

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 3, 2004

- A. OPENING BUSINESS
- B. DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION TO BOCC ON 2004 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN  
AMENDMENT FINAL DOCKET
- C. ADJOURNMENT

## **A. OPENING BUSINESS**

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

DCD staff present were Josh Peters, Kevin Russell, Kyle Alm, Karen Driscoll, and Cheryl Halvorson, secretary.

There were about seven members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were Linda Swisher, Marilyn Hoeft, Nancy Dorgan, and Ande Grahn of Olympic Peninsula Planning.

The minutes for October 20, 2004, were approved as submitted.

The Chair invited staff updates.

Josh Peters explained that a letter from the DOE had been handed out. He noted that the comment period to the Planning Commission had closed, but he thought the commissioners would still be interested in seeing it. He noted that the letter would go to the BOCC for their information as well. Tom McNerney noted the DOE comment about buffers being based upon what was needed rather than upon a statutory number of feet, which might vary from 25 to 300 feet. Mr. Peters explained that was based on a new wetlands rating system which was adopted in 2004 and replaced an early 1990's rating system. He explained the new rating system and the kinds of factors that would now play into a typical wetland assessment. Bud Schindler stated that he had reviewed the current county regulations and thought all of those elements were taken into account. Mr. Peters explained his understanding of the current wetland rating system, which had to do with the features of the wetland itself. The new system was a more holistic approach based more on the functionality of the wetland within the landscape. He thought it was a bit more complex with more variables.

Tom McNerney commented that he understood from the letter that the intent was to require a buffer that was more realistic based upon what was on the ground, rather than merely setting specific buffer widths. Josh Peters responded that he thought DOE thought it would be more flexible. However, they were also advocating for bigger standard buffers at the start of the evaluation process. Then, depending upon the findings related to the specific site, you may be able to reduce the buffer. He stated that the county currently had a mechanism for allowing a buffer reduction. One of the possibilities was that this tool would provide more protocol for the Administrator in order to make those kinds of judgments. Mr. Peters stated that another reason staff wanted to provide the DOE letter to the Planning Commission was to show the commission another piece of evidence staff was trying to consider in working on staff's own proposal for critical areas protections. He thought it was possible staff would make some adjustments to their proposal based upon this and other letters that addressed that particular aspect of the proposal. He noted that it was something that had not been discussed at the Planning Commission level.

Tom McNerney stated that the letter was basically related to UDC regulations, rather than Comp Plan amendments. Josh Peters responded that the staff report on the Comp Plan amendments did contain some recommendations for amendments to the UDC. They had to do with Part A of MLA04-28. He stated

that the county was obligated to consider best available science again and look at the development regulations with regard to critical areas and make a determination about whether they were protected enough. Mr. Peters stated that his point was that staff may make some adjustment to the staff report at some juncture in the process based upon the public comment.

The Chair invited public comments. There were none offered.

**B. DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION TO BOCC ON 2004 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN  
AMENDMENT FINAL DOCKET**

**MLA04-27, Jefferson County (Agricultural Lands)**

Tom McNerney stated that there were about four parcels that the Planning Commission had asked receive further review by the Ag Lands Committee. Dennis Schultz reported that the Ag Lands Committee met regarding the subject parcels, and some parcels had received site visits. The committee reviewed the criteria again along with the criteria in the Comp Plan. Based upon the committee's findings, the committee was recommending that the parcels owned by Joe Walden and Pam Taylor be recommended for approval for the rezone, which was a reversal of the original recommendation. He stated that the other parcels still fell within the criteria for denial.

Eileen Rogers asked if anyone had been in contact with the property owners. Karen Driscoll explained that she had written to all of the property owners whose parcels were recommended for denial. Therefore, they had had an opportunity to object. One had and the committee was now recommending approval based upon the criteria and the new information about the subject parcels. A second parcel was also now being recommended for approval, even though the county had not heard from that owner, based upon further review and research. A third parcel was still being recommended for denial.

Tom McNerney stated that the commissioners had been provided a list of all of the properties that had applied for the rezone. He stated that the properties that were recommended for denial were ones that did not fit as agricultural land.

Allen Panasuk moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of MLA04-27 with the modifications discussed. Jenny Davis seconded the motion.

Dennis Schultz recused himself from the discussion and vote because he owned one of the properties on the list. Tom McNerney stated, for the record, that some of the staff also owned properties on the list, but they could not vote on the issue.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously (8-0-0 with one recused).

**MLA03-232, Port of Port Townsend (Airport)**

Kevin Russell reported on the Airport Committee meeting. Staff provided a new draft, which the committee had reviewed. It established two overlays. He stated that the committee looked at the two proposals and their differences. The committee decided that Overlay I still needed some disclosure language. He handed out an updated map depicting the two overlays. He stated that a new draft had been e-mailed to the Planning Commission on this date and was being provided as a handout to the

commissioners at the meeting. Mr. Russell explained the two modifications made in the November 3 draft. One was a clarification. The other was that, when the two overlays were broken apart, the nuisance provisions were not carried over to Overlay II.

Phil Flynn, Airport Committee chair, stated that the issue had been ongoing for a number of years and, recently, for a number of months. He stated the belief that this proposal addressed most of the issues raised during that time, particularly those related to the noise issue. He stated that he, personally, recommended that the Planning Commission forward the proposal to the BOCC. Mr. Flynn stated that Ms. Davis and Mr. Panasuk were also members of the committee.

Jenny Davis stated that she had not really had a chance to digest the revisions regarding the nuisance provisions. Kevin Russell explained that the nuisance provisions had not actually changed. The change was that they should apply to both overlays.

Allen Panasuk thanked staff for their work on the airport amendment.

Phil Flynn moved that the proposal for MLA03-232, as revised, be sent forward to the BOCC. Allen Panasuk seconded the motion.

Bud Schindler asked whether the disclosure provisions would apply to Overlay II as well as Overlay I. Kevin Russell replied that Overlay II was more of an area to apprise people that they were in a zone that had a flight path designated by the FAA. So there was not going to be anything put on permit conditions. All that would happen was that, when someone applied for a Type II or III permit, the county would have to make a finding that the use that would be going into Overlay II was compatible. Mr. Schindler stated that he thought the issue with Overlay II was safety. There were noise issues with Overlay I. He was surprised that safety was not part of the disclosure in Overlay II. Mr. Russell replied that the safety element was basically taken from the DOT guidelines. Those guidelines said that we should not allow certain types of uses in that overlay. He stated that staff and the committee developed a list of prohibited uses for Overlay II, but they were not including noise disclosure provisions.

Tom McNerney stated that there were two references in the draft to the Environment Element of the Comp Plan. He asked if those had been added to the Environment Element. Kevin Russell replied that staff had made some revisions but they should check to make sure all of them had been done. Josh Peters clarified that there was nothing for the Environment Element; the references were to the Economic Development Element. Those changes had been made.

Phil Flynn stated that there were a couple of typographical errors. Kevin Russell replied that staff had changed one and would change the other as well.

Tom McNerney stated that he thought the committee had talked about Type I permits (single family residences) having a stamp on the permit notifying the permittee about the overlay zone. Kevin Russell stated that the proposal did not change with regard to Type I permits; there would be no notification on the permit or referral to the Port. Phil Flynn agreed that was the way the committee meeting had ended. He pointed out that CTED had questioned why you

would not notify the Type I permits in the same manner as you would the Type II and III permits.

Tom McNerney offered a friendly amendment that Type I permits have some kind of notification on the permit, a stamp or something similar, that they were in the safety zone for both Overlay I and II. He clarified that it would merely be a notification on the permit; the permit would not go to any agency (like the Port). He did not think it would be a big problem if it was just a stamp to be put on the permit. He stated that the county already checked Type I permits for other kinds of overlays, such as critical areas, so it should not be a big problem to do a similar thing for the airport overlays.

Kevin Russell stated that the committee had discussed how people became informed. He stated that when someone came into DCD to research a property, staff gave them maps and other information the county had available. He did not recall talking about making a change and imposing something. He stated that on the Type II and III permits, we were only talking about making a finding, not a condition, on the permits. Tom McNerney stated that he was only talking about a notification to a person who was applying for any permit that the subject property was in the overlay.

Before accepting the friendly amendment, Phil Flynn suggested the Planning Commission be clear about what was intended.

Josh Peters suggested that the commissioners review the provisions as proposed. He referred the commissioners to Page 17 of the November 3 draft. In ii and iii, the document addressed the disclosure provisions, with iii being the referral of Type II and III permits. Mr. McNerney was not proposing any change to iii. In ii, the words "except Type I permits" would be deleted. Dennis Schultz stated that the result would be that anyone who applied for any kind of permit would be informed that their parcel was within the airport area. Jenny Davis thought something should be added under the Overlay II section. Mr. Peters stated that there was currently no such language in the Overlay II section.

Jim Hagen stated the understanding that Mr. McNerney was merely following up on the proposal from CTED.

The commissioners discussed whether the friendly amendment would apply to both Overlay I and Overlay II. Kevin Russell stated that CTED did not review anything on Overlay II. He stated that Overlay II was based on DOT guidelines, which the county had followed. Tom McNerney stated that he would propose, as a compromise, that the friendly amendment apply only to Overlay I.

Phil Flynn and Allen Panasuk accepted the friendly amendment. Tom McNerney summarized that the motion as amended was that the Planning Commission recommended approval of MLA03-232 with the November 3 draft and with the revision as discussed for Overlay I in the friendly amendment.

Jenny Davis stated that the purpose of Overlay II was so that people who were looking to buy property within that area, when they were doing their due diligence, could come to the county and find out about the parcel. She did not think it should have a nuisance provision. While she could understand having it, the commission had not discussed it at all. She did not think the commission should add a nuisance provision at this late point in time because it had not been part of the public process so far. She acknowledged that

there would be more public process before the BOCC. She stated that she knew the neighborhood was upset about having the nuisance provision on Overlay I. She did not think it was necessary to have it on Overlay II. From her point of view, the second overlay was so that people could go to the county and pull up a map and see that they were in an overlay. Ms. Davis asked if the nuisance provision was recommended by DOT. Kevin Russell replied that it was from the Port's original proposal. Ms. Davis pointed out the Port's proposal was for Overlay I but not Overlay II. Mr. Russell stated that the Port's response to Overlay II was that it was an area of safety and would experience noise and vibration, so the nuisance provision should carry over. Ms. Davis stated that Overlay I was a noise overlay. Mr. Russell agreed, stating that it was based on the 55 DNL contour.

Dennis Schultz stated that you also had to consider that Port property extended outside that 55 DNL noise overlay zone. There were properties abutting that Port property that was outside the noise overlay.

Jenny Davis stated that her concern was that she knew the neighborhood was opposed to a nuisance provision, and she did not like adding it in at the last minute without having a public process.

Tom McNerney stated the opinion that the issue had been discussed at the committee meeting, so it was not a last minute idea. It was also a response to comments at the public hearing. Jenny Davis stated that her concern was with Overlay II, which she did not think had been discussed. Mr. McNerney stated that the whole reason for calling the airport an essential public facility [EPF] was to protect it from encroachment by incompatible uses. He stated that the whole purpose of a nuisance provision was to notify people about where they were, and so they would know what to expect, and they would have to accept that if they moved there. He stated that the whole intent of an EPF, whether it was a prison or an airport, was to make sure that facility was protected.

Jim Hagen commented that, from a legal standpoint, part of the planning strategies for the Comp Plan was guidance from Hearings Board decisions. He stated that there were specific Hearings Board decisions that related to what Mr. McNerney had just said. He thought the Hearings Board decisions were very relevant. He thought what tied in with the nuisance issue was private property issues and the issue of takings. He stated that Appendix F of the Comp Plan contained a takings checklist. Mr. Hagen stated that he was sensitive to the core issue of the best interests of the public, and protecting this EPF, and sensitivity to private property owners and how to best balance those interests. He stated that, by the legal guidelines available regarding takings and the need to protect the EPF, he agreed with what Mr. McNerney said.

Tom McNerney stated that he looked at it as a preventative thing. If you told the people ahead of time, before they built a home or there were several homes and then they found out about the airport, it would be too late. Phil Flynn stated that the Planning Commission had recommended Overlay II because it was the flight path and there would be noise and vibration. That was in essence a nuisance. People would either accept it or reject it and not move there. He thought that alerting them to the fact was probably in the best interests of the county as well as protecting the EPF. Mr. McNerney stated that Overlay II was in response to the public testimony from the pilots about their flight pattern.

Jenny Davis stated that, unfortunately, the Port did not include an overlay for the flight pattern in their proposal so that the public would have had more time to comment. Phil Flynn stated that the public certainly would have an opportunity with the BOCC.

Allen Panasuk stated the opinion that the Planning Commission had done a better job than the Port. The commission's recommendation addressed public comments received about safety as well as comments received from state agencies. He stated that the public could still comment to the BOCC, so the process was not finished.

Allen Panasuk called for the question. The vote on going to the question carried.

The motion, as amended, carried with seven in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions (7-0-2).

Tom McNerney stated that Edel Sokol had indicated previously that she would not participate in the discussion or vote on the airport amendments due to her relationship to Port Commissioner Bob Sokol.

#### **MLA03-244, People for a Rural Quimper (Airport)**

Tom McNerney stated that the staff recommendation was that the application be denied.

Phil Flynn moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the PRQ application, MLA03-244, be denied. Jim Hagen seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried with seven in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions (7-0-2).

#### **MLA04-28, Jefferson County (Comp Plan Update)**

Tom McNerney stated that staff was still working on completing the Land Use and Rural Element response. Therefore, the Planning Commission would not be able to complete its recommendation to the BOCC at this meeting. There were several sections, however, that the commission could complete.

Josh Peters addressed the Land Use and Rural Element issue. He stated that it was the most complicated of the elements and included a lot of the core policies. He stated that staff had responded to the Planning Commission proposal and provided it to the Director, who had identified some issues that needed be resolved. He stated that the commission's options were to wait for the staff response or to move ahead with what the commission had. The commission could make a recommendation to the BOCC without having a response from staff.

Tom McNerney stated that there was some thought that the committee had not done as much work on it as staff had found could or should have been done. It may be appropriate to reorganize the whole element. He stated that things had changed since the Comp Plan was originally written, citing ESB 6094 as one example. He wanted it to be clear that it was not a simple re-write because things had changed with new laws. He thought the element was sadly obsolete. He stated that staff was trying to reorganize the whole element, which was much more drafting than the committee had proposed. That was what was taking the time.

Bud Schindler asked when staff thought the element would be ready. Josh Peters replied that it was up to the Director, stating that he had some issues with it that he wanted staff to work on. Mr. Peters stated that he was not sure when it would be ready. Mr. Schindler stated that he wondered if it would be ready by the following week so the Planning Commission could go over it together and still meet the recommendation deadline. Tom McNerney stated that would be up to the staff and how much time they needed.

Tom McNerney asked what the other option would be with regard to what the Planning Commission could do. Josh Peters replied that there were two pieces to the Comp Plan update. One was the Planning Commission's re-write (Part B). The other was the county's response to the state mandated update (Part A), particularly related to the critical areas issue. He stated that staff had been focusing on that particular proposal. He stated that he was not sure staff would have that piece of the puzzle ready by the next week either. He thought there was a chance, but he was not sure. He thought it may be necessary for staff to go to the BOCC with a different recommendation, separate from the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission was still discussing issues, then it could come to the Planning Commission first. If not, then staff may need to take it directly to the BOCC.

Tom McNerney asked how many elements had received both staff and Planning Commission consideration. Josh Peters replied that the only element for which staff had not provided a response to the Planning Commission was the Land Use and Rural Element. He stated that the Natural Resources Element had not been amended. Mr. McNerney wondered if there was a way the commission could make a recommendation on everything except those two elements. He understood that staff could not provide an estimated date of completion of the new draft. He understood that the timeline was that all of the Comp Plan amendments should be finalized by the BOCC at one time. Josh Peters stated that the county may decide to separate the critical areas piece out, similar to what Port Townsend was doing, in order to put more time into it. He stated that Port Townsend's critical areas piece was part of their code, so that may make a difference for the county. He admitted that, by law, it was part of the update. Mr. McNerney stated that the critical areas issues were really UDC issues which could be done later. Mr. Peters stated that there were some Comp Plan amendments also.

Tom McNerney and Josh Peters discussed the Natural Resources Element. Mr. Peters stated that the element was not included in the September 22 Staff Report and Recommendation, which included the Planning Commission's recommended Comp Plan amendments. He stated that the Planning Commission did not make changes to the Natural Resources Element. Mr. McNerney stated that, if the commission made changes to the element now, it would be appropriate to say that we had not had public involvement in it and it had not been subject to a public hearing. He asked if there were any other elements, besides the Land Use and Rural Element, staff had not done a response to. Mr. Peters replied that there were no others.

Tom McNerney suggested that it may be possible for the Planning Commission to do its final review and recommendations to the BOCC on the other elements and hope that staff could get its review of the Land Use and Rural Element in time for the commission to act on November 10. Josh Peters responded that staff would try. He stated that the timing was tight and he understood the commissioners' frustration. He stated that, at the same time, staff did not start out the year expecting to re-write the whole Comp Plan; that just sort of happened. He stated that the Planning Commission had asked staff to



respond to the commission's proposal and staff did the best they could in the time they had. If the Planning Commission wanted to move on and move their proposal to the BOCC, the commission could do that. Or, the commission could wait until staff felt comfortable in giving the commission the response to the last element.

Edel Sokol and Josh Peters discussed how long the Director had the Land Use and Rural Element. Mr. Peters stated that staff had met with the Director to discuss issues. He stated that staff was working on its response to the Planning Commission's draft; it was not a staff recommendation. He stated that the Planning Commission's recommendation had been ready since September 5.

Eileen Rogers asked about the Natural Resources Element and whether the public had had an opportunity to comment on it. She asked what had happened to that element in the process. Josh Peters replied that staff had identified through discussions that there were some parts of that element that warranted modification. He stated that the element had not been before the public because no proposed line-in/line-out amendments were suggested by either staff or the Planning Commission. Therefore, the element was not included in the September 22 Staff Report and Recommendation. Mr. Peters stated that one way to get the public participation on the few amendments that should be made would be to include it in the BOCC's public hearing on the Comp Plan amendments.

Jim Hagen stated that what he was hearing was that the Planning Commission had two options. One was for the commission to forward the entire Part B, which contained the commission's proposed Land Use and Rural Element, with whatever changes the commission may want to make based upon public comments. The other option was to wait for the staff response. He stated the understanding that the staff response would go beyond even what the Planning Commission had recommended. He stated that staff had said that they had not anticipated a re-write of the Comp Plan. Yet it appeared that staff was doing a further re-write of what the Planning Commission proposed. He stated that it just seemed like there had been a series of delays. He wondered whether the proposed changes would get to the BOCC in time for them to make a timely decision. He stated that his final point was that he would love to see staff's response to the committee's work on the Land Use and Rural Element.

Tom McNerney stated that staff was talking about doing a proposal because it was felt that element could stand a drastic revision. Josh Peters stated that if we were going to re-write the Comp Plan, then we should re-write the Comp Plan. He stated that we should take an organized approach to it and, if necessary, take another year to do it. We could start with all the work the commission had done this year as a building block. He stated that the department's work plan for 2004 was to finalize the UGA, work on some other issues including the airport and ag lands, and to respond to state mandates. He stated that the Planning Commission received a letter from the BOCC, and the commission took that and ran with it, which was great. However, we were now in a position where he was not sure what the commission was asking staff to do. Mr. McNerney stated that his point was that, if staff had some drastic changes to the Land Use and Rural Element and it had not been before the public in a public hearing, even if the Planning Commission got the staff's revisions and response, perhaps it would not be appropriate to put it in the Comp Plan at this time. Mr. Peters stated that staff was not proposing to add a lot of new information. He stated that staff would add

some policies that were part of the discussions. Mr. McNerney stated that his concern was that we were not doing something that would not be acceptable to the public process. If staff's revisions were in response to what the commission had heard from the public during the comment period, it would not be improper from a public process standpoint to send it on to the BOCC. Mr. Peters stated that the staff review was a response to the Planning Commission's recommended element, the same as the response to the other elements. He stated that staff had talked about five or six issues. Mr. McNerney asked if there was a possibility that it would be ready by November 10 for the Planning Commission to act on it. Mr. Peters replied that it was a possibility but it would depend upon the Director, who had some concerns with it.

Eileen Rogers stated that the committee had done a lot of work. She stated that the commissioners were not professional planners, so they looked to the staff to provide their staff reports. She was concerned that what she was hearing was that the commission's work would be going forward without any staff report. Tom McNerney stated that what the commission was talking about was only the Land Use and Rural Element. He stated that there were many other elements that the commission could act on which had received a staff response.

Allen Panasuk expressed a concern with the process. He stated the belief that the Planning Commission should provide direction and the staff should do the work. He stated that the commissioners had provided countless hours of work that he thought, quite frankly, they should not have done at all. He thought the drafts should come from staff and the Planning Commission should review them and pass them on. He expressed frustration that the commission was "spinning its wheels" because someone (the Director) was uncomfortable. Josh Peters offered a different perspective. He stated that he recognized all of the work that had gone on this summer. He stated that the UDC said that the Planning Commission, during a periodic review, was to basically come up with a report. That report would lay out a general policy approach or policy guidelines for, essentially, staff or a consultant to put into action. The next thing that would happen would be that staff would look into the Comp Plan, re-write it where appropriate, and given it to the Planning Commission for comment. Then the Planning Commission would review the document. It did not happen that way this year for whatever reason. He stated that if he had control of the situation, he would have managed it differently, but he was not in control of the situation. Mr. Panasuk stated that he understood that. He stated that, as someone who donated his time to the Planning Commission, he got extremely frustrated when he heard that we did not have time. Mr. Peters responded that lack of time was not his point, although that clearly was a factor. He stated that there were actually substantive issues that he believed were the cause of the Director's discomfort. Mr. Panasuk stated that he would prefer that staff, including the Director, bring those issues they were uncomfortable about forward to the Planning Commission and present them. He recognized that staff were the planners and could deal with the language better than the commissioners.

Tom McNerney stated that he would prefer to take a different approach, rather than trying to lay blame and questioning why it was not done. He stated that he would like to work on finalizing the other elements, which had also received considerable time and effort, and hope that the commission could receive the staff response on the Land Use and Rural Element in time for the commission to act on it.

Eileen Rogers asked if staff had reviewed any of the Planning Commission work on Part B. Josh Peters replied that the materials in the October 29 mailing contained the staff response to the Planning Commission proposal. It included five elements. It did not include the Land Use and Rural Element. Tom McNerney suggested that the commission take action on those five elements, which had been done in conjunction with staff. The commissioners agreed to proceed.

The commissioners reviewed the Comp Plan Review Committee's recommendation for revisions to the various elements. The recommendations were contained in an e-mail dated November 3 from staff. The commissioners discussed each of the suggestions. In some cases, the commissioners acted upon the suggestions; and in some cases, the commissioners agreed to leave the draft as proposed. These minutes do not reflect the specific discussions, especially as they related to wordsmithing or grammatical corrections. Specific revisions were noted by staff for updating the draft elements. Certain portions of the discussions are noted in the following for informational purposes.

Jim Hagen referred to Page 5-5 of the Housing Element where it addressed housing costs versus incomes. He stated that Census data indicated that even people with the median wage were spending a disproportionate percentage of their income on an average priced home. It was not just the moderate and low wage earners. He thought that was an important concept to include, although he did not have specific wording to offer. Edel Sokol responded that the committee had proposed some verbiage to address the issue.

Referring to Page 5-7 of the Housing Element where it addressed "lack of available land", Jim Hagen asked if the GMA required the counties to address availability of land versus affordability and the market factor. He asked if GMA simply asked that there be a comparison of available land against the population growth projection. He stated that there was a big difference between having enough available land for the projected growth and having land that was affordable to the two-thirds of the population. Josh Peters stated that one thing you had to do under the Act was to make sure you could accommodate your projected population. That was more of a raw number exercise. He thought the Housing Element was where the nuances of affordability came into effect.

Allen Panasuk moved that the Planning Commission accept the recommendations of the committee as noted in the November 3, 2004, memo to the Planning Commission from staff for the Housing Element. Phil Flynn seconded the motion.

Bud Schindler stated that he had some editorial comments that he could provide to staff. One related to an inconsistency with Table 5-3 on Page 5-6 regarding the percentage of mobile manufactured homes not matching the percentage cited in the text. There were a number of other editorial comments pointed out. Tom McNerney pointed out that most of the comments would be addressed during the next update of the draft.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously (9-0-0).

The commissioners moved on to the Economic Development Element. They reviewed the Comp Plan Review Committee's recommendation contained in the November 3 memo.

Jim Hagen proposed removing Policy 9.1 and explained his reasoning, which had to do with the thought that the subject of the policy was already addressed elsewhere.

Jim Hagen moved that the Planning Commission eliminate Policy 9.1 of the Economic Development Element. Eileen Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried with seven in favor and two opposed (7-2-0).

Allen Panasuk moved that the Planning Commission accept the Economic Development Element as corrected per the November 3 memo. Eileen Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried with eight in favor, none opposed, and one abstention (8-0-1).

The commissioners moved on to the Introduction Element and reviewed the committee's recommendations contained in the November 3 memo.

Edel Sokol moved that the Planning Commission add the language proposed in the November 3 memo for the Introduction. Bud Schindler seconded the motion which carried unanimously (9-0-0).

Phil Flynn moved that the Planning Commission accept the Introduction Element as amended. Eileen Rogers seconded the motion which carried unanimously (9-0-0).

The commissioners moved on to the Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historical Preservation Element. They reviewed the suggestions from the committee contained in the November 3 memo.

Allen Panasuk moved that the Planning Commission approve the Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation Element as amended by the November 3 memo and agreed to by the commissioners. Phil Flynn seconded the motion which carried unanimously (9-0-0).

The commissioners moved on to the Environment Element.

Regarding the reference to Summer Chum and Chinook Salmon on Page 8-2, the commissioners suggested that the verbiage be changed to "Currently in 2004, ..." or that staff find the date they were listed and reference that date.

Regarding ENG 7.0 on Page 8-27 where it addressed "including high quality native vegetation", the commissioners agreed to delete "high quality".

Some commissioners suggested that ENP 13.5 on Page 8-32 include sewage treatment as an addition with water systems. Josh Peters pointed out that ENP 2.11 was a proposed addition that addressed the suggestion. No change was made to ENP 13.5.

The commissioners agreed to an editorial change in ENP 10.1.

Eileen Rogers moved the adoption of the Environment Element as amended. Jim Hagen seconded the motion which carried unanimously (9-0-0).

The commissioners moved on to the Utilities Element pages which were included in the October 29 mailing. There was also a memo from Allen Sartin regarding the Capital Facilities Element.

Phil Flynn moved that the Planning Commission accept the Allen Sartin memo as part of the Capital Facilities Element. Edel Sokol seconded the motion which carried unanimously (9-0-0).

The commissioners reviewed the Utilities Element pages. The commissioners made some editorial revisions and pointed out some inconsistencies.

Edel Sokol moved that the Planning Commission approve the Utilities Element as corrected. Jenny Davis seconded the motion which carried unanimously (9-0-0).

The commissioners moved on to the Implementation and Monitoring section of the Introduction Element. Edel Sokol had some questions of staff. One related to whether the Airport Master Plan would become part of the Comprehensive Plan. It would not. Another related to population projections and supporting the growth.

Referring back to the Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation Element, Bud Schindler raised an issue with "limiting the amount of lot coverage" referenced on Page 6-23. He stated that the committee had recommended the reference be deleted, but it was put back into the draft. He explained the issues related to the reference and the committee's reasons for deleting it.

Edel Sokol moved that the fourth bullet on Page 6-23, "limiting the amount of lot coverage", in the Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation Element be deleted. Bud Schindler seconded the motion.

Jenny Davis asked for staff's reasoning for putting the reference back in. Josh Peters replied that it was accurate in terms of the reality of the regulations, stating that this county did have lot coverage limitations for most zones in the county.

The motion carried with six in favor and three opposed (6-3-0).

The commissioners returned to the Implementation and Monitoring section. On Page 1-18, the commissioners agreed to add "values" in the fourth bullet where it said "... periodic review and updates in response to changing community goals and vision ...". On Page 1-21, the commissioners agreed to add the word "needs" to the second paragraph so that it would state "... changes in technology, omissions or errors, needs, or a declared emergency)."

Edel Sokol moved that the Planning Commission accept the September, 2004, Transportation Element. Allen Panasuk seconded the motion which carried unanimously (9-0-0).

Eileen Rogers moved that the Planning Commission accept the Vision Statement. Jenny Davis seconded the motion which carried unanimously (9-0-0).

These actions completed the Planning Commission's recommendations on all of the elements with the exception of the Land Use and Rural Element.

Josh Peters stated that the Planning Commission had some options: (1) Recommend the Land Use and Rural Element as the Planning Commission had proposed, plus the critical areas changes that staff had proposed, and move the whole amendment package to the BOCC. (2) Or, recommend the Land Use and Rural Element as the Planning Commission had proposed and move the whole

package to the BOCC, but defer the critical areas piece for more work and discussion. As was noted, the critical areas piece did not have to be done as part of the annual amendment cycle, although it was supposed to be done by December 1. (3) Or, delay to await a Land Use and Rural Element from staff in response to the Planning Commission's proposal and also to discuss critical areas.

Tom McNerney stated that the commission had tentatively scheduled a meeting for November 10. He suggested that the Planning Commission hold that meeting in order to review and make a recommendation on the Land Use and Rural Element. If the staff response was available by then, the commission could act on it. He thought the commission's work would be completed by then. The tradeoff may be that the Planning Commission could cancel the rest of the meetings for the year. The commissioners agreed by consensus to hold a meeting on November 10 at the Tri Area Community Center in order to act on the Land Use and Rural Element, with the hope that staff would have its response available.

#### **C. ADJOURNMENT**

The Chair invited public comments. There were none offered.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

#### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

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

---

Thomas McNerney, Chair

---

Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary