

**Jefferson County Planning Commission**

**Minutes for August 18, 2004**

- A. Opening Business
- B. Committee Reports
- C. Discussion on MLA04-28, GMA Comp Plan Update
  - Economic Development Element
  - Housing Element
  - Open Space, Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation Element
  - Environment Element
- D. Adjournment

## **A. Opening Business**

Chair Tom McNerney called the regular meeting to order at the WSU Learning Center at 6:30 p.m. Planning Commission members present were Tom McNerney, Eileen Rogers, Jenny Davis, Phil Flynn, Edel Sokol, Jim Hagen, and Dennis Schultz. Allen Panasuk and Bud Schindler were excused.

DCD staff present were Josh Peters, Kyle Alm, and Joanna Sanders (filling in for Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary).

There were no members of the public present.

Eileen Rogers moved to approve the minutes of the July 21, 2004 meeting. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.

Phil Flynn moved to approve the minutes of the August 4, 2004 meeting as submitted. The motion was seconded and carried with two abstentions, by members Eileen Rogers and Jenny Davis who were absent for the said meeting. Phil Flynn asked to confirm whether findings of fact or indicators are supposed to be reflected in the Plan. Tom McNerney noted that the findings of fact are not listed in the Comp Plan but are in the UDC.

## **B. Committee Reports**

Edel Sokol reported that the Comp Plan Committee had addressed and incorporated Bud Schindler's suggested changes and that updated copies of the Housing, Economic, Environment, and Open Space/Parks and Recreation elements were given to the Commission. The Committee would continue with their review of the Rural Land Element, after which they would go through the Goals and Policies and Introduction sections.

Tom McNerney invited Staff Updates.

Josh Peters reported that the County has now hired a building official, who as of September would be working part-time with the City and part-time with the County, replacing interim building official Al Scalf. The Draft Ordinance for the Adoption of UGA proposals would be before the BOCC on Monday, August 23 at 10:05 a.m. The draft ordinance, agenda request, new maps and a new Chapter 2 of the Comp Plan, including a transportation strategy, would be posted on the County website. Adjustments were made to the acreage figures corresponding to changes in the land use and zoning maps. He circulated a draft copy of the revised zoning map. At 11:00, Staff and the BOCC would also review the Planning docket to complete the Comprehensive Plan amendment as a whole, including new dates as follows: August 31 - Roundtable Public Workshop on Planning Commission 5-year Comp. Plan Assessment and September 7 - County Response to the State mandate. He further explained that the August 31 public workshop would provide an opportunity for Staff to answer questions and take informal comment from the public. Modeled after the Kitsap and Clallam programs, the workshop would address the requirement to have a Public review of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update. The workshop would be noticed in *The Leader* and *Peninsula Daily News* as well as on the website, along with preliminary work of the Comp. Plan Committee. Tom McNerney suggested that Commission members with an interest in hearing comments might also attend. There was support for noticing the meeting as a Public workshop and, for legal purposes, as a Special Commission meeting in the event some Commissioners decide to attend.

Related to the County's response to the State mandates, Josh Peters distributed a brochure developed by the Puget Sound Action Team (PSAT) providing guidelines and recommendations for jurisdictions on Growth Management updates and, more specifically, critical areas aspects. He explained that the Puget Sound Action Team is an organization created by the governor and legislature and is composed of a broad representation of agencies, tribal, federal and local governments with direct responsibility and authority for conservation and restoration of Puget Sound. Discussion ensued about how at this point, the Comp. Plan Committee might incorporate the suggestions in this document into their work. Tom McNerney noted that the document is not primarily geared for environmental elements, but parking elements etc. Josh Peters pointed out that these references relate to stormwater management. Edel Sokol suggested that stormwater management is already required for any development, to which Josh agreed, but added that while they are required they do not always work. He recommended the Commission visit the PSAT website.

Tom McNerney opened the meeting to public comments. There were none.

Jenny Davis solicited the Commission's feedback on whether her involvement in the airport committee would present the perception of a conflict of interest. She disclosed her family's interest and involvement in the airport since the 1980s. She has a 50-year lease on a 2,200 square foot hangar; she and her husband owned a business at the airport for 10 years, which was sold in 1998; and her husband is a Federal Aviation Administration inspector. While she did not feel she had a legal conflict, she asked the commissioners whether they believe there is an ethical conflict. Phil Flynn mentioned that Jenny's experience on the committee is invaluable. Edel Sokol agreed that her expertise is important and believes she would act in an ethical manner. Dennis Schultz pointed out similarities to his involvement as an active farmer on the Ag Committee. Jim Hagen said to exclude her expertise would be detrimental to the effort. Eileen Rogers concurred that it would be a loss if she were not to participate on this committee. Tom McNerney agreed to review with Jenny Davis the Planning Commission handbook, but pointed out that individuals serving on the Commission were appointed because of their specific interest and it is important to publicly disclose these interests before participating in related discussions.

Dennis Schultz reported that the Ag. Committee had received applications for roughly 250 parcels. Out of those, three or four are thought not to meet the criteria for agriculture and several others are already zoned agricultural. Due to some confusion in which some thought an earlier questionnaire was their application, some applications are still being collected. A list sorted geographically would be given to the Commission for discussion. Tom McNerney suggested that the criteria also be given. Josh Peters then explained that these proposed zoning amendments are part of the docket. On Tuesday, August 24 the Ag. Lands Committee meeting would be held in the BOCC Chambers instead of the Planning Department to utilize that facility's Internet map server technology for displaying individual parcels rather than producing paper maps.

### **C. MLA04-28, GMA Comp Plan Update**

The Commission then began a review of the Economic Development element, with Staff recording additional revisions. Under Policies, there was discussion of the proposed change to "living-wage" jobs from "quality" jobs. Staff agreed

to search for a definition that could be added to this text or the text of the housing element. The Commission continued to work through the chapter. There was also support for an additional sentence in the summary table, Number 7 - Environment, which says, "The presence of a vital economy benefits the environment by reducing fossil fuel consumption and emissions caused by long distance commuting." Jim Hagan suggested that this might address some of the comments that additional commercial zonings are environmentally harmful. There was support for the committee working with this concept.

In reviewing Open Space, Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation, there was discussion of the challenges of listing goals and policies without suggestions for their funding. There was support for moving OSP 4.10 to the beginning of the policies section as 4.1. Given that there are other policies "limiting the amount of lot coverage," there was support for eliminating that item under Strategies, Number 6. In addition to the Committee's suggestion to add "tribal settlements" under OSG 6.0, there was discussion of, but no decision regarding adding a term such as "Euro-American." Since there are other agencies acquiring land, there was support for changing all references to Jefferson Land Trust to "a nonprofit agency." There was discussion of eliminating OSP 5.3 because of the concern that it is overly broad and the establishment of trails is covered under OSP 5.2. Edel Sokol moved to retain OSP 5.3 as written. The motion was seconded. During discussion, there was agreement that 5.3 is more specific than 5.2. The motion did not pass with three in favor and four opposed.

The Commission then moved to the Housing element. There was support for listing as an action item under Strategies "Coordinate and promote an economic development strategy that creates adequate income for affordable housing."

Under the Water Resources section of the Environment element, there was support for Tom McNerney's suggestion to include language that would be more consistent with state law giving consideration to water for people as well as fish. Goal ENG 1.0 was revised to read, "Conserve and promote the protection of water resources"... and add to the end of the sentence "...and for the needs of the projected population of Jefferson County." The ENP 1.2 would conclude with "and for human needs."

Under the Shorelines section, there was a suggestion to confirm whether the uses under ENP 4.1 needed to be updated. Josh Peters clarified that the Shoreline Management Master Program incorporates goals, policies and regulations. The Comp. Plan should contain the goals and policies and the UDC would contain the development regulations; but they should be integrated in a way that clearly indicates which goals, policies regulations relate to the master program because they must be approved by Ecology. He noted that Staff would probably recommend leaving the Shorelines goals and policies unmodified. There was some interest in reviewing the Environment element to ensure considerations for humans. There was Commission support for replacing "protect and enhance" with "promote the protection of...." throughout the Environment section. Under Flood Hazard Areas, the deletion of ENP 11.5 was suggested because it is covered by existing ordinances. There was also a proposal to eliminate ENP 11.6 because there are ways to mitigate flood damage through the building construction.

There was discussion of whether replacing Goal 2.0 with ENP 2.1 provides the same level of protection in situations where surface and groundwater resources have been damaged. It was noted that while the State Department of

Health and Ecology have jurisdiction over such situations, the County also has a role in protecting the quality and quantity of surface and groundwater resources. There was support for revising ENG 2.0 to instead say "Protect the quality and quantity of surface and ground water resources, and promote their restoration where they have been damaged if possible." At 9:00 p.m., Jenny Davis left the meeting, but agreed to send her comments to Kyle Alm for incorporation into the committee's work to be discussed at the next Committee meeting on August 25.

Significant discussion then ensued about whether August 31 is too soon to schedule a public workshop to answer questions and discuss the Committee's proposed revised plan elements. When asked whether the Commission is mandated to provide a report of all changes, Josh Peters noted that they are mandated to evaluate environmental impacts of every change that is proposed. He further explained that the Commission essentially chose to combine into one two separate procedures as outlined in the Planning Commission assessment section of the Code. Instead of drafting a report with Policy recommendations in general to be presented to the Board, the Committee has begun line-in, line-out modifications. Edel Sokol mentioned that it would be desirable for Staff to review the Commission's work. Staff responded that other priorities have kept them from working along with the Committee on joint recommendations.

It was suggested that the Commission could endorse the recommendations at the September 5 meeting. Staff agreed to provide the Commission with clean drafts of all elements. The Commission was in support of having Josh Peters facilitate a public workshop at the Commission's regular meeting on September 15. There was agreement that before the next meeting the committee would meet to incorporate recommended changes from tonight as well as to finalize the Introduction section. At the next meeting, the revised package and a report would be presented with an explanation of the changes and a basic framework for what we work was accomplished and some of the philosophy behind the Committee's approach and, if possible, a paragraph for each section and the strategy behind that particular element. There was confirmation that the plan and UDC have to be in compliance with the GMA.

**D. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

**E. Approval of Minutes**

These minutes were approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of September, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas McNerney, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary