



THURSTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes October 5, 2011

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

2 Chair Lane called the October 5, 2011 meeting of the Thurston County Planning
3 Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.
4

5 **Attendance:** Chair Chris Lane, Commissioners Kathleen O'Connor, Bill Jackson, Scott
6 Nelson, Christine Spaulding, Christopher Earle Edward Fleisher & Jennifer Davis
7

8 **Absent:** Liz Kohlenberg
9

10 **Staff:** Andrew Deffobis, Cindy Wilson, Scott Clark, Jeremy Davis
11

12 **Guests:** Bonnie Shorin, National Marine Fisheries Service
13

14 **2. 6:31 P.M. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

15
16 **MOTION: Commissioner O'Connor moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner**
17 **Earle seconded. Motion carried.**
18

19 **3. 6:31 P.M. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS (Not associated with topics for which**
20 **public hearings have been held.)**
21

- 22 1. *Barb Scavezze – 3008 Amhurst Court SE Olympia, WA 98501 – Spoke in*
23 *regards to the CAO.*
- 24 2. *Preston Troy – 7946 Mirimichi Drive NW Olympia, WA 98502 – Spoke in*
25 *regards to shoreline preservation.*
- 26 3. *Name was inaudible, did not sign in – homeowner on Totten Inlet – Spoke in*
27 *regard to water quality and shoreline preservation.*
28

29 The official audio is available on line at:

30
31 [http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.h](http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.html)
32 [tml](http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.html)
33

34 **4. 6:37 P.M. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

35
36 **Commissioner O'Connor moved to approve the August 17, 2011 minutes and accept**
37 **the audio as the official record. Commissioner Nelson seconded. Motion carried.**
38 **Commissioner Spaulding opposed.**
39

40 Commissioner Spaulding requested that the verbatim section of the August 17, 2011
41 meeting minutes be edited to an extent of replacing the “oh’s, um’s and uh’s. This
42 request would include any further verbatim minutes to come in the future.
43

1 5. **6:41 P.M. WORK SESSION: Critical Areas Ordinance – CARA’s, Second Draft**
2 **Revisions & Fish & Wildlife Conservation Areas**

3 *Staff: Scott Clark, Andrew Deffobis, Cindy Wilson & Jeremy Davis*
4

5 Mr. Clark introduced Bonnie Shorin with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (NMFS).
6 Ms. Shorin will be discussing the National Flood Insurance Program and the science that
7 went into the program.
8

9 Detailed section starting at: 00:13:50
10

11 Bonnie Shorin: Thank you for having me. I am Bonnie Shorin and I did write a
12 significant portion of the biological opinion. I am hoping that I am not going to give you
13 information that is not pertinent that you know you weren’t really hoping for but this is
14 basically a primer and will walk you through a little bit of the litigation history just
15 briefly and then a little bit of the background of the RPA. So, I guess we will just start
16 with that. So, in 2003 National Wildlife Federation filed a lawsuit against FEMA saying
17 that they had never consulted with the resource agencies National Fisheries Service or US
18 Fish and Wildlife Service on affects of the national flood insurance program on
19 endangered species. Now I don’t know how much you have been aware of this but
20 they’ve been in litigation in many parts of the country on failure to consult and they have
21 been found in jeopardy in many parts of the country because the program does create a
22 type of inducement to development in the floodplain. So the court did order them to
23 consult with us, they really didn’t believe that was the right outcome so they presented to
24 my agency a not likely to adversely affect document. They said here, it’s not us, were not
25 causing any of the effects, its local government. So we didn’t really agree that that’s the
26 whole relationship there and our conclusion was that the program does create a jeopardy
27 risk to endangered salmon in the Puget Sound region. So where do we get a jeopardy
28 opinion? We write a reasonable improvement alternative and that’s basically a set of
29 instructions that tells the action agency, thank you. If you were to modify your program
30 in x, y and z way then we don’t expect that it would continue to create a jeopardy risk for
31 our listed species. So what they were sued over was these little action components here
32 which are; the mapping of the floodplain, the minimum criteria for community
33 participation in the national insurance flood program, the community rating system which
34 you may know is it’s “inaudible” for jurisdictions that adopt more stringent standards or
35 more greater protections than minimum standards they get reduced insurance premiums
36 within their community. The insurance was also was the plaintiff asked for national
37 wildlife federation that the court said that the issue on some insurance was not
38 discretionary once a community was participating in the program. So we consulted on
39 the first three and like I said we reached a jeopardy conclusion and when we reach a
40 jeopardy conclusion we write a reasonable and improvement alternative and we had
41 seven components to that and which we instructed FEMA to modify how they run the
42 national flood insurance program. We wanted them to improve “inaudible”, we wanted
43 them to write some protocols on levies, but the one that really affects you guys most
44 significantly was element three and that was a series of instructions to FEMA to change
45 the way the minimum criteria for participation are executed. We wanted to make sure
46 that development that took place in the floodplain was not going to impose an aggregate
47 risk to salmon habitat and to salmon and to orcas that feed on Chinook. FEMA has
48 elected not to revise their regulations. FEMA has elected to ask every single jurisdiction

1 to adopt modified floodplain management protocols. I guess that's a more flexible site
2 specific bottom up approach. The implementation of the RPA ended last night. So what
3 are the things that you might be concerned with as a jurisdiction that has to now meet
4 FEMA's standard that came to you through us? We have asked for much greater
5 protection for the floodway, the channel migration zone, "inaudible", the riparian buffer
6 that's based on WDFW riparian management protocols. Within that zone which FEMA
7 has nicely called the protected area the development standard really that we have asked
8 for is that no adverse effects at all occur to habitat features because those translate down
9 the road to affect salmon. There are standards that will remain in the floodplain to I'm
10 sure you are really excited to see those. So the protected area you can see, I think this is
11 up in Pierce County, the protected area is in red so it equals the floodway and the channel
12 migration zone and the riparian area and then the little light blue parts are the remainder
13 of the floodplains. So there not necessarily synonymous and in some jurisdictions the red
14 part will be a small subset of the entire floodplain based on presence of levies or other
15 conspiring features. Ok, why did we want these particular components in to have greater
16 protection? Well, the floodway is the area that is most likely to be inundated its' going to
17 have the greatest frequency, it's going to have the greatest depth, it's going to have the
18 greatest volume and it's going to have the greatest length of duration of inundation. That
19 means that it's going to provide the best and most frequent habitat for salmon cause when
20 it's wet, when it's full of the river that's where the salmon will go. With the channel
21 migration zone the reason we want that included is because when channels move it's bad
22 for people. When channels move it's bad for buildings and infrastructure but it's really
23 actually good in the long term for salmon habitat because channel complexity is created
24 that way and that's what are endangered species have evolved for and that's what they
25 need in order to have a rich and complex habitat. And then of course there're is the
26 riparian vegetation and there are so many features that riparian vegetation provides
27 including all the way out to 250 feet.

28
29 Andrew Deffobis: Can we stop for a minute?

30
31 Bonnie Shorin: Sure.

32
33 Detailed section ending at: 00:21:05

34
35 Detailed section starting at: 00:21:37

36
37 Bonnie Shorin: Ok, so riparian vegetation has a number of functions when it's up in the
38 floodplain and the river get's up there it slows velocity's and created good refuge for
39 juvenile salmonids. When it's standing there on the river bank stuff falls in, bugs fall in
40 and salmon eat those. When it's standing on the river banks it creates shade which cools
41 the river water which is good for juvenile salmon. As everyone here will know when it
42 begins to rain, hey look at that, when it begins to rain you run get under a tree if you're
43 out walking because the tree intercepts the rain fall which meters the rate at which water
44 comes to the ground which means it mediates your storm event. And then there is the
45 weed debris, so when trees fall into the river that creates complexity that is also necessary
46 for salmon habitat. So that is why all three of those elements are part of the protected
47 area that we would like to see have greater protection. So when you manage the
48 protected area to a no adverse effect standard it is important to know that's not a strict no

1 development standard but it is a very high bar to try to reach. We would like to make
2 sure that every jurisdiction before it allows development in this protected zone to
3 evaluate what habitat conditions are available, what floodplain functions continue to be
4 there, and how will those be impaired by proposed development, what's the duration of
5 effects and how are those either going to be retained or re-provided for juvenile
6 salmonids. So I told you about the remainder of the floodplain just quickly we would
7 like to have effects there mitigated it's a much simpler arithmetic. We are hoping that
8 jurisdictions will retain 65% tree cover where they already have a wooded condition in
9 their floodplains. That density would be retained at one building to five acres where
10 that's the current zoning and we would really like low impact development, standards,
11 protocols use for new development. So the parts that's been hardest as we've spoken to
12 jurisdictions FEMA and I have gone out and talked to a lot of jurisdictions now. The part
13 that's hardest for people to wrap their head around as they look at development in the
14 floodplain is that the floodplain is actually part of the river. They, you know to a
15 developer it looks like dry land but it will get wet that's why it's called the floodplain.
16 When it gets inundated fish will be there and that when you alter even the uplands we got
17 some reference earlier to uplands, even when you alter the uplands you do change
18 functions within the floodplain. So, there is the floodplain as part of the river when the
19 river is there fish are there. And when you alter the upland even when it's way upland
20 when you alter, particularly for our species when you alter the floodplain you're going to
21 change how it works. Whether it absorbs water, whether the water sheet flows to the
22 river, whether you have clean water returning to the river or whether you have pollutants
23 returning to the river. So when I was talking earlier I mentioned that we would like every
24 jurisdiction that is approaching floodplain management including those portions, well in
25 fact let's remember this our critical areas ordinance in Washington State include
26 frequently flooded areas. "Inaudible" frequently flooded areas is defined as the 100 year
27 floodplain. So you could take your entire 100 year floodplain and recognize it as an
28 important critical area and manage it for safety stewardship is also good salmon
29 stewardship. So we would like landscape within the floodplain and particularly within
30 that protected area to be evaluated for the base line conditions, what are the functions that
31 are there, is it flood refuge for fish, is it wooded, is it pavement? Identify what features
32 are there and what function they serve for habitat. We know that not all places have
33 habitat values left anymore. Many of them have just basic storage "inaudible" for flood
34 waters. So this base line which is beautifully wooded has many, many functions, this is a
35 really good place for fish. This one not so much you guys might notice this is our
36 neighbor to the south. We are asking jurisdictions to make floodplain management
37 choices in critical areas, choices that are comprehensive in nature although FEMA has
38 allowed jurisdictions to continue on a site by site project by project evaluation. We at
39 National Marine Fisheries Service are hoping that by adopting a comprehensive approach
40 that strengthens critical area ordinances, shoreline management plans, growth plans,
41 zoning and comprehensive management plans whichever of those tools is available and
42 convenient for you that those will also factor, those can be factored with recover plan
43 elements that you all may have contributed to the development of a shared strategy. And
44 we expect that, that is a more flexible option for a jurisdiction because you can anticipate
45 for instance how many properties are holey within the protected area and are slated for
46 future development you can evaluate what impacts may come with that development and
47 then identify through your recover plan what you can bring back to the table for fish.
48 Working in the dry is always a way to avoid fish effects again as I mentioned before how

1 frequently the site inundates is going to be a factor that determines how heavily your fish
2 will be affected. How long the impacts will endure is something that would go into a
3 mitigation or adverse effect equation. Being able to repair, I'm sorry replace loss
4 functions before fish need to be on that floodplain again is really important in avoidance
5 context. So you can see construction right up there on the water. I don't know you can't
6 quit make it out but there is a turbidity plume by not working in the water you avoid
7 turbidity plume. This work because it affects the channel is going to affect the hydrology
8 it's going to revegetate the riparian banks and in particular when we take trees down we
9 have an extensive duration of effect because you can replant lots of trees but it will take
10 ten, twenty, thirty years for them to achieve the same level of function that they were
11 providing before. So that's really an important feature to factor and it's also very, very,
12 very, very hard to mitigate. This project as you can see the work is all up in the dry but
13 this is clearly a project that's going to have fish effects because when this river goes over
14 bank that house is in the way. The habitat features that we would like to see for juvenile
15 salmon are not going to be there any longer we are not going to have trees that slow the
16 movement of water, were going to have whatever these folks keep in their garage, there
17 can of gasoline, there oil for their equipment, there can of Raid, that stuff gets into the
18 water and those things are all bad for species, my species, salmon. So that's the type of
19 evaluation that we want to see that comes with every project and this is, that's on a
20 project by project level but more valuable would be for jurisdictions to recognize this
21 location as part of the protected area, put a no adverse effects standards into place and
22 keep development away from the river. So this is just the one science slide that I have for
23 you guys. Juvenile salmonids really prosper by being on a floodplain. This was a study
24 conducted in the Yellow Basin in which juvenile fish were put in a cage, both of the fish
25 were in a cage when the Yellow Basin was inundated. The Yellow Basin is a bypass that
26 is farmed and yet the relationship is that the farmers understand that it is a flood overflow
27 channel and that when it gets wet they don't get to ask for compensation for "inaudible"
28 less agriculture produce and things like that. So it was wet, the researcher put, had these
29 fish, the little fish in the active channel and for the same duration of time these other little
30 fish that started at the same size were up on the floodplain. They were both caged and
31 you can see that the floodplain fish grow. They have, the water is not as, the velocities
32 are slower. The temperature is a little bit warmer. They don't have to fight to stay in
33 place and they can eat because when the floodwater is up on the land all those little
34 insects that you know the little blue fuzzies and those nats that fly in your face? Those
35 get in the water and the fish just gobble them up. So that was the genesis for the basic
36 element of our analysis; is that fish who are on floodplains during flood conditions have
37 higher survival rates, they have higher growth rates and when they get back to the river
38 they're going to be more successful in there outward journey and in their time in the
39 ocean. So you guys might be concerned about what happens with the deadline that just
40 passed, don't freak out were not, NMFS and FEMA are committed to continuing to
41 provide support to local governments as they prepare their packages for qualification.
42 The National Wildlife Federation has filed a sixty day notice of intent to sue. They are
43 probably going to bring litigation up with FEMA and they are of the opinion I have
44 heard, the representative from National Wildlife Federation Seattle office say that he
45 believes that the "inaudible" protections that came with our "inaudible" biological
46 opinion are no longer valid. As a third party they are probably looking for, in fact I know
47 that they are looking for jurisdictions that they can scoop in part of this strategy. Let's
48 see I talked about "inaudible" is the comprehensive approach FEMA language is could

1 that site qualify as “inaudible” two? “Inaudible” three is where they place every
2 jurisdiction that has not submitted a comprehensive package. So nothing exciting there,
3 when the rivers there the fish are to. So are there any questions I can answer for any of
4 you?
5

6 Commissioner Jackson: I have a question about that one slide where you had the
7 buildings virtually on the bank of that water, whether it be a creek or river?
8

9 Bonnie Shorin: That’s the Yakima River.
10

11 Commissioner Jackson: Well you’re talking about a fifty foot buffer in a situation like
12 that, would that make much of a difference though?
13

14 Bonnie Shorin: Well actually we’re talking about, we’re talking about first protecting the
15 floodway. The floodway is probably, that house is probably in the floodway. So if we
16 were applying these protections that house would not be available to be built in that
17 location, it would have to be behind the floodway and then we would also like to have, if
18 this river has a history of movement we would like to have them even further back so
19 they’re outside of that area where the river likes to jump. The other measure that we use
20 is the riparian buffer and its WDFW’s recommended riparian buffers and on this river it’s
21 probably 250 feet. So this house should probably be at a minimum 250 feet away and
22 that would provide much better protection.
23

24 Commissioner Jackson: What about the historical channel migration? “Inaudible”
25

26 Bonnie Shorin: Could be, it could be and if that is going to be a river specific and we
27 have acknowledged in our document that where infrastructure and levies provide serve as
28 a check to the historic channel migration that were not going to ask that those be taken
29 down. We’re not asking that those infrastructure checks on migration be disregarded
30 because unless a jurisdiction is in a position to pay the money to set the levies back that
31 channel migration zone is stopped pretty much right there.
32

33 Chair Lane: So what happens if this guy’s entire lot is within the floodway?
34

35 Bonnie Shorin: Well, I believe that what happens if this guys entire lot is within the
36 floodway is that FEMA’s going to chastise this jurisdiction for violating their prohibition
37 on development in floodways. Now unfortunately and this is one of the reasons that we
38 ended up calling jeopardy, FEMA will actually allow development in the floodway as
39 long as the floodway is redrawn. So we don’t think that’s a very good practice. It’s not
40 good for people it’s not good for fish.
41

42 Chair Lane: Well I guess what I am saying is that if this guys entire lot is within the
43 floodway and he hasn’t built yet, yes.
44

45 Bonnie Shorin: You want to know about like takings? Ok, well you know that there’re
46 the reasonable use exempt or reasonable use standard for takings, so you have to be left
47 with some use, some reasonable use of the property. I know that in many jurisdictions
48 their code includes a statement that is single family residence is a reasonable use.

1
2 Chair Lane: Yeah, I'm aware of that. I was kind of wondering what your view was on
3 that.
4

5 Bonnie Shorin: We think that there may be uses that you can put that property to that
6 don't necessarily have to be right up on the river bank.
7

8 Chair Lane: Ok.
9

10 Bonnie Shorin: Low impact development standards, maybe elevating the house, maybe
11 putting a green roof on it all on the in house not on the fill. "Inaudible" yes stilts.
12

13 Chair Lane: Stilts.
14

15 Bonnie Shorin: That would actually, putting a house on stilts is actually going to preserve
16 a lot of the function and that's for lots that are only within the protected area that may be
17 the solution. Other questions? Go ahead.
18

19 Detailed section ending at: 00:37:41
20

21 A member of the audience asked if the discussion was open to the audience. The
22 Planning Commission responded with a no answer.
23

24 Detailed section starting at: 00:37:52
25

26 Commissioner Davis: It sounds like National Wildlife Federations sort of watch dogging
27 a little bit of what local jurisdictions are going to do here but so what responsibilities
28 FEMA for that matter NMFS taking and sort of monitoring and analyzing not only what
29 local jurisdictions adopt but what is being implemented on the grounds?
30

31 Bonnie Shorin: Well FEMA actually has a continuing relationship with all the NMFIP
32 participating communities and they every couple of years I'm not sure how frequently it
33 might be every three years they do community assistance visits, what they call those in
34 which they come out and evaluate whether or not the jurisdiction has been managing the
35 flood plain consistently with their codes. So they have told us very clearly that the ESA
36 compliance is now going to be part of that community assistance visit evaluation. If they
37 see a pattern of practice of ESA shortfalls then they will spend, they will put you on
38 notice, they provide technical assistance to try to get you up to snuff, if that fails they put
39 you on probation. When you are on probation there is a surcharge on the insurance
40 premiums and if that doesn't get you whooped into shape then they suspend you from the
41 program and then you don't get flood insurance anymore.
42

43 Commissioner O'Connor: So maybe duck tailing on the flood insurance and then I had
44 another question. So you're talking flood insurance in relation to a particular jurisdiction
45 correct?
46

47 Bonnie Shorin: Yes.
48

1 Commissioner O'Connor: So what if any impacts are on the individuals who live within
2 that jurisdiction and who own the homes? What happens to their flood insurance?
3

4 Bonnie Shorin: I believe that's where the surcharges go is to their premiums.
5

6 Commissioner Nelson: There's some "inaudible" that goes out in compliance that nobody
7 in Thurston County has literature on, it's not the county.
8

9 Bonnie Shorin: Right, so this is a key thing to make sure that we remember in all of this.
10

11 Commissioner O'Connor: The other thing I wanted to ask you is when you were talking
12 earlier about some of the recommendations; issues about mapping and protocols for
13 levies you mentioned something about aggregate risk to salmon to other habitat is there
14 any particular technique/tool combination that you recommend for helping a jurisdiction
15 evaluate aggregate risk because if we're going to look at what exists now and what do we
16 see might be aggregate risk what's going to help us do those things?
17

18 Bonnie Shorin: Well I think that the first thing to do is maybe produce a GIS layer that
19 shows you where your protected area is because that's the area that we think has the best
20 habitat function. As a general principal you would want to then within that layer in that
21 zone that you identify you want to determine what level of development is already there.
22 You know certainly farmland functions differently than forest land. The Chehalis
23 functions differently than the Tolt because of the presence of infrastructure. So that's the
24 first thing that's that base line that I was asking about so where you already have for
25 instance maybe a suburban or urban level of development adjacent to the river that's the
26 place to keep adding "inaudible". Where you have suburban reaches that move toward
27 rural that's where you want to retain rural qualities. If your growth boundary for
28 instance, if there was a growth boundary that crept into a rural area it might, you would
29 want to see what functions would become impaired if that area then is more intensely
30 developed because that's where you're going to start to lose features. It's where you
31 know, it's where you start to make this and this just does not function well for fish. I
32 mean they can get out of the river, they can swim thru this, is it healthy for them? Well
33 they probably are doing a little bit better than if they were in the main channel, but
34 they're not doing really well. So to the degree that you have this, try to keep this and
35 don't put this in there. I don't really have, did that reach your issue?
36

37 Commissioner O'Connor: Sort of I think that some of it's just a matter of well how do
38 you try to apply some of this and then imagining what are some of the processes and
39 other things that would go into it.
40

41 Bonnie Shorin: Right. I know for instance like Jefferson County has gone through their
42 tax parcels and they have been able to identify, I'm making this number up but I think it's
43 about 724 parcels that exist completely within the protected area which is back to your
44 question and they do have a single family residence as a reasonable use standard. So they
45 basically I think limit the size of the house. They put some restrictions on what type of
46 footprint they can have there and so they pretty much can predict exactly how much
47
48

1 flood storage there is and they are hoping to use their recovery plan to find restoration
2 activities that will buy back and equal amount of function or better. City of Everett is
3 doing the same type of thing with their report.
4

5 Scott Clark: So the background on the National Insurance Program, Thurston County as a
6 participant there's what they have is called a community rating system and it's from 1 to
7 10, 10 being the highest. The County is currently a 5. They're only about 40
8 jurisdictions in the United States that are higher than that. The higher the ranking the
9 greater the discount for the homeowner that's purchasing flood insurance. So the lower
10 ranking or non-compliance means you either pay higher insurance, non-compliance
11 means you don't get flood insurance. So to put this all in context FEMA has the National
12 Flood Insurance Program, they regulate what you can do in the floodplain, NMFS came
13 along and said that's probably not enough our consultation suggests you do more. So
14 what you have heard now is the more that they suggest and where we're at right now with
15 the compliance on this was there was a September 22nd compliance deadline which we
16 had to chose one of the magic doors to go through the one we chose to go through is
17 we're going to look at the individual permits that come in for building in a floodplain of
18 which we receive very, very few because of our current floodplain regulations and we're
19 going to do that until we pass the CAO that's the intent because you should consider best
20 available science this should provide it that way were done and then it's a programmatic
21 permit like what we talked about earlier we are not longer doing the individual habitat
22 assessment where a homeowner or a property owner has to go get this individual
23 assessment they get coverage under the County's permit. So that's the Commissioner's
24 intent at this point in time, this is what we're trying to do as you've heard yet another law
25 suit has surfaced. You know there is going to be law suits and we just keep motoring
26 ahead and stayed focused. So I hope that puts it in context for you and that's why she
27 came in to talk about this tonight so you get where it's going and what's going on.
28

29 Detailed section ending at: 00:46:00
30

31 The Planning Commission asked when the next community assistance visit would be for
32 Thurston County and it was answered in the next couple of years.
33

34 Mr. Deffobis then addressed the Planning Commission about further progress in regards
35 to the CAO. Staff has completed the first draft of the Best Available Science Summary
36 Report for Wetlands and this was handed out to the Planning Commission. The other
37 chapters are forthcoming and will have a similar format. The draft will also be posted on
38 the Planning Commission website. A CD of Fish and Wildlife habitat conservation areas
39 was also given to the Commission which includes reference to the biological opinion.
40 Due to the size of the best available science CD's that have been previously passed out to
41 the Planning Commission a list of each document will be posted on the website and
42 anyone who wants a copy can have staff make them one. The Fish and Wildlife Habitat
43 Conservations Areas Chapter and the Special Reports Chapter staff are trying to finish up
44 this week and will probably distribute them to the Planning Commission by e-mail.
45

46 The second draft materials that were passed out last week were then discussed. The first
47 Chapter was General Provisions. The underlining on the second draft indicated the
48 changes from the first. The second Chapter was Signs and Fencing. The Planning

1 Commission liked the inspection of the wetland sign after placement. The third chapter
2 was Amendments. 24.91.030E states that map amendments may be charged and the
3 question was if that was already determined. Staff will check the fee schedule to see
4 what will be determined. A few definitions were then discussed.
5

6 The Assessor's office is trying to determine the correct assessment and will be meeting
7 with Mr. Clark in the next couple of weeks to discuss. A lot of discussion is taking place
8 in regards to these assessments.
9

10 Ms. Wilson recently discussed cluster subdivision with Mike Kain, Resource Stewardship
11 and this section will be put within the third chapter.
12

13 Staff is still working with Environmental Health on the CARA's Chapter.
14

15 **6. 7:36 P.M. STAFF UPDATES**
16

17 Mr. Clark provided the following staff updates:
18

- 19 • Staff would like the Planning Commission to consider having the public hearing
20 for the CAO on a Saturday. This would provide all for a safe schedule during the
21 daylight instead of two nightly meetings in a row. A discussion ensued in regards
22 to dates that may work for all the Planning Commissioner's to attend. It would be
23 at the Planning Commissions pleasure how long to hold the hearing. A discussion
24 was also had about keeping the record open a week before and two weeks after
25 the hearing. Robert's Rules of Order was requested to be ordered and looked at
26 for particulars. The Planning Commission would like to encourage the public to
27 look at the website on how to give public testimony to give specific examples to
28 bring to the hearing. The dates of November 19th, December 3rd and December
29 10th were discussed. The majority of the Planning Commission would like to see
30 the hearing held on a Saturday. A doodle pool will be sent out to indicate which
31 members could be present on any of those dates and what times they are
32 available.
33
- 34 • Scott Longanecker will be returning in two weeks to discuss Agritourism and the
35 changes the Planning Commission requested.
36
- 37 • Next week the Planning Commission will be working on Tracts and Easements
38 and looking at the Best Available Science Report draft.
39
- 40 • The meeting on the 26th will be upstairs not in room 129 due to other meeting
41 reservations.
42

43 **7. 8:02 P.M. CALENDAR**
44

45 October 12, 2011 – All Commissioners will be in attendance.
46
47

1 8. 8:03 PM ADJOURN

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

With there being no further business, Chair Lane adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.


Chris Lane, Chair

Prepared by Carrie Toebe, Recording Secretary