigation Grant Program Funding in Washington State is in the millions of dollar range. The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program supports: retrofitting structures and facilities to minimize damages from high winds, earthquake, flood, wildfire or other natural hazards; acquisition, elevations or relocation of structures in hazard prone areas; construction activities such as rerouting or placing utility lines underground, upgrading storm drainage and culverts; and development or revision of hazard mitigation plans. The core plan which is region wise is adopted by every jurisdiction and consists of six sections of planning; the introduction, plan process an development, Thurston County Community Profile, risk assessment, mitigation goals and initiatives and adoption, implementation, monitoring and maintenance. The planning team consists of the Emergency Management Council of Thurston County, Hazards Mitigation Planning Workgroup and Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) staff.

A risk assessment is conducted with factual basis for mitigation strategy. Hazard profiles are for earthquakes, storms, flooding, landslides, wild land fires and volcanic events. Summary risk assessments for hazards are then profiled within Thurston County and a hazards profile created. Goals of this were then discussed. The mitigation initiatives are an action designed to reduce or eliminate losses resulting from the effects of hazards, prioritize, hazard-specific, categorized by function, related to goals and objectives and countywide initiatives adopted by every jurisdiction. A base year of 2006 and forecast year of 2030 was also used to find the total population/employment dwelling units that would occur in those hazard areas. The 2007 buildable lands update to inform a portion of the forecast plus data from the Thurston County Assessor. Each jurisdiction is responsible for implementing their mitigation initiatives through a comprehensive plan, comprehensive emergency management plans, critical areas ordinance and capital facilities plan. The plan is monitored by a plan steward with emergency management council of Thurston County who reviews the plan on an annual basis and does an assessment after a significant disaster event. Annexes are the responsibility of the jurisdiction. The Emergency Management Council and the workgroup will oversee revisions to the core plan. Revisions are performed and distributed by Thurston County Emergency Management. Procedures exist to add new communities to the plan between update cycles.

6. **7:31 P.M. WORK SESSION:** Development Code A-9 Agritourism, Wineries/Breweries
   *Staff: Scott Longanecker*

Mr. Longanecker asked the Commission if they had a chance to review the chart (attachment B of A-9 staff report) and if it was helpful. The Commission agreed that the
chart was helpful in answering some of the questions they had from the last work session. Commissioner O’Connor stated that she had sent Mr. Longanecker an e-mail that he may not have received before the meeting in regards to a land use project that was unpermitted so that he could look into how the process was carried out to fix the situation. Within the table it shows what already exists and then what is proposed.

The development standards were then discussed including camp grounds and cabins. It was discussed leaving Nature tourism and Geotourism out of the document. The purpose of the Development Code was then discussed and language was reviewed to try and make the purpose much simpler and to delete language and requirements that already exist within other code. Commissioner Spaulding would like to know why the overlay district boundaries were made to only cover certain areas of the county and would like to see it apply to all rural areas in Thurston County. Mr. Longanecker agreed that the Planning Commission should make a recommendation to expand the area and also to have some members of the group that created the boundary come to a Planning Commission meeting to discuss. The Commission would also like to see other ordinance examples from different states. A further discussion ensued. Mr. Clark and Mr. Longanecker will be working on the draft further so that it will go from macro to micro.

Mr. Longanecker gave the planning commission a hand out for the findings they wanted on Development Code A-7 and A-10.

7. 8:22 P.M. WORK SESSION: Critical Areas Ordinance Reasonable Use Exception
   Staff: Andrew Deffobis, Cynthia Wilson & Scott Clark

Mr. Deffobis handed out to the planning commission (PC) the new three draft chapters that were broken off from the Geo Hazards Chapter of the CAO. The three chapters are Volcanic, Mine and Seismic Hazards and they had been tabbed to be placed into the PC’s CAO binder. A memorandum was also handed out entitled Critical Areas Ordinance Update – Current and Proposed CAO Comparison Table that some of the PC members had been asking for.

The purpose of the discussion tonight was to take in the PC’s concerns, questions and comments on the Reasonable Use Exception Chapter. Ms. Wilson stated that the PC was given the Reasonable Use Exception Chapter to read and it was not very long and has not substantially changed from the current chapter except clarifying language and/or additional language. This is the chapter that people will refer to when the proposal they have applied for etc. has been prohibited or does not meet the standards within a particular chapter. Usually when you are talking about a reasonable use you are either discussing recreation, residential, commercial or a smaller structure. Because reasonable use by definition implies that there will be an impact because they are not meeting those standards we do allow for some off site mitigation.

Since this is an existing process the cost associated with it was brought up by the PC. It was said that when we have the opportunity to simplify these regulations in terms of reasonable administrative costs or reasonable costs for the citizen Commissioner Spaulding believes this should be done. Staff charges a base fee then projects that take longer than the projected base time are charged on an hourly basis.
Mr. Davis will be discussing the draft new chapters that were broken off from Geo Hazards; Volcanic, Mine and Seismic Hazards at the July 6, 2011 Planning Commission meeting. The PC was asked to send any questions to Mr. Davis via e-mail. Mr. Deffobis and Ms. Wilson will not be attending the next Planning Commission meeting on July 6, 2011.

8. 8:39 P.M. STAFF UPDATES

- Mr. Deffobis position has been extended through a grant extension. Mr. Clark is also working on receiving further funding for another staff member to continue to work on PDR & TDR.
- The Prairie hearing is on Thursday, July 7, 2011.

9. 8:40 P.M. CALENDAR

July 6, 2011 – Chris Earle will not be in attendance.

10. 8:41 PM ADJOURN

With there being no further business, Commissioner Nelson adjourned the meeting at 8:41 p.m.

Scott Nelson, Commissioner

Prepared by Carrie Toebbe, Recording Secretary