

Lewis County Planning Commission

Public Meeting

In-Person & Virtual Meeting via Zoom

June 28, 2022 - Meeting Notes

Planning Commissioners Present: Lorie Spogen, District 1; Jason Alves, District 1; Gretchen Fritsch, District 3, Bob Russell, District 2; Corbin Foster, AL; Frank Corbin, District 3

Staff Present: Lee Napier, Community Development Director; Mindy Brooks, Senior Long Range Planner; Tammy Martin; Amber Smith, Prosecuting Attorney;

Others Present: Tammy Baraconi, City of Chehalis; Hillary Hoke, City of Centralia; Gwen Ichinose Bagley, YMCA; Loria Yeadon, YMCA

Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Draft Meeting Notes – June 14, 2022
- Staff Report: Centralia UGA Expansion
- Staff Report: Chehalis UGA Expansion
- Staff Report: YMCA Rezone
- Staff Presentation: UGA Expansion Proposals
- Staff Presentation: YMCA Rezone
- YMCA Written Testimony

1. Zoom Guidelines

Lee Napier dispensed with the Zoom Guidelines.

2. Call to Order

A. Determination of a Quorum

6 Commissioners were present; there was a quorum.

3. Approval of Agenda

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the agenda. Commissioner Russell made the motion to approve the agenda; second by Commissioner Alves. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the meeting notes from June 14, 2022. Commissioner Corbin made a motion to approve; second by Commissioner Russell. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Public Hearing – YMCA Rezone

Chair Spogen asked the commissioners if they would like to place a time limit on the public testimony for the YMCA rezone. Lee Napier responded that 13 people signed up to provide public testimony in addition to anyone joining via Zoom that would like to testify. In light of the information, the commissioners chose not to limit the time for public testimony further than the standard 3 minutes per person. Commissioner Corbin made a motion to end oral testimony at 8:00pm and if not everyone present at today's hearing is able to provide testimony prior to 8:00pm to continue the hearing to another date. The motion was seconded by Commission Russell. The motion passed.

Chair Spogen, being concerned that the hearing be fair in form and substance as well as appearance, asked the following questions;

Does anyone in the audience objects to the participation of any member of this Commission in this public hearing. There were no objections.

Is there anyone in the audience who believes that the public was not notified in a timely manner? Ron Nilson stated concerns about the timeframe in which the public was notified and that they were only told one week in advance that members of the public were allowed to attend the meeting in person. The Planning Commission noted his concerns, but had met the legal notification requirements and had the right to move forward with the hearing.

Is there anyone in the audience who believes that this Commission does not have jurisdiction in these matters? There were no objections.

Do any Commissioners have an interest in this property or issue? Do any of you stand to gain or lose any financial benefit because of the outcome of this hearing? Or are you otherwise unable to hear and consider this item in a fair and objective manner? There were no comments from the Commissioners.

Have any of the Commission members engaged in communication outside this hearing with opponents or proponents on the issue to be heard? If so, that member must place on the record the substance of any such communication so that other interested parties may have the right at this hearing to rebut the substance of the communication. There were no comments from the Commissioners.

The purpose of this hearing is for the Commission to hear and consider the pertinent facts relating to this proposal. I will now turn it over to staff.

A. Staff Presentation

Mindy Brooks, Senior Long Range Planner with Community Development gave a presentation on the YMCA Rezone Proposal.

Prior to tonight, staff provided two reports on April 15th and May 13th, as well as presentations at workshops held on April 26th and May 24th. That information was made available to the public on the Community Development webpage.

Tonight I will provide a quick overview of the rezone process and then a summary of the YMCA rezone proposal. After that, I will summarize staff findings and the written testimony received. The applicant, YMCA, is here this evening and will have a few remarks included in the presentation.

Here is the rezone process: First, the proposal is submitted by the property owner as a rezone application to Community Development. Next staff reviews to make sure we have all the information needed to process the application. Once staff determine an application is complete we notify the applicant. Then we issue the notice of application, which is mailed to property owners within ¼ miles of the site and posted on the site at the road. The public can provide written comments on the application. The comments are provided to the applicant and they have the option of amending the application. Next staff issues a non-project SEPA Determination. The determination is also noticed and the public can provide written comments on the determination. Then, staff package all of the information, including all of the public comments to date, and share with the Planning Commission in form of staff reports and presentations at workshops. After the workshops, Planning Commission holds a public hearing to receive testimony from the public. That is the step we are at now. Planning Commission will weigh the evidence in the record and testimony tonight, and make a recommendation on the rezone proposal to Board of County Commissioners. Before the Planning Commission recommendation is given to BOCC, the Department of Commerce has a 60-day review period. Commerce is verifying that all state rules are met. After Commerce review, the Planning Commission's recommendation is transmitted to BOCC and they hold a public hearing to take testimony before making a final decision.

These are the criteria Planning Commission and BOCC uses to make decisions on rezones. First, all the state Growth Management Act rules and the Countywide Planning Policies must be met. Second, there must be a demonstrated need for the amendment. Need could be that the land is not suited for the existing allowed uses or other uses would better serve the County's planning goals. Third, is the amendment in the public's best interest? This is the most discretionary criteria, although there is guidance provided in the code. Fourth, the amendment cannot facilitate spot zoning. That means the rezone is not creating an island of zoning that is

inconsistent with land around it. The April 13 staff report included findings against all applicable rules and policies.

This is a quick summary of the YMCA proposal – we gave a longer overview at the April 26 workshop. The site is north of Mineral Lake. YMCA has request to apply the Master Planned Resort overlay zone to 500 acres of Forest Resource Land, shown in orange on the map. To do this, the Comp Plan map designation needs to change from Resource Land to Other Rural Land. YMCA would like to develop an overnight youth camp for 400 campers, 100 staff, cabins, tents sites and trails and dock. One thing you need to keep in mind is that this is a non-project application, there is no project proposed even though they've stated their intended future plans. Project level impacts are not known at the time of rezone because there is no development proposed – it is just a change of zoning. Future development, should the rezone be granted, will require future permits and SEPA review to address project-level impacts. Planning Commission is only charged with evaluating the rezone and if it meets the approval criteria in 17.12.100. Planning Commission is not charged with evaluating the future project impacts.

Staff provided findings in the report on April 15 and at the workshop on April 26. Findings are where staff evaluate the proposal, SEPA determination and public comments to-date to determine if the approval criteria are met. I'm going to go over our main points from the staff findings.

The first approval criterion is that the proposal conforms to the state Growth Management Act and the Countywide Planning Policies. GMA and CWPP are actually dozens of criteria. Staff provided findings against all applicable laws and policies in Exhibit E of the first staff report. Exhibit E is 17 pages long, lots of rules need to be met and I encourage you to read it in full. I will cover some of the main findings.

GMA has a rule about MPR. MPR are an allowed use provided the rules are met. "A Master Planned Resort means a self-contained and fully integrated planned unit development, in a setting of significant natural amenities, with primary focus on destination resort facilities consisting of short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of developed on-site indoor or outdoor recreational facilities." That is what YMCA is proposing.

The criteria are primarily about containing the MPR and making sure impacts are addressed including infrastructure, services and environmental protection. The criteria also are about increasing jobs and economy. Providing access to unique recreational opportunities. And having minimal impact on forestry lands. The terms of the SEPA MDNS are clear that project-level impacts to infrastructure, services and the environment will be addressed through subsequent permitting process and project-level SEPA determinations, so those criteria are met. The MPR will add jobs and increase tourism. The impact to forest land is negligible and the MPR overlay requires that 40% of the land be preserved as open space.

The Countywide Planning Policies also call for use of MPR zone to encourage recreational uses suited to the unique opportunities in rural Lewis County. There are no MPRs right now, this

would be the first one. This location is unique because it's on Mineral Lake and within 15 miles of Mt Rainier.

The second criteria is a demonstrated need. There are no MPRs in Lewis County even though both the CWPP and the GMA encourage MPR to increase recreational access and eco-tourism. Therefore there is a need to meet the County's own policies. In addition, YMCA stated a need based on increase demand for this type of overnight camp facility.

The third criteria is the most open ended. There is guidance, but you are allowed to consider more than what is listed. Staff find that the MPR will provide recreational access and jobs and have a negligible impact on forest lands. Therefore, for these items the rezone are in the public's interest. The concern about future negative impacts on the public can be addressed during the project-level permitting. Should the rezone be approved, there will be many permitting steps, including the Type III Binding Site Plan, which will require project-level SEPA. And all applicable LCC development regulations related to sewer, water and transportation will also need to be met.

The last criterion is that the rezone should not facilitate spot zoning. The reason why this criterion is used is to prevent a single property being zoned something very different from the surrounding uses. This is not the case with the YMCA proposal. A MPR is a unique allowance supported by the GMA and is encouraged by our Comp Plan. This is also a 500 acre site and the use is consistent with surrounding uses, namely recreation and preservation of open space.

Based on the analysis and the conditions of the SEPA MDNS, staff finds that the YMCA's application to amend the comprehensive plan map from Resource Land to Other Rural Land and application of the MPR overlay zone designation meets the approval criteria of LCC 17.12.100.

We have received written testimony. Written testimony closed today at 5:00pm. We received 31 pieces of testimony. There are also 28 public comments that were received on the NOA and SEPA Determinations. Planning Commissioners have received a copy of all written comments and testimony.

There was testimony and comments both in support and against the rezone proposal. I've summarized the primary issues contained in the testimony on the screen. This is not an exhaustive list. In support of the project, comments stated educational benefits to youth, economic benefits to the community, enhanced recreation for community, unique location, protects open space, and ensures so individual residential development on site. Again the project, comments stated increased traffic on local roads, impacts to wildlife, lack of sufficient fire and emergency services, insufficient sewer and wat infrastructure, increased noise and pollution, and increased people in the natural area. Again, Planning Commission has received a copy of all the testimony through 5:00pm today.

Mindy turned it over to YMCA to make a few remarks.

Loria Yeadon, president and CEO of the YMCA: I start my remarks this evening by extending my sincerest regards to county staff and to the planning commission for all their hard work and due diligence on the Y's request to amend the classification from resource land to other rural land and to establish a master plan resort overlay zone designation on approximately 500 acres. The Y understands and we embrace the work ahead of us to build and bring a youth camp to Mineral Lake, which is intended to serve children and families throughout Lewis County and around the region. The camp will create opportunities for young people to get outdoors and onto the water through outdoor education and water and boat safety programs and other activities that foster self-confidence, social & emotional wellbeing, belonging and inclusion, and other skills designed to build strong communities and help our young people thrive. Many thanks to all of you who have submitted your written testimony and those who will provide oral testimony this evening about this project. Now, I would like to invite Gwen Ichinose Bagley, development officer for the YMCA who also serves as the lead for this important project, to provide some remarks about the Y's application.

Gwen Ichinose Bagley: I am the senior vice president for our youth development program at the YMCA and project liaison for the camp at Mineral Lake. Thank you to the commission for its due diligence in reviewing the proposed comprehensive plan map amendment to provide a master plan resort overlay on the forest resource land. Your approval of this proposal will allow the eventual phased development of a youth and family camp using the binding site plan process. We believe that the conditions you have built into this proposal will allow the creation of accountability, but not more intensive development, and we support that approach. We appreciate the detailed questions you have asked hope that in the course of the last few months we have sufficiently responded to each of your inquiries regarding the rezone proposal. We also recognize that you and the broader community have additional questions that must be answered as we move ahead and create a more detailed project proposal for the camp and for you to approve the binding site plan for the property. I look forward to working with you and the community in answering these questions. I am here tonight on behalf of the Y and the youth and family we serve in Western Washington, including the youth and families of Lewis County and we are able to serve at the camp. They are the reason that we respectfully ask for your support. We appreciate that the site has been the focus of various projects in the past years. We know that residents from Mineral will oppose the project this evening, but we also know that there are other community members who support the project and we want to hear all voices. It is our belief that the project represents the best use for this land. This belief is based on three facts. First, the camp will have a very modest footprint and use only a small percentage of the total site, leaving the rest of it in its natural state. Second, the Y is committed to sustainable forestry practices on the remainder of the site as well as protecting the quality and safety of Mineral Lake. Third, as we have seen from past proposals the most probable alternative use of the land is some sort of private development that would not provide these advantages. We believe the Mineral Lake community and all of Lewis County will greatly benefit from the rezone and the eventual creation of the camp at Mineral Lake. These benefits include infrastructure upgrades, additional property taxes to support public services, job and economic opportunities – both as we build the camp and as it operates, continued opportunities for forest product

related employment as we practice sustainable forestry to protect the bulk of the site, and education opportunities for local youth and families. Just as the Y is in need a new camp for families looking to experience the outdoors, Washington State is in need of more outdoor facilities as confirmed by the legislature this past year. A youth camp at Mineral Lake would not only help meet this need, but also provide local youth and families with exciting new learning opportunities. The YMCA is committed to being a good neighbor and a good steward of this property. We have held public meetings, communicated with local residents, and created a public website with responses to frequently asked questions about our plan and we will continue to update this information as we complete studies and learn more in the months ahead. We also remain open to constructive feedback and dialogue with local communities. We are committed to being a good steward to the natural resources and making sure they are all attractive to those who live and visit there. We want to make a positive contribution to the health of the community. Therefore, we respectfully ask for your support of the comp plan amendment and the overlay that will allow us to begin planning our camp.

B. Commissioner Discussion

Chair Spogen opened up commissioner discussion and questions.

Commissioner Corbin: My questions have more to do with the next steps and the future impacts, but that is not the subject of our conversation. Our conversation is just about the rezone. We do need to enter into conversations about the future impact fees.

Commissioner Russel: My understanding is that we are looking for questions about data still needed from staff or the applicant.

Smith: You are correct Commissioner Corbin, tonight is just about the rezone and if that is a permissible use for the forestry land. Impact fees and project specific questions are for a future permitting process.

Commissioner Fritsch: My questions are more about future impacts. So I will refrain from that and I'm comfortable with the information provided.

Spogen: What would happen if the actual project was not approved?

Smith: BOCC decision will just be the overlay zone. For the project, the applicant will have to go through the permitting process including SEPA for that project. If the overlay is approved but the project is not, then the overlay will be removed after a certain amount of time.

Brooks: SEPA MDNS includes terms. The MNDS limited the types of use that would be allow and prohibited to certain uses like condos. If YMCA chooses not to proceed or don't obtain Binding Site Plan, then overlay will be removed and the site will revert to forest resource land.

Commissioner Alves: No questions at this time.

Commissioner Foster: No questions at this time.

Spogen: I have a few questions. One of the criteria is that there is a need in Lewis County. Is Lewis County going to get the maximum benefit out of this or would they be subject to availability? Not just King County. How would someone apply to go to the camp? Do you have to belong to the YMCA to go to the camp?

Gwen: When fully operational, our priority is on the local community for access. Part of how we do that is financial assistance to create equitable access. We have online and in person applications and we promote through local schools, along with other methods such as mailers. You don't have to belong to attend camp.

Spogen: Different activities, not just youth camp. What else would happen there? Big conference with a lot of traffic?

Gwen: On our off season, we do family camp for weekends. Small backpacking trips. During school year we have outdoor education.

Spogen: We want to think about future impacts. How will the economic climate impact YMCA programs? Can you get bus drivers? Fuel costs impacts to your operations? Are people driving individually?

Gwen: Our current camps use a variety of ways to attend, but primarily bus.

Spogen: Please clarify relationship between the YMCA and Nisqually Tribe. Is this normal or first time?

Gwen: We have relationship with tribes and are honored for the collaboration with Nisqually Tribe. We do have an easement with them for access for cultural activities.

Chairman of Nisqually Tribe (William): For Nisqually Tribe it is about working with outside communities and working together for outdoor education. We want all kids, native and non-native, to grow here together. This is a win-win. We don't want conference. We want to protect the land. We want to be good stewards.

Spogen: Have you partnered with YMCA before?

William: No, this is our first time. We work with Boys and Girls Club in Lacey and want to work with YMCA.

Spogen: Please excuse my lack of understanding, would there be a situation where Nisqually uses their tax-exemption status when the tribe owns the land? In the future, could Nisqually Tribe not pay property taxes or have different rules?

William: No. We don't plan on this land being in trust. A trust would be the only time that could change property taxation. When Nisqually Tribe purchases land off the reservation, we look for partners along Mt Rainier and the Nisqually Watershed. We are looking to protect the land.

Smith: This is a joint effort between YMCA and Nisqually Tribe. At this point YMCA owns the land, so it would not qualify under the trust scenario.

Brooks: If the land doesn't go forward with Binding Site Plan because someone else becomes owner, the overlay zone would be removed and it would revert to forest resource land. Whatever legal rights of the FRL zone would apply.

Gwen: YMCA is the property owner. We have an agreement with the Nisqually Tribe.

Spogen: My only concern is based on paying impact fees or for infrastructure like roads. I hope the partnership will be good for all involved. If there are no other questions, we will begin with oral testimony. Staff would you like your opening remarks and presentation to be entered in as testimony.

Smith and Brooks: Responded yes.

C. Public Comment

Spogen: The commissioners are here to hear from the public. No applauding or booing is allowed. We ask for the public to cooperate and be respectful. We will begin with those people who let staff know ahead of time that they wish to testify. Then we will hear from people in the room and then on Zoom. If you did not sign up ahead of time, please raise your hand in Zoom or sign up at the lectern. Each person will have 3 minutes. There will be a timer displayed. You need to state your full name and address for the record. Please speak slowly and clearly.

Napier: I will call on people who signed up ahead of time first. When your name is called unmute on Zoom or come to the podium. Start with your name and address. Once you begin speaking you will have 3 minutes, which is displayed on the screen.

Mark Waters: Became aware in August 21. Attended the YMCA meetings in Mineral regarding the project. The information is flawed and inaccurate. I've read the materials and attended the Planning Commission meetings. A site visit was recommended and I'm concerned with responses from the commissioners including not needing a site visit because there are photographs. Further, there were concerns about the cost of gas to go to Mineral. I think the town is more important than that. Commissioners stated that they had not been to the meeting. It's not appropriate to vote on a proposal when you have not been to the community that will

be impacted by the rezone. The rezone will allow some structures and prohibit others; however, there is no WAC, state code or county code that precludes an amendment to the rezone to allow things that are prohibited under this rezone. Previously community planning provided transitional zoning as you move from the I5 corridor, this was not provided. There are over 80 lakes in King County, why do it here? It is too unique. Your vote is about if you represent your constituents or Seattle's special interests. Make the sensitive choice and do not approve the rezone.

Mike Heinz: (Held up a sign reading No Rezone in Mineral.) We are bending over backwards for Seattle YMCA. I hope you take it seriously. I am against it. We only have 135 people living in the rural town. People moved up there to get away from the city, not to bring it up there. I understand that YMCA does good things, but they have other options. The community can't get into the YMCA facilities where there are YMCA activities going on. It's a private resort for them. Leave it long term forest commercial like it is now. We have no infrastructure, no policy, volunteer fire department. It will impact the wildlife – deer, elk, bear, and osprey. I used to hike up there and I've seen spotted owls. It's a rural setting, why would you change it? I want to focus on spot zoning. The area is zoned residential, farm or forest. This is spot zoning – applying a Master Planned Resort in an area where it is not allowed right now. And it's going to take 5-15 years of building. What about all the noise and disruption. The lake is very quiet and you will be able to hear everything. To the YMCA, 500 acres is not a modest impact. I am against this rezone.

Commissioner Spogen: Where did you get the 15 years for development?

Heinz: It's on their proposal that it will take 5-15 years to complete the resort.

Jane Hodges: I own the Mineral School building. I am in favor of the YMCA proposal. I understand the infrastructure and logistical concerns being raised, but the YMCA has the resources and with the County Commissioner oversight, I believe these issues can be addressed. The YMCA will bring a number of positive things to Mineral. Most notable is social and economic change. All people deserve access to Mineral Lake. This doesn't have to be an us versus outsiders argument. There is no reason children can't enjoy the lake, learn to swim, learn team work, and learn about nature alongside people fishing in the lake. These can coexist. I'm excited about Nisqually inclusion in this. I feel that this is their land. The YMCA will create jobs in Mineral. And will improve the professionalism of the people who work in the area. As someone who runs a business in the area, it is hard to find people who are "banked" and "running on the grid." Those complaining about noise – log trucks go by on Mineral Road South and are very loud at 4:00 in the morning. There is traffic all the time in Mineral at different day parks and different locations. This won't be any different. I am a part time resident and I've made a big

commitment to Mineral. I think YMCA will be a good influence in the community, if people can let go of their fears and tell the YMCA what they want.

Elisabeth Rohr: Retired public school teacher. I am not in favor of the YMCA rezone. I have a number of concerns. First is water availability, because there is a low aquifer and the amount of water needed to support the camp would have a substantial impact. Second, is septic because the site is upslope from the lake. Septic for 500 people will have nutrient impacts. Roads are a concern because of trucks and buses transporting hundreds of kids. There isn't room to widen the roads. Residents shouldn't have to deal with convoys of children. EMS needs to be addressed. The local volunteer fire department is not equip to address hundreds of people even if YMCA pays for a new ambulance. The residents will have to pay with levees. The number of calls from the site is of concern, even if there is a doctor onsite. Water safety is of concern. The Sherriff Water Safety Unit is near Randle. The potential for drowning is of concern. I'm am familiar with Camp Coleman because I was my districts camp organizer. There is financial support for YMCA that are not available to religious camps in the county. And there are requirements about demographics and curriculum taught. YMCA touts its equality and inclusion and removing barriers to marginalized people to access to nature. Camp Coleman already addresses this for King County. YMCA is supported by United Way and our Economic Alliance, which ... *(Lee Napier interrupted because 3 minutes were over)* What oversight will there be from local organizations and that CRT ... In conclusion, not only water, septic, roads and EMS need mitigated, but the camp itself is not a good fit.

Harry Bhagwandin: I have owned a tree farm in Onalaska for 40 years. We've raised our kids there. We grow timber, chestnut and chickens. We are zoned Forest Resource Land. We are certified under three stewardship plans and we are sustainable under the WSU Forest Stewardship Program. I say this because I have experience with management plans, which is the next stage after the rezone. I am an active community member and worked on economic development in Onalaska, with the formation of Onalaska Alliance. I want to give you context. My understanding for a youth camp on 600 acres to provide outdoor activities in a natural setting. My childhood memories of attending camp gave me experience that I never would have had even though I grew up in the cornbelt in the Midwest. These were unique outdoor activities with other kids under the mentorship of caring camp counselors. In these times we need to provide as many opportunities as possible for kids to experience off screen learning. Something that is of limited access in urban areas and a benefit to families with children here in Lewis County. The applicant has held meetings, in addition to the required county meetings. This demonstrates a desire by the applicant to hear and address local concerns. While this is not billed as rural economic development, there will be economic benefits to the local community. Peak season the camp will have 100 season staff ... *(Lee Napier interrupted because 3 minutes*

were over) YMCA has stated they will forfeit their nonexempt tax status to address community concerns for EMS. This is proactive. County should proceed with granting rezone.

Marot Page: I'm very excited about my town welcoming YMCA. I strongly support the rezone. I don't have the nervousness and fear about the YMCA's plan. I've been to the meetings and read the material. I feel they have been very forthcoming. (*Lee Napier stated that audio was not working well*) I won't repeat the good that YMCA does. What is at issue is if the town will be open to this project. I'm troubled by the hostility and misinformation from the community. It's a great town and I want us to be welcoming to the YMCA.

Spogen: If you would like to send that in a letter because your audio was difficult to hear, we'd like hear what we may have missed.

Shawn Seeger: Thank you for letting us be in the building. I am opposed to the rezone. Please do not approve it. I have been involved in youth camps and they do a lot of good, but this is not a good fit. There are many outstanding issues related to traffic, wildlife, EMS and water. Residents already have to check for arsenic. YMCA has been disingenuous and misleading in some of their statements. Even tonight they adjust a statement from a community meeting. You have the opportunity to not let this happen. This is just an overlay, but if you do it you are kicking the can down the road. After the rezone we have no way to stop it. The YMCA is misleading with the numbers. Their letter says 400 campers and 100 staff and they omit per week. Or is it all the time for the full year or during summer? They have an opportunity with a dock and swimming area to request a section of the lake be cordoned off. So the community will lose access to a section of the lake. (*Lee Napier interrupted because 3 minutes were over*) I request that you do not allow this to move forward and that you reject the rezone proposal.

Tyra Larson: On three occasion the YMCA has held community meetings at the fire station, school and church. My husband and I have concerns and are against the proposal. We understand the need for children to engage in nature and have outdoor activities. I understand Nisqually Tribe's curriculum. But there has to be a better location than Mineral Lake for a community camp. Maybe Alder Lake, which is the Nisqually Watershed. To build a 500 acre camp at Mineral Lake will have negative environmental impacts as well as negative economic impacts. The local community will have to help with the infrastructure that will be later down the road. YMCA was only allowed to purchase with the help of the Nisqually Tribe and YMCA doesn't have the financial resource to build it as of today. I know this because I applied for a job with YMCA out of pure curiosity. They have many positions open. They will require community support in Seattle/King County to raise the money to build the camp at Mineral Lake.

Ron Nilson: The Tribe and YMCA gets lots of time and we get 3 minutes. Is that fair? There are a lot of errors in what has been said. One example by the county or YMCA is a 500 acre and sometimes a 600 plus acres. I had communication with Lorie Spogen and that wasn't presented to other people here. We tried to listen on Zoom and couldn't hear Lorie Spogen, we could only hear 10-15% of what she said. Some people are denied information because they can't use Zoom. Quasi-judicial – I'm going to read from RCW 42.36.010 "Quasi-judicial actions do not include the legislative actions adopting, amending, or revising comprehensive, community, or neighborhood plans" Yet the County has used quasi-judicial to restrict comments. Development of the property has failed three times. Weyerhaeuser wanted no acreage restrictions. It was established that no there would be no more than one residence per 80 acres. Then Weyerhaeuser wanted to put in 120 lots. That one failed. That one the County represented local people. Now the County wants development. Last time myself and three others challenged the County when it went from 80 acres to 20 acres ... (*Lee Napier interrupted because 3 minutes were over*) We've been treated unfairly.

Jill Labrecgue: My property is two over from the YMCA's master planned resort. This will be a resort. I'm against that. This is a lake, a prestige lake. I don't feel entitled. I feel lucky and I don't take it for granted. You should come see it. Out of state people come and enjoy the small lake. The YMCA is looking at taking over a majority of the lake. It will impact our little property where I have many memories. I know if the rezone happens, a master planned resort will invite more people in and it will change. That is not what I want. Please keep it a very majestic, enchanting place. Ask anybody if they have been there. They may have seen the store or tavern or school that is an artist residence. It is still little and we are proud of. I hope it will continue as a small community. I don't want it commercialized and an event center. I heard amphitheater. I think noise will echo. The number of people for the rentals. (*Lee Napier interrupted because 3 minutes were over*) Thank you very much for listening to our remarks.

Dave Cunningham: I'm not for a YMCA camp. I don't think a YMCA camp of this size is right for Mineral. We don't have infrastructure, EMS, water, septic. There isn't enough road access. The amount of water they will use every day will impact our wells. Mineral Lake is a great fishing lake. How will this impact the lake? The majority of people in Mineral don't want it. Thank you.

Teresa Fenn: (Packwood) I'm not a Mineral resident, but I did take a field trip and talk with a resident. My impression is that if done right, and I believe in the master planned resort process, YMCA would be a fabulous way to protect the lake and the forest around it. Short of turning it into a park, this rezone will protect it and provide the best use. Future development if the forest designation changed would destroy the area. The Tribal involvement is significant. It means they are in support and it is the best use. When I spoke to the resident, the major concerns are

related to infrastructure and would be worked out in the process. The businesses have been hurt by the changes to camping, this would benefit the local businesses. I'm excited for the use in Packwood, because we can use it too. Thank you.

Dick & Paula Hopkins: We are by Muckleshoot tribal lands. Not everyone opposed to adult and children education and recreation. We agree with Jane Hodges on limited impacts. YMCA can provide forest education and recreation. We personally have experience with similar facilities and we encourage a vote to approve.

Donna Elliot: I understand from listening to the workshops, that this is not the forum to ask questions. But to a point made, there is misinformation. That is because there are so many unanswered questions. How will infrastructure be impacted or support. If the project is approved, can we negotiate where funding comes from? My concern is the same as what you have heard. I haven't made a decision for or against because of the unanswered questions. My message is, while we have unanswered questions it is hard to make an educated decision. They didn't even come out and look at the community. There was a discussion of that, but that didn't happen and that disappoints me. There are lot of benefits but also very negative impacts without the information. It's premature to make a decision.

Gerald Olson: *(Zoom audio was cutting in and out. It was not possible to hear the testimony fully. Lee Napier recommend turning off the camera. The timer was reset. However, audio was still cutting in and out.)* There is no lake like this and it is less than undeveloped. It is one of a kind. Developing it would be criminal. There are more suitable sites for YMCA. What about turning it into a nature preserve for future generations. Once developed you can't undo it. It will be lost. Also the infrastructure needs and wildlife. I would hope commissioners will look at it and vote no. There is money involved in all of this.

Lee asked if there was anyone else on Zoom or in the room that wanted to testify that has not had a chance to yet. No one spoke up. Lee turned it back over to Chair Spogen.

D. Commissioner Deliberation

Spogen: Expressed appreciation for everyone who spoke tonight and were respectful of everyone else. The oral testimony is closed on the YMCA Rezone proposal. We have received testimony and reviewed the staff reports. The subject is now open for discussion among commissioners.

Russel: I'd like to start by apologizing for my comments about going on a site visit. I have been to Mineral, before the discussion of the rezone. I went camping and it's a beautiful area. The reason we didn't go was because it is quasi-judicial item. We'd have to drive in separate cars, be monitored so we didn't discuss the topic outside of a public meeting and it didn't seem like a

good use of time. We couldn't have this kind of discussion as we've had tonight. I think this is very important. We are taking this seriously and this is a hard part of being a volunteer for Planning Commission. I want to thank everyone tonight and staff for putting together all of the information. I've seen the letters and heard your thoughts both pros and cons. My question is, we've heard if we do the rezone but that we should "go back." But that sounds like a nature preserve. I want staff to remind us about the current zoning, how it got that way and what is allowed. What is this decision changing?

Brooks: I will refer to previous staff reports and reiterate the explanation. First, the zoning now is forest resource land. In 2010, the zoning changed from FRL of long term significant to FRL of local importance. It was owned by Forecastle. That changed the allowed minimum lot size from 80 acres to 20 acres. At that time Forecastle and proceeded with dividing the land into 20 acre parcels. In 2011 the rezone was challenged and in 2012 the zoning was restored to FRL of long term significance. But between 2010 and 2012, multiple 20 acre lots were created. Those are legal non-conforming lots of record and each can be developed with a single family residence and can have typical forestry uses.

Russel: If a resort doesn't happen, it will go back to 20-acre parcels that could be sold to individuals to be developed with a house or for timber uses.

Brooks: Yes, it would remain FRL and allowed uses could occur, including one single family residence per lot. (Mindy shared a map of the current lots.)

Spogen: Is it designated forest land?

Napier: For tax purposes it is taxed for timber.

Spogen: What would it be taxed after building a camp?

Napier: The Assessor's Office would change the taxation to a different use.

Spogen: I assume once the taxation code changes out of timber, Lewis County would be collecting more taxes on that land.

Brooks: We would need to check on that with the Assessor's Office.

Spogen: How does the intention of being non-profit impact taxation? How does that impact Lewis County?

Gwen: We are not using our non-profit tax status on this property. We are paying property tax.

Spogen: The portion in forest land, not camp, you'd probably keep forest land. But you could chose to change to non-profit tax status.

Gwen: I don't want to miss speak about taxation and will defer.

(A member of the public spoke and Mindy responded that the record is closed.)

Spogen: Would this qualify as spot zoning? Please to explain.

Brooks: No. First is because it is similar to the allowed uses of FRL which include recreational uses. Second is because the state laws explicitly allow for this use.

Smith: This is one of the situations where state statutes allow for something that would otherwise be considered spot zoning. The laws are clear that master planned resorts can occur even if not similar to the zoning around it.

Brooks: Also, there are other state laws that allow what would otherwise be spot zoning. For example, mineral lands occur where there are mineral resources and we can zone for mineral lands even if that use is not similar to the surrounding uses.

Spogen: Going back to the criteria, you said the last one is most subjective. It's about if the neighborhood can support it. What does the fire department says?

Brooks: They commented on the SEPA determination. We send the SEPA determination to all potentially impacted service providers and received comments back. The comments are typically about the next steps. Concerns from Fire District No. 9 about existing roads being sufficient, needing upgraded road approaches and secondary access. These would need to be addressed at the time of permitting. The SEPA MDNS requires project-level impacts must be addressed including fire and life safety.

Spogen: This is about what the developer needs to meet to build a camp?

Brooks: Yes, this will be required during future permitting.

Spogen: Will there be emergency services inside of the camp? Will you be able to handle different incidents?

Gwen: I can talk about our current camps. We have staff trained as EMS and volunteer fire department staff. We work closely with local service providers. We provide training for community as well, including CPR. We have had evacuation of an injured swimming. We have the protocols in place and we will provide safety for the campers and community.

Spogen: Will it take 15 years to build out the camp?

Gwen: Depending on the timing of the plans, studies and infrastructure. It will occur over a range of time. We will need approval of permits and on fundraising. We will better define timeline in the Binding Site Plan.

Brooks: We listed in the SEPA MDNS, two sunset. A 5 year window to obtain Binding Site Plan and 15 year window to do the subsequent permits. If those are not met then the overlay is removed and site reverts to FRL.

Corbin: Some of our discussion has been around site planning. Those impacts are handled at a later stage. I have concerns as well about water, sewer, etc. But that is a later step, not this step. Those are important and staff will need to work to resolve those. But right now, we are only looking at the rezone and if it meets the criteria, then it's black and white. I know the ball can be dropped and local residents can be on the hook. I don't want to see that happen to Mineral. The mitigation needs to be place. And thank you to everyone who provided testimony.

Spogen: Planning Commission is not involved in permitting process?

Brooks: Planning Commission makes decision about if the zoning is appropriate for the site. But the decision is actually for the BOCC to make. You are making a recommendation. Next step is permitting, there are lots of steps. Binding Site Plan will include SEPA and it will be noticed for public comment and appeal. Then there are development permits, many of which will require SEPA. All local and state laws need to be met.

Spogen: Will you put the last page of the criteria on the screen. (LCC 17.12.100)

Fritsch: I truly believe that the first two have been met in good faith. What we are having discussion about is if this is in the public interest. I'm struggling with who is the "public" – Mineral, Lewis County, Washington. I'm in Packwood and I feel it is being overrun. I'm having trouble sharing your special place. But if you don't give other people the opportunity to experience your special place, they will not respect it when the visit. They will throw trash out. When you provide an opportunity to establish that respect at a young age, it is valuable to the community. One question I have is if there is public access. You (public) walk on that property.

Brooks: It is owned by YMCA and before the Forecastle. It is private property and they can restrict access. People may have been able to walk on it, but that access can be restricted by the property owner.

Fritsch: Will there be a day use option at the camp to fish or hike? That would be a positive impact for the community to enhance access. I like that you will give preference to local kids. It's expensive to go into the national park or go skiing. Just because we live here means we can access the natural areas.

Gwen: I can talk about other camps. We do have family events and we partner with community on events. We want to work with the community on what they want and need and make it happen in a safe way.

Spogen: What you said about who is the public is a great insight? But I want to clarify if people from Mineral would have preference.

Gwen: We have an affordable for all approach. We target Lewis County first, that includes Mineral.

Russel: Learning to share and respect is so important. I'm a wetland scientist. I have a passion and I wonder where it came from. When I was little I grew up in Oregon my dad took me to Spirit Lake YMCA camp. I swam and hiked. I see the beautiful Mineral. I'm ready to make a decision and will support the overlay. There are lots of good questions but those happen later, not now. I think the criteria have been met. I will support it.

(A member of the public spoke. Mindy told them the oral testimony is closed.)

Spogen: Do any commissioners need any more information from staff? *None of the commissioners requested additional information.* Seeing no hands raised, we need to make one of the following decisions; 1) Planning Commission is ready to make a motion to recommend or reject the YMCA rezone proposal to BOCC. 2) Planning Commission would like to continue the hearing to receive additional information from staff or the applicant and reopen the written record.

Corbin: If there was a motion and this commission decided to not approve the overlay, could the BOCC still decide to go ahead with it if they wanted to?

Brooks: That is correct. The Planning Commissioners may make a motion that the BOCC reject the proposal. We would then go to the BOCC with your recommendation and they would hold a hearing to make a final decision. They will still need to make a final decision.

Spogen: I was confused because I thought we were doing another hearing, but I was trying to recall if the BOCC would then be taking testimony again?

Brooks: The BOCC will have another public hearing.

Spogen: I feel that I would like to have a little more time for public testimony. I would like to hear if anything that was said today sparks other ideas. If there's the option for people to give further testimony at the BOCC, do we need to do it here?

Brooks: The first option is recommending that the BOCC approve. The second option is a recommendation to the BOCC that they reject the proposal. The third option is if you wish to continue the hearing and you may choose to reopen the written record so people can submit additional testimony.

Corbin: I move to continue the hearing to consider the YMCA Rezone proposal to amend Lewis County Comprehensive Plan and apply a Master Plan Resort overlay zone to July 12, 2022 at

6:00pm, and to reopen the written record beginning now and ending at 5:00pm on the day of the hearing.

The motion was seconded by Chair Spogen.

Corbin: The primary reason I have made this motion is because I want the public to know that we are seeking maximum opportunity for input and show concern – that we truly do want to take all of the resident’s concerns into account. This means positive and negative input on the issue. We have heard a lot of negative, but I also want to give a fair shot to any interested party who may not have been able to make it tonight so that is the reason for continuing the hearing. I don’t think it will be detrimental to the overall plan here. Let’s give them one more shot before we make a decision.

Fritsch: I noticed that many members of the public had more to say than what 3 minutes allowed. If there is more than what we have heard, I think it would be a good idea to extend that.

Chair Spogen called for a vote. Lee Napier called on each commissioner to verbally vote. The motion passed with 4 yes votes and 2 no votes.

Brooks: The hearing will continue on July 12, 2022 at 6:00pm. The meeting will take place at the Lewis County Historic Courthouse as well as on Zoom and the written record is open now through 5:00pm on the date of the continued hearing.

Spogen: Thank you to everyone who came tonight and the time you took to attend. We are going to move on to the next agenda item which is the Centralia and Chehalis UGA Expansion after a 10 minute recess.

6. Workshop – Urban Growth Area Expansion

Spogen: The next agenda items are proposals to expand urban growth areas. We have three UGA expansions to consider. The purpose of a work session is for the staff to present information about the topic and the Commission to ask questions and make recommendations. No actions on these proposals will be taken tonight. I will now turn it over to staff.

Mindy Brooks, Senior Long Range Planner for Community Development gave a presentation on the Urban Growth Area (UGA) expansions.

We have 3 proposals for UGA expansions – one from Centralia and two from Chehalis. Staff reports on each were sent to Planning Commission on June 17 and posted on the Community Development webpage for the public. A reminder, workshops are for Planning Commission to hear information about the proposals and to ask questions of staff and the applicant. No public comments are taken on the UGA expansions at the workshop. Public comments can be provided as testimony when the items are back for a public hearing.

We will start with a high level reminder about the UGA amendment process and approval criteria. Then I will summarize the proposals. First Centralia and then Chehalis. We will pause of each proposal for Q&A from commissioners. Staff from each city are here tonight to answer questions. Then we will close with the next steps.

Let's start with a reminder about what the urban growth area is. All cities are required to have a boundary around them; that is the area the city expects it will grow in to, which means annex, over the next 20 years. The UGA boundary is based on the adopted 20-year population forecast. The city needs to have sufficient land to accommodate the anticipated population. Like I said, all cities in Lewis County have a UGA. Cities can bring forward amendments to their UGA boundary every year. Changing a UGA boundary is an amendment to the County's comprehensive plan map.

This is the process to amend a UGA boundary. The city submits the proposal to the county. The Planned Growth Committee review the proposals in the spring of every year. The PGC is made up of one elected official from each jurisdiction in the county; however, typically only the cities that are proposing changes attend. This year only Centralia, Chehalis and Mossyrock, along with the BOCC Chair, attended PGC meetings. Planned Growth Committee votes to recommend or not the proposals be considered by Planning Commission. That is the step we are at tonight. PGC has recommended you consider the Centralia and two Chehalis proposals. After Planning Commission holds a public hearing and makes a recommendation, then staff will complete SEPA review and make a determination. While the SEPA review is occurring, Dept of Commerce will also conduct their review. They are verifying that all applicable state laws are met. And then the Planning Commission's recommendation is sent to BOCC for a final decision.

Because amending a UGA boundary is an amendment to the Lewis County Comprehensive Plan map, you will use the same criteria as is used for rezones, which also are Comp Plan map amendments.

The criteria are:

1. The amendment must conform to the state Growth Management Act rules and the Countywide Planning Policies.
2. There must be a demonstrated need. For UGA that is typically based on needing to accommodate the 20-year population, but it could also be based on jobs needs.
3. The public's interest is served. As you know, this is the most discretionary of the criteria but there is some guidance provided in the code.
4. And finally, it isn't spot zoning.

The staff reports from June 17 included findings against all of these criteria and I will summarize the findings later in the presentation.

The City of Centralia has requested an expansion of their Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundary to accommodate the 2040 population forecast of 26,280 people. The site is 45.17 acres, consisting of 16 parcels, bound on the north by Graf/Military Road and east by Scheuber Road South. The intended future land use of the site is low density residential with a zoning designation of R4 (4 units per acre).

Corbin: Is there a break in the already established UGA and the recommended amendment or are they connected?

Brooks: The Centralia UGA and the proposed expansion are connected. There is no break in the expansion.

Staff displayed a map of where the site is in relationship to the full Centralia UGA (shown in brown hatch line) as well as the full water service area in solid black line.

The two most important parts of the staff analysis are 1) is the expansion needed; and 2) can the city provide services to the area? Let's start with the needs analysis. Centralia's 20-year population forecast is 26,280 people, which equates to 10,905 dwelling units. Centralia's Land Capacity Analysis updated 2022 shows that the existing UGA can accommodate 6,842 units, leaving a need of 4,063 units by 2040 to meet the 20-year forecast. The proposed UGA expansion can accommodate 80 new units. So, this criteria related to need is met.

Russel: I thought it was a wonderful report that Ms. Hoke wrote. I thought it was very detailed when it broke down the 45 acres down to how much they were really going to use. I had a hard time with this map. I am assuming we need it because we have 20 years to get to this 4,000.

Brooks: They have a deficit which means they need to either change their zoning within their existing area to add more density or they need to expand their UGA. They need, by 2040, 4,063 units. This site will provide 80 units. So it reduces the deficit.

Russel: So they just need to be positive to meet their needs, not meet the 4,000 on this move?

Brooks: Correct. They don't have to meet the full need today. They need to meet it over the 20 year period of time. This addition is going towards meeting that need. When I say the need is met, yes they have need for land to meet this so the needs assessment is qualified in this proposal.

Smith: The 4,000 units is what the city needs in total – in city limits and the UGA. This particular site doesn't need to have 4,000 units.

Mindy continued her presentation. The Centralia Water System can support an estimated 14,382 dwelling units. The total need based on the 20-year forecast is 10,905 dwelling units; therefore, there is more capacity in the current system than is needed within the 20-year planning period.

The current sewer system can serve a population of 18,865-22,535. The current 2022 population is 18,360 therefore there is capacity in the existing sewer system to serve the additional 80 units the UGA expansion will provide. Per the ILA the County is responsible for the existing roads until annexation and development, then it's the city's responsibility. The developer will be required to complete road improvements within the development.

Going back to the approval criteria LCC 17.12.100. The applicable state rules and local policies are met. The full set of findings against this criteria are found in the June 17th staff report, attachment D. There is demonstrated need for housing. Centralia can serve the area with water, sewer and transportation. And it is not spot zoning because the future zoning will be consistent with the surrounding zoning. So, staff find that the criteria are met based on the information in record to-date.

Spogen: I was here in the past when we did an UGA expansion with Centralia and Chehalis and Community Development. At that time we forecasted what our population was going to be in 20 years. Has that changed?

Napier: In 2018 we did the swap. It has not changed.

Spogen: Did we think that we had met our goal for Chehalis because they picked up some ground? But Centralia dropped some area because they didn't want to provide services to that area?

Brooks: We could get into the details of why the area was swapped. There can be many reasons why you may want to "swap" land. One could be if you have an urban growth area that extends to a space where you realize you are not going to be able to provide urban services to. A city can say they thought they were going to be able to serve this area, but we are not going to be able to and therefore, we are going to give back a portion. They will need to account for on the map that they lost space to accommodate their population. They will have to go back to their planners and think that through.

Spogen: Does that enter into this 10,000 number because Centralia gave that up over to Chehalis?

Brooks: It would enter into deficit – that balance. So the overarching number won't change until we get a new population forecast from OFM, which will happen this year. The big number doesn't change, but how much they have and how much they need can change. It can also change if they rezone within their city limits. There's a million moving parts around this. We make sure that they do need the land. If their maps showed that they had more than enough land to accommodate their population then we wouldn't approve an UGA expansion. They also need to show that they can serve the expansion.

Spogen: So this UGA expansion land can be better served than the area that they previously dropped.

Napier: The review was actually done in 2019. At that time the city submitted a proposal for 800 or so acres to be returned to the county. About 132 were returned to the county and then 676 acres were transferred to the Chehalis UGA.

Fritsch: When I was looking at the package I noticed that the application was from an individual. Since the city is the one who is running out of room, would they be the purchaser of the land and the ones asking for the expansion?

Brooks: The city is not purchasing land. When they expand an urban growth area they are saying the land is now within the urban growth area of the city and the city, therefore, over time intends to annex the land to become part of the city. It is still private property owner's land. The land becomes part of an urban growth area and retains the zoning that it currently has, which is still a county zoning, until it gets annexed into the city and then it gets city zoning and services. An UGA is a look forward. It is saying that over the next 20 years this is the space that our city limits are going to go into. So we look to make sure that the urban growth area is appropriate for the population that they need to accommodate, and that they can show that they will be able to give adequate services over the 20 year period. The reason you see names on this is because often times cities do not bring proposals forward until the property owners want to be included in the UGA. Often times, realistically, the way the process works is that a property owner or a group of property owners will come to a city and say they would like to be part of the UGA and the city will consider if they need the land and the logistics of how it would work. The city has an internal process they go through before they bring it to the county for consideration. That is why you see names of property owners. Legally, this is the county's decision to make – the jurisdiction still rests with us.

Fritsch: They are in fact, in a large deficit of land. Are they going out asking?

Brooks: I don't know. I will let the city answer how they go about their planning processes. Once we have it, we consider it underneath our approval criteria.

Corbin: My questions are related to EMS provision and possible flood control mitigation issues. This has nothing to do with a zoning change correct?

Brooks: Correct, this is a change to the urban growth boundary, not a zoning change itself.

Corbin: So then as far as the city wanting to change the zoning, that's totally up to them. Then they have to follow whatever guidelines there are regarding EMS provision and emergency services and that type of thing. I'm assuming there would also be some process that they should also be following regarding building in the floodplain. I don't know if this particular area is in a floodplain or not. These are three red flags that went up for me and I want to make sure if we hand this over to the city that they will be addressed.

Brooks: I may want to defer to the cities to talk about their processes once something is in the UGA and how they work going forward in coordination with special service districts. I will say Centralia does not have any floodplains on this particular site.

Hillary Hoke: This particular area would be served by the Lewis County sheriff's office as it currently is now. For fire protection, we have a contract with Riverside Fire Authority who have indicated that they can serve the area with current equipment.

Brooks: Going forward, when it comes time to annex and do all of that, do you want to speak to your coordination with service providers?

Hillary: They do have to provide reports that they are able to serve with the current equipment. We would go through that process before the annexation could happen.

Russel: When I see these things, I see critical areas, floodplain issues, but I have incredible faith and a lot of experience with all these people that they ask all the questions that need to be answered. The floodplain issues, the setbacks, all the issues are going to be dealt with. So, when I look at this I like it because it is on high ground. I sat on a committee the other day, a local alternative of non-dam and the engineering firm is looking at alternatives and one of the things they said is that they have to go to high ground. Chehalis did a really nice job in their report of explaining that issue – that a lot of the UGA right now is in a floodplain and they got to go dry. I think this answers a lot of the questions of why do they need other land when they already have land – because they can't build on it. It is two feet below the water line. I like this UGA. I think Centralia prepared it very well.

Brooks: We will talk a little bit more about floodplain as we move into Chehalis' because they do have floodplains on their site, unlike Centralia. Amber reminded me, and I think it is important to clarify, the city limits is a hard line and inside the city's limits is the city's jurisdiction. Between the city limits and the urban growth area, we have Interlocal agreements with the cities where we share jurisdiction. It's usually county zoning and the county usually takes care of roads. We have Interlocal agreements with Centralia and Chehalis because that is a space that is supposed to become urban, but it is still rural. Shoreline management stuff is still the county's in the UGA. There's a mix of jurisdiction until it is annexed. Once it is annexed into the city limits, it is the city's and they have to meet all the growth management stuff. The question that always comes before Planning Commission is does it meet the approval criteria? Is there need? Can it be served? Is it in the public's best interest? Is it not spot zoning? We will get into the specifics later.

Spogen: Do we know that all the area in the proposed UGA expansion is all buildable? If not, why are we putting the whole thing in the UGA?

Brooks: They are looking at developing at 4 units per acre. The site is big enough to accommodate more than that so they can avoid steep slopes and add infrastructure. Site design will accommodate the restrictions of the site. They will consider all the site constraints when they subdivide the property.

Spogen: Why don't they only expand the UGA into the buildable areas? Then they could acquire more acreage elsewhere – or does it not matter?

Brooks: It doesn't matter because when you do the calculations for land assessment, you do deductions for your critical areas, infrastructure, market rate, etc. The provisions specifically say that the urban growth area is supposed to include green space. So it isn't just that the UGA does all these weird little things avoiding all the resources. Those resources are your open spaces and green spaces in the city and they are supposed to be there. When they say this site can accommodate 80 units, they are not saying it could accommodate 150 units if it were completely flat and had nothing else and they wanted to put a higher zoning on it they could do it. Realistically, we have no sites that have zero constraints.

Spogen: They don't have to make water or sewer available to the area that is not suitable for development, right?

Brooks: They will make it available where it is appropriate. The other thing that they have done is they are suggesting full parcel inclusion which is the typical approach. You don't have to by law include entire parcels, but it does make a lot more sense. I encourage you, if you're really curious about it, read the lands need assessment that are produced by the cities. It is very interesting how they do the math to account for all these complicating factors.

Mindy continued her presentation. There are two proposals for Chehalis. Both are to accommodate the 2040 population forecast of 11,230 people. The Breen site shown on this map is 109.8 acres, consisting of one parcel, and bound on the north by Hamilton Road and east by Interstate 5. The intended future land use of the site is low density residential with a zoning designation of R4 (4 units per acre).

The second is the Westlund/Enbody site shown on this map. It's 247 acres, consisting of 8 parcels and is bound on the east by Jackson Highway and south by Rush/Kirkland Road (Map 1). The intended future land use of the site is mixed commercial and residential use, including multi-family residential.

Chehalis's 20-year population forecast is 11,230 people, which equates to 7,711 dwelling units. Chehalis's land capacity analysis shows that the existing UGA can accommodate 1,195 units, leaving a need of 6,516 units by 2040 to meet the 20-year forecast. Breen will add 456 new units. Westlund/Enbody will provide 1,224 new units. Remember that Chehalis is proposing mixed use and multifamily which is why the housing units provided is higher than Centralia.

City's current water treatment plant is designed to produce 4.8 million gallons per day (MGD) during extremely favorable conditions, which are determined by water flow and water quality. The existing typical draw is 1.37 MGD. This leaves 3.4 MGD for growth. The current water system is not sufficient to support the expansions and upgrades are necessary. The pump station at 18th

street as well as upgrading water lines from the pump station to handle more capacity. In addition, a water main extension along Bishop Road for approximately 1,000 feet is needed. These necessary improvements are identified in the 2012 Water System Plan and the 2022 Capital Improvement Plan. The City has also captured these items in the proposed Chehalis Water System Plan that is currently being reviewed by the Washington Department of Health. The source of funding for water system upgrades will be covered through the General Fund, grants and loans, and the developers. Lewis County Sewer District 4 currently serves this area with sewer service. LCSD 4 will need to upgrade a grinder pump located on Jackson Highway just north of Yates Road. The district has had plans to perform this upgrade for several years. They have the funding to pay for the work within their current budget. At this time, the City and Lewis County Sewer District 4 are in conversations to discuss the possibility of the City absorbing the Sewer District.

Going back to the approval criteria LCC 17.12.100. The applicable state rules and local policies are met. The full set of findings against this criteria are found in the June 17th staff report, attachment D. There is demonstrated need for housing. With upgrades identified in the existing plans and funding secured, the City of Chehalis can serve the area with water, sewer and transportation within the 20-year planning period. And it is not spot zoning because the future zoning will be consistent with the surrounding zoning. So, staff find that the criteria are met based on the information in record to-date.

Spogen: Did I see on some of the information that somebody heard about the UGA and requested to be added to the area?

Brooks: That certainly could be true. They would be working with the city because it is the city's proposal. I could go back and look, but I don't remember.

Spogen: I was just wondering what they do because it seems like the neighbors could say, I want to be on that too, what is the process for doing that?

Hillary: We did have that scenario where when we first received the application we reach out to the surrounding property owners to see if they're interested or if they want to submit preliminary comments for or against. We did have one volunteering to join in with the application.

Spogen: It seems like that would be kind of advantageous to you if their land is suitable because you do need more density. When does that change? When do you stop anybody from jumping on your program?

Hillary: Usually before we present to the Planned Growth Committee. We do have a gentleman who is interested and he attended tonight just to become familiar with the process. He reached out after we presented to the Planned Growth Committee (PGC) so we were going to approach you tonight with a possible addition, but he elected not to do that. Normally, it would be before we present to the PGC.

Tammy: In this case, both of these applicants came to us and asked to be part of this process. We did not open it up to other individuals simply because we have to take a snapshot in time in order to get our numbers and to get everything in line for the PGC so we just took the applications that were in front of us.

Corbin: Are there any proposed commercial developments going in either of the Chehalis UGA expansions?

Brooks: There is no proposed development at this time. The zoning, I believe, on one of them would be a mixed-use zoning once it was annexed which would allow commercial, but there is no proposed development at this time.

Fritsch: When you're talking about needing to add housing/dwellings, are you also talking about having to provide housing for all income levels? Is that involved in this process at all?

Brooks: It is not something that the county is required to address when looking at urban growth areas but I would invite the cities to respond to that if they would like to.

Tammy: I know that for the city of Chehalis we definitely did look at that. We do have a shortage of housing in our community and that is one of the things we looked at.

Hillary: Same with Centralia. We are currently in the process of conducting a housing assessment plan. Part of the reason we're only looking at this 40 acres with 20 acres developable is that we don't want to make any drastic changes until we know the results of that housing assessment plan, but knowing we are drastically short will help the results of the housing assessment plan and result in more changes. We will likely be back before you in the next couple of years with more changes.

Brooks: I think we have mentioned to you that House Bill 1220 that was passed last year really impacts urban areas more than rural areas. Advice will be coming out of that guidance from Commerce so that will be another thing that cities will be addressing and we get a new 20 year growth projection this year. So, quite a few things will be changing coming up pretty soon.

Russel: My question is for Hillary and the City of Centralia. If only 10-20 acres of the property can be developed, and you plan for 4 units per acre, did you think about asking for more development than that?

Hillary: We did, but the surrounding zone is R4 and with the development constraints we didn't want it to appear as an apartment.

Brooks: The city is also required to follow regulations around spot zoning.

Russel: When do we move past spot zoning? When we have the opportunity to do something that's different, are we always going to be constrained by spot zoning?

Brooks: The way to move past that is to do it as part of a larger comprehensive plan amendment. You could come into an area and do a full relook of the zoning of that space and you can make all kinds of changes and as long as it's part of that larger legislative change and you're involving the full community, you can make changes that otherwise would appear as spot zoning because one property owner has asked for something that is substantially different. So they're really two different processes and there is a process that you can do to do that kind of stuff. It looks very different than what you are doing when a specific site request comes in like this.

Russel: So if somebody owned a couple hundred acres where this might be a big issue, you would do the UGA and then they would move on to ask for something more?

Brooks: It would be up to the city. Again, when you come into an urban growth area the county zoning just stays as it is, but it becomes the area for which the city will now be planning for and the city will be adding to their comprehensive plan and they will be considering what zoning is appropriate for that area. If they were to take in a really big piece of property, let's say 800 acres or something, they would probably engage in a pretty substantial planning process to determine how that whole area would end up being zoned and changed over time. That would be the cities and we would not be a part of that.

Russel: I heard you say hold it to four unit per acre and then if it makes sense the city could address and change it later?

Brooks: Yes, they could do that later. They're proposing 4 units per acre right now because it is consistent with the property around them.

Brooks: The Chehalis areas do have quite a bit of critical resources within them. That is something that we deal with, especially along the I5 corridor. Maybe Tammy wants to speak to this, but they are suggesting that the floodplains be placed in a conservation easement to ensure that they are protected going forward so that was part of the proposal that I did not highlight in the summary, but it was presented to you and you could certainly ask Tammy about that.

Tammy: That is actually a requirement of the state regulations that any area that we want to bring into the UGA has to extinguish all of their development rights within a floodplain in order to come into the UGA. In both of these UGA expansion areas the owners have agreed to do that in order to move forward.

Brooks: So that's an extra level of protection for those floodplains.

Spogen: Can they transfer those development rights or is their only option to extinguish them?

Tammy: They could transfer those if they chose to do that, but they don't have to transfer them. They just have to extinguish them.

Spogen: Who owns that property going forward after they do that?

Tammy: They do unless they choose to transfer it.

Brooks: That doesn't mean that we wouldn't bring in into the UGA. It becomes that green belt that's protected in perpetuity.

Spogen: In Lewis County or Chehalis, can we transfer development rights?

Napier: No, we do not have TVRs. We do have conservation programs through clustering, but that's it.

Mindy continued her presentation. Staff displayed the Planning Commission process on the screen. The question is, are you ready to move to a public hearing? Or should we continue to a public hearing? Or do you need additional information before moving to a hearing? That means receiving another staff report and holding another workshop. In thinking about this – to move to hearing or have another workshop – consider if you have simple questions that I or the cities can answer easily in a staff report. Or if your question or requests for information are more substantial and you want another workshop to discuss with fellow commissioners before holding a hearing to hear from the public.

You don't need to vote to move to hearing. This is just a discussion and if the general consensus of the Commissioners is to move to hearing that is what we will do. Or if the general consensus is to hold another workshop, we will do that. If you chose to move to a hearing, the next steps are on the screen. The hearing would be on July 26, 2022. I will turn it over the Chair Spogen to discuss the next step.

There was general consensus that the commissioners were ready to move to a public hearing on July 26th.

7. Public Comment

There were no members of the public who wanted to provide public comment.

8. Good of the Order:

A. Staff

Mindy showed a figure of the SEPA Appeal code amendment final adoption schedule. The Planning Commission submitted a letter of transmittal on June 23rd. July 6th will be a director's update. Notice of hearing will be on July 12th. We probably will not do a full Wednesday

workshop on this because it's such a small issue – we'll probably just discuss during their regular director's meeting and business update. The hearing before the BOCC will be on August 2nd.

Lee thanked Tammy Martin for stepping in to help the Planning Commission from the Board of County Commissioners to help us in Megan's absence.

B. Planning Commissioners

There were no items from the commissioners.

9. Calendar

The next meeting of the Planning Commission will occur on July 12, 2022 and the agenda items are a continued public hearing on the YMCA Rezone Proposal and a workshop on the Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-in proposal.

10. Adjourn

Commissioner Corbin made a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m.