1. **6:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Lane called the August 15, 2012 meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

**Attendance:** Chair Chris Lane, Commissioners Bill Jackson, Scott Nelson, Christopher Earle, Edward Fleisher & Christine Spaulding

**Absent:** Jennifer Davis, Liz Kohlenberg & Kathleen O'Connor

**Staff:** Mark Swartout, Jeremy Davis, Cliff Moore, Roger Giegelhaus & Kerry Hibdon, Parks Operations and Maintenance Manager

**Guest:** Randy Young, Henderson & Young, Jennifer Kenny, City of Olympia

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

The meeting audio from this meeting did not start recording until 6:40 during the middle of the Work Session on the Olympia Comprehensive Plan Update. If a motion was made or public comment was given at this time it was not recorded or documented.

The official audio is available on line at:

http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.html

**Note:** The meeting minutes for this date are not verbatim but are detailed to contain action items and discussion along with research of explanation.

3. **6:45 P.M. WORK SESSION: Olympia Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Staff:** Jennifer Kenny, City of Olympia

Jennifer Kenny with the City of Olympia gave a brief over view of the changes that have been made to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. A hand out was given to the PC called Olympia Comprehensive Plan Update – July Draft 2012, Chapter Summary: Olympia’s Vision. The website for the hand out can be viewed at imagineolympia.com.

The city has gone to web based format therefore cutting the size of the Comp Plan in half. Extensive public outreach has been done including work done with their Planning Commission. They will start their deliberation process at the end of August. Public testimony will be allowed during the PC’s deliberations. They hope to bring a draft from the PC to the City Council in January 2013.
One of the major changes is a proposal for sub area plans/neighborhood plans. Most general comments are that the public is encouraging staff and the PC to continue doing what they are doing and move forward.

Some general questions were then asked by the County’s PC about particular building’s staying in with the feel of the downtown Olympia area. There are also currently no zoning changes proposed.

The PC and staff were again encouraged to go to the website at imagineolympia.com and view the changes. All of the deliberation results will be posted on line afterward.

4. **6:53 P.M. Presentation: Henderson and Young – Consultants for Impact Fees**

   **Staff: Randy Young & Scott Clark**

Mr. Clark introduced Randy Young who was contracted by Thurston County about two years ago to do an impact fee study. The impact fee study would look at the cost to infrastructure improvements related to transportation, parks and recreation, schools and fire. Mr. Young is from Henderson and Young and will be taking the PC through the background on impact fees, how the process was developed, the modeling and methodology and where we are at now.

Mr. Young discussed the main differences between SEPA and impact fees. Under SEPA, short plats have a statutory exemption. Examples of when developers and property owners need to pay for impact fees were then given. If you are responsible for an impact fee then you only have to pay it once.

These are done by the Government because there is never enough money to provide for all of the impact fees and Capital fees that are needed. This is because of taxes. Growth can be charged for growth, growth cannot be charged at impact fees for a pre-existing deficiency. There is also a nexus requirement which means the amount of the fee is proportionate to the amount of the impact. There can be no double charging. If the local government already has money ready for a part of an impact fee that can be deducted from what the developer or property owner would be paying as well. The policy also says that you cannot rely on impact fees solely. The money that is allocated has to be spent on the impact fee within ten years or returned. In order for the impact fees to go forward the Capital Facilities Plan Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan has to have the same list of projects that are on the impacts fee list or vice versa.

A growth chart was then shown and explained. It is the official forecast in the currently adopted Comprehensive plan. The forecast goes out to the year 2030. The total cost for the project list is $217,000,000.00. It was explained then how impact fees will contribute less than a third of the project list amount. Then the complex math analysis that helps each zone come to the impact fee amount that will be paid on a single family residence, parks, and transportation.
The Parks Impact Fee Rate Study and Transportation Impact Fee Rate Study are available at:  
and  
http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/impact/docs/transportation-impact-fee-rate-study-201204.pdf

Mr. Clark asked that if the PC comes up with any further questions to contact him and he will find out the answer.

5. **7:36 P.M. WORK SESSION: Capital Facilities Plan**  
*Staff: Mark Swartout*

Mr. Clark gave a brief introduction of Mr. Swartout.

Mr. Swartout stated that he had sent the PC a copy of the power point presentation that he will be going over this evening and the six year tables of the preliminary Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) for 2013 – 2018. Mr. Swartout added the table for the year 2012 to the PC’s copy’s they received so that they could see the differences in last year’s CFP and this year’s proposed CFP. The preliminary CFP is also on the website at:

http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/cap-facilities-plan/cap_facilities_home.htm

The CFP project description is also available at the same website location. This shows what policies are being implemented and a description.

The BOCC does not approve the projects that are listed in the CFP that is through a separate process. The funding sources are listed on each page of each proposal. You cannot do a capital project within the county if it is not within the CFP. This forces the project managers and Commissioners to add projects that are projected a ways out into the future that may come. In the event that a funding source is found sooner than later the only way the project can be started is if it is listed within the CFP for the year. The dollar amount listed within the CFP does not have to be exact only close to the amount listed. The CFP can also only be amended once a year. Some examples were then given.

The time line for the annual CFP update schedule was then discussed. The key GMA requirements for the CFP are: 1.) the GMA Planning Goals 2.) CFP Required Content 3.) CFP consistency with the County budget 4.) GMA and State grants and loans and 5.) GMA Sanctions for non-compliance. The GMA Planning Goals ensure that the public facilities and services are in place when development is ready for occupancy and use…without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards. The CFP required content is inventory of existing facilities, with locations and capacity, forecast of future needs, County capital facilities – objectives and policies and a six year plan for financing that is within projected funding capacity and identifies sources of public funding. It also requires that if funding falls short that we will reassess land use and ensure that land use, CFP and CFP’s financing plan are coordinated and consistent. This would usually pertain to a lower level of service.
The CFP has to be consistent with the County’s budget. The CFP and the annual budget are always consistent and therefore, the two are adopted at the same time so the first year of the CFP can be consistent with the coming year’s annual budget. Penalties for non-compliance, which are grants that are put in jeopardy; Centennial Clean Water Fund (Capital Projects only), State Revolving Fund (Capital Projects only), Public Works Trust Fund, FEMA – Hazard Mitigation Program and then there are other grants that give preference for being in compliance. The Governor may sanction certain state funds to the County i.e. the motor vehicle fuel tax, transportation improvement tax, urban and rural arterial trust accounts, sales and use tax, liquor profit and excise tax and real estate excise tax (REET).

The process for projects making it onto the list of the CFP was then discussed. Each department uses a unique set of ranking and priority setting criteria based on their circumstances. Examples of criteria being used are then given and are: regulatory requirements – compliance, public health and safety, planning – which addresses capacity and asset management, effectiveness – which addresses multiple issues, the ability to implement – costs and technologically feasible, prevent property damage – which reduces the county’s risk, vision statement which meets the goals of solid waste comprehensive management plan and sustainability which meets social, environmental, and economic sustainability goals. Public Works – Water and Sewer Utility Basis for project priorities were then given.

The Parks Facilities have no new projects this year and they didn’t drop any. The total six-year expense for Parks Facilities is $11,886,000. Solid Waste Facilities have no new projects this year and they didn’t drop any. They did complete the Rainier Drop Box Improvements. The total six-year expense for Solid Waste Facilities is $7,430,000. The Stormwater Facilities added Munson Road at Swift Creek and Capital Facility Replacement Assessments to their list. They dropped Hidden Forest Outfall and Evergreen Terrace at Sitka. They completed the Countryside Acquisition and Woodland Creek Pollutant Reduction. The total six-year expense for Stormwater Facilities is $7,518,000. Water and Sewer have no new projects this year and they didn’t drop any. The total six-year expense for Water and Sewer is $12,259,900. Transportation Facilities added Cooper Point Road and Kaiser Road, Yelm Highway Capacity Projects, Steilacoom Road Phase I, Steilacoom Road Phase II, Smart Corridors, 15th Avenue NE and Draham Road NE (Olympia City limits to Draham NE, which is several projects lumped into one) and 15th Avenue NE and Draham Road NE (15th to Carpenter Road) and Pacific Avenue pedestrian enhancements. They also added Old Highway 99 Rural Capacity projects, SR12 Grand Mound West UGA Boundary to US99, Delphi Road Upgrade Phase III and run-off-road and Intersection Safety project. The revised projects for Transportation Facilities were Yelm Highway Bridge 0-12 replacement at Burlington RR Crossing combined with Yelm Highway Capacity project IV and Littlerock Road Bridge L-5 Replacement at Bloom’s Ditch combined with Littlerock Road and 115th Avenue intersection improvements. Many of these projects were combined. The completed projects for Transportation Facilities were Yelm Highway Capacity project – Henderson to Rich Road, Carpenter Road Capacity project – widen to 4 lanes – Pacific Avenue to Martin Way except within the city. Also Noschka Culvert and McCorkle Road SE 113th Avenue to Old Highway 99. The total six-year expense for Transportation Facilities is $54,818,600. The new projects for County Buildings are the ARC Expansion.
– work release and ARC Flex Unit. The dropped projects for County Buildings are Mansard roof replacement and emergency power projects. The completed projects of County Buildings are Arc implementation of consultant recommendations, building #5 tenant improvements and Tilley master plan Public Works and the EOC building. The total six-year expense is $41,981,149. Conservation Futures has no new projects. The completed projects were the Mill’s property acquisition and Whitewater Ranch shoreline protection. The total six-year expense is $10,667,634.

The total effect on local taxes and fees is that there are no proposed changes. The summary of the six year financial plan has the total this year at $146,561,286 and was $156,998,654 last year.


6. **8:04 P.M. WORK SESSION: Comprehensive Plan Parks & Recreation Element**

*Staff: Roger Giebelhaus, Utility Planner, Cliff Moore, Director of Resource Stewardship & Doug Bell, Chair of Advisory Board for Parks*

Mr. Clark gave a brief introduction of Mr. Giebelhaus, Mr. Moore and Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell gave a brief history of what has been going on with the Comprehensive Plan in regards to the Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces section (Chapter 9). There is currently a version of this Chapter that was completed in 2002. Then in 2008 there was an attempt in upgrading the version but at the end of the process the budget crisis hit and due to the aggressiveness of the document it was not approved. The Chapter has now been reviewed again by many including the advisory board to try and move the draft forward for approval. Some brief examples of reasons why certain aspects of the changes made to the Chapter were then given including citizen input. A map was shown of the Thurston County Park system.

Commissioner Fleisher commented on the list of parks and recreation values and that he noticed that none of the values that are listed acknowledge ecological function or values. The focus seems to be on social and community values. He encouraged them to look at the natural values that are associated with the park. Preserves were brought up as being part of that value but are not listed as an active use.

Mr. Giebelhaus explained that at this time there are really two tracks the plan is taking. The Parks Board has done a fair share of writing the Plan already. Changes to the Comp Plan were made back in 2002 and those have been struck out and the new information infused into the new plan. The old language is within the Capital Facilities Plan and is not in Chapter 9 Environment. There is language within the existing Capital Facilities Plan and within the proposed one that deals with Parks policies and level of service that is also being transferred to this new Chapter. This approach more fully integrated the operations of Parks and Recreation overall into the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Parks and Recreation Board is also working on a standalone Parks and Recreation Plan that will be more detailed that was presented this evening in the Comprehensive Plan.
The Plan is scheduled to be adopted by the end of the year. The hope is to schedule a public hearing on this subject by the first meeting in October. The Growth Management Act requires the County to include a Parks Element in its Comprehensive Plan and this is how that requirement will be met.

Commissioner Nelson asked why on page 9-12 it says that there is 33 sites, 2,600 acres, 12 active parks, 6 preserves, 3 historic sites and 12 trail properties which according to the map is 700 or 800 acres but on the next page (map 9-13) it says TC (Thurston County) has 288 of developed and operational parks plan and trails. The level of service numbers don’t seem to add up.

Mr. Hibdon looked at both of the maps and agreed that there may be some inconsistency that will need to be adjusted. Mr. Moore states that the adjustments will be made and given to the PC at the next PC meeting in September.

Commissioner Fleisher suggested cutting the section down that is given through about seven pages of the document on the background on parks.

Commissioner Earle suggested that on page 9-31 some of the parks and open space items should be advanced in the priority list. There is also some overlap in the acquisition policies; i.e. number 4 is almost the same as goal number 4. Acquisition policy number 3 is too vague.

A short discussion on other issues that include parks was had. Staff will be working on making the changes and bringing this issue back to the PC sometime in October.

7. **8:37 P.M. Set Public Hearing: Ag Reconsiderations for September 19, 2012**
   **Staff: Jeremy Davis & Scott Clark**

Mr. Davis stated that at the last PC meeting they were asked to come back today and have a public hearing set for the Agricultural Lands Reconsideration.

A short discussion ensued. Due to the amount of information requested and further review that will be necessary it was decided upon to wait to schedule the public hearing.

8. **8:43 PM ADJOURN**

With there being no further business, Chair Lane adjourned the meeting at 8:43 p.m.

[Signature]
Chris Lane, Chair

Prepared by Carrie Toebbe, Recording Secretary