1. **6:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER**

   Chair Lane called the June 6, 2012 meeting of the Thurston County Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.

   **Attendance:** Chair: Chris Lane Commissioners: Kathleen O’Connor, Ed Fleisher, Scott Nelson, Liz Kohlenberg, Bill Jackson, Jennifer Davis & Christopher Earle

   **Absent:** Commissioners: Christine Spaulding

   **Staff:** Scott Clark, Jeremy Davis, Olivia Story, Chris Hawkins with PHSS and Art Starry PHSS director

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

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

   The agenda item numbers 5 & 6 have been switched.

3. **6:31 P.M. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   **Commissioner O’Connor moved to table the minutes till the following Planning Commission meeting for adequate review.**

4. **6:32 P.M. STAFF UPDATES**

   Mr. Clark provided the following staff updates:

   - A new planner was hired and started, Christy Osborn. Ms. Osborn will be working on the CAO including proof reading and final changes. She will be assigned to other projects after the final changes are completed including Long Term Agriculture.
   - The CAO is available on line.
   - Cynthia Wilson has secured additional money for shorelines. A technical GIS person will be hired to work through starting this project again. A science team will also be created to do peer review.
   - The Habitat Conservation Plan is in progress. The next meeting is to discuss covered activities.
   - The hearing for impact fees is on the 19th at 6:00 p.m.
   - Staff did have their hearing before the Washington Growth Management Hearings Board on Mineral Lands and should hear something within fifteen to thirty days on how it goes.
5. **6:37 P.M. CALENDAR**

- June 20, 2012 – Chair Lane & Commissioner Kohlenberg will not be in attendance.

6. **6:39 P.M. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS** (Not associated with topics for which public hearings have been held.)

1. **Dave Lewis with Miles Sand and Gravel – 400 Valley Avenue NE Puyallup, WA**  
   Spoke in regards to Asphalt Plants & Mineral Lands

2. **Dean Smith with Lakeside Industries – Spoke in regards to Asphalt Plants & Mineral Lands**

   *Mark Biden with ORCAA spoke in regards to what HAP stands for which is “Hazardous Air Pollutants”.

The official audio is available online at:

[http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.html](http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.html)

7. **6:44 P.M. WORK SESSION: Health & Human Services Comprehensive Plan**  
   **Chapter**
   **Staff:** Jeremy Davis & Chris Hawkins, Active Healthy Communities Coordinator, PHSS

Mr. Clark gave a brief history on the subject. The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) about two years ago was seeking on how to integrate health back into zoning and planning.

Mr. Hawkins was introduced from the Public Health Services Department. Only three other jurisdictions have integrated health back into the comprehensive plan. Again in 2010 the BOCC placed a comprehensive plan amendment on the docket to complete a new Health and Human Services Chapter for the TC Comp Plan. As the Chapter’s introduction states, public health from the national to the local levels has, to an increasing degree, recognized the importance of environmental and policy changes to the health of the population. In early 2011, the Board of health and leadership of the TC PHSS discussed the health issues to be included in the first Health & Human Services Chapter of the Comp Plan. The initial draft identified the following issues:

1. Access to Health Care
2. Environmental Public Health
3. Nutrition, Physical Activity and Obesity
4. Tobacco and Secondhand Smoke

The draft Chapter was presented to the Board of Health in September 2011 and again in February 2012, and PHSS staff worked after each presentation to resolve questions or incorporate suggestions made by the Board of Health. The current staff draft is
responsive to the Board’s direction and is ready for the PC to review and the public
review process.

The Draft Chapter consists of the following:

1. Introduction
   a. Purpose statement
   b. Authority and origins of planning in public health
   c. History
   d. Relationship to other chapter of the TC Comp Plan and relevant county
      policies
2. Background and Context
   a. Determinants of Health
   b. Current understanding of interactions between built environment and
      health
   c. Public health priorities in Thurston County
3. Thurston County Community Health Indicators
   a. Health data for decision making
   b. Access to health care
   c. Environmental health
   d. Health Living – chronic disease prevention
4. Goals, Objectives and Policies
   a. Access to Care Goals and Policies
   b. Environmental public health goals and policies
   c. Nutrition goals and policies
   d. Physical activity goals and policies
   e. Tobacco prevention goals and policies

Mr. Hawkins stated that certainly, the chapter does not contain all of our County’s health
concerns, but the four sections are ways to start beginning the process of winning the
battle as far as public health goes. These are the four most important things that staff can
actively work on right now that would make a difference in terms of preventing disease
and preventing early death.

Commissioner Kohlenberg asked why the Board of Health did not include Behavioral
Health. Mr. Hawkins said that there are some objectives within the draft but the subject
did not come out of the top four initial list.

Commissioner Fleisher asked, if the Board of Health, when going through the different
priorities, if they really belong in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Clark commented that
yes they did, but it was a debate and continues to be so. This is definitely a work in
progress. The policies that a community set influence the behaviors in the community
around the very issues discussed in the draft.

Mr. Hawkins took the PC through the draft in a quick manner after the series of
questions. Since today was an introduction of the draft, it was just to make the PC aware
of the issues coming forth to them. The PC will be sending comments to Mr. Hawkins if
they have them.
Commissioner O'Conner requested that during the next presentation by Mr. Hawkins that he bring back how PHSS deals with their public process or public presentations. Basically how they plan setting up to deal with the different issues with the public and how they process the information provided from said hearings. The draft dates were also requested for planning.

Commissioner Davis commented also that in particular as a planning commission their concerns are with the land use issues, rural land use and what can they as planning commissions do better in rural development. A lot of the references seemed to be urban based or city based. It does not seem clear about the planning commission's role within the process.

Mr. Clark noted that the PC will make a separate recommendation to the BOCC. Based on the discussion this evening they will probably end up calling out which things fit in the current way of the Comprehensive Plan of structure and putting certain issues elsewhere.

8. 7:39 P.M. GUEST SPEAKER/Presentation

Staff: Mark Goodman with ORCAA (Olympic Region Clean Air Authority)

Mr. Goodman was asked to come to the PC about air quality issues related to discharges related to asphalt plants because the county is looking for some information from the State to help shape the asphalt plant policy.

Mr. Goodman works for one of the seven clean air agencies within the State of Washington which are established pursuant to the State Clean Air Act. His presentation will be on how asphalt plants are regulated by clean air agencies. ORCAA is responsible for regulating the Olympic Peninsula all the way down to the Columbia Gorge. The primary responsibilities are air permitting, new source review, and ongoing inspections after facilities are constructed. They can issue tickets, and are an enforcement agency. They enforce the State Clean Air Act and laws and regulations pursuant to State Clean Air Act as well as federal regulations. They also do land clearing burn permits.

Asphalt plants do require an air permit before they can construct. For portable asphalt plants, they require what is called a notice of intent/construction. They have the ability to deny permits that are applied for. Very few have been denied after working with the applicant through the process to comply with the standards. This is a public process and can require a public hearing depending on how big the plant is and what the concern may be within the area. The permit process for clean air can also be integrated with the SEPA process. For performance standards, they say how something needs to operate and what emission limits they need to comply with including federal, state and ORCAA standards. The stricter standard whether it be federal, state or ORCAA does not void the lesser standard. An asphalt plant cannot even begin to start with a permit application until the federal limits are met, which are a particulate limit and an opacity limit. Again these are part of the basement level performance standards. Third party testing firms are required to do the tests, and have to be certified, and ORCAA oversees the testing. They are also observed and then audited.
The next regulation is BACT testing which is Best Available Control Technology, and this has to be required at the time of permitting. BACT testing evolves as new technologies come about. Examples of different asphalt plants that have been approved and are still running were given and the performance standards they are required to go by.

Again third, as discussed, were the ambient air quality standards. When ORCAA receives an application they consider emissions after the control device models are given. Air dispersion modeling is required to show that the project will not cause or contribute to a violation of ambient standards. The current EPA model is called air screening. If the most modest modeling does not meet this standard, then they have to do another called air mod which requires site specific meteorological data site specific topography. The last criteria for approval is a review against the Washington Air Toxics Regulation. The two requirements for this are that the Best Available Control Technology for air toxics is used, and an analysis is done that can demonstrate that emissions are significantly low enough to protect human health and safety from potential carcinogenic or other toxic effects. All of these standards are designed for sensitive individuals as well. These are also required to be reviewed every five years.

The setback distance of HMAP to nearest property boundary should be reviewed through the air permitting process and in no case would be less than 150 feet. The 150 foot setback is what is currently proposed in the Ecology “General Order”. The distance to the nearest property line and residence is determined through the air permitting process. Minimum distance needs to be good for small and portable plants too and that is why ORCAA is proposing a case-by-case basis. ORCAA is also opposed to any setbacks that would preclude the case-by-case review through the air permitting process.

The question of having certain wildlife setbacks was also discussed. Since the case-by-case determination is made with respect to AAQSBs and since the standards are designed to protect human health and protection of the environment including sensitive individuals, additional margins don’t seem to be needed for protection of wildlife in Mr. Goodman’s opinion, with ORCAA. However, if the County were to request certain habitat areas be looked at within a certain buffer range on a parcel with a proposed asphalt plant, ORCAA could accommodate that request. This would also include cumulative impacts. If more than one asphalt plant was in place in the same area, the air quality standards would be considered from each asphalt plant, not on an individual basis.

Emissions are calculated both cumulatively and seasonally. For air permitting, it is done at a mass rate by pounds per hour. They are also tested annually. Also, when the permit is applied for the fuels proposed have restrictions. The air analysis is based on the worst case fuel properties. The actual emissions from vehicles that are coming and going from the plant are not considered within the model.

Any change to the asphalt plant after it has been permitted requires another approval process, including the moving of the plant itself somewhere else on the site. If this should happen, they are subject to any new standards that have been put into place.
Ms. Story received a few comments on the draft regulations for the Chapter. The two comments were:

- Add an option to allow Recycled Asphalt Pavement (RAP) stockpiles to be uncovered and on pervious surfaces. The text can be found at: 20.54.070, 3.1h.
- Remove the text, “or other zones” from the possible zones available for asphalt plants.

Staff included the language to offer the public the full spectrum of options to comment on during the public hearing. The PC then discussed what the benefits would be if any by discussing the draft chapter first before the public hearing and decided that they should wait to receive public comment before recommending any further changes. The public hearing is scheduled for June 20, 2012.

9. **8:46 PM ADJOURN**

With there being no further business, Chair Lane adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

Chris Lane, Chair

Prepared by Carrie Toebbe, Recording Secretary