

Lewis County Planning Commission

Public Meeting

In-Person & Virtual Meeting via Zoom

July 12, 2022 - Meeting Notes

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

Planning Commissioners Excused: Bob Russell, District 2; Kathy Chastain, District 2

Staff Present: Lee Napier, Community Development Director; Mindy Brooks, Senior Long Range Planner; Megan Sathre, Office Assistant Senior; Amber Smith, Prosecuting Attorney;

Others Present: Gwen Ichinose Bagley, YMCA; Eric Staley, NV5 Geologist; public participants

Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Draft Meeting Notes – June 28, 2022
- Staff Presentation: YMCA Rezone Testimony Summary
- Staff Presentation: Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-In Rezone Proposal
- SEPA Appeal Amendment – BOCC Process Update
- Development Permits Quarterly Report

1. Zoom Guidelines

The clerk dispensed with the Zoom Guidelines.

2. Call to Order

Mindy Brooks announced that Kathy Chastain was appointed by the Board of County Commissioners this morning to the Planning Commission.

A. Determination of a Quorum

5 Commissioners were present; there was a quorum.

3. Approval of Agenda

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the agenda. Commissioner Corbin 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 28, 2022. Commissioner Corbin made a motion to approve; second by Commissioner Alves. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Public Comment

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

6. Continued Public Hearing – YMCA Rezone

A. Opening Remarks

Chair Spogen introduced the continued public hearing for the YMCA rezone.

At the June 28, 2022 public hearing the Commission voted to continue the hearing to today, July 12, and to reopen the written record to received testimony until 5:00pm on the day of the hearing. The Commission did not note to reopen oral testimony. We will start with a few specific questions, followed by a short staff presentation and then continue deliberations.

We are concerned that this hearing be fair in form and substance as well as appearance. Therefore, I would like to ask if anyone in the audience objects to the participation of any member of this Commission in this public hearing. If so, please raise your hand in Zoom or unmute your phone and say "yes" or step up to the podium. *There were no comments.*

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? If so, please raise your hand and state your interest, benefit, or inability to hear and consider this matter in a fair and objective manner. *There were no comments.*

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.

Chair Spogen clarified her conversation with Ron Neilson, as was mentioned at the last meeting on June 28th. Prior to the last meeting, Chair Spogen was approached by Mr. Neilson on the sidewalk and he informed her that he could not hear her at the previous night's Zoom meeting. Chair Spogen notified staff immediately so they could rectify the issue for future meetings.

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

B. Staff Presentation

Mindy Brooks, Senior Long Range Planner, gave a summary of the YMCA rezone testimony received since June 28th through 5:00pm today.

As was stated, the commissioners continued the hearing and reopened the written record, which closed at 5:00pm today. We received 14 pieces of new testimony. Those that were received before noon today were emailed to the commissioners and posted on the Community development webpage before noon. Since noon, 4 pieces of testimony were received and have also been posted to the webpage. The main topics that have been received in testimony over the entire time are displayed on the screen. The majority of the testimony that came in reiterated points of support and concern that we have heard in previous testimony. Clarification on some topics related to economic benefits and increased local taxes. The fire department did provide additional comments as well about their need to upgrade their facilities, which are deficient to serve their current patrons, let alone additional patrons. The fire department has concerns about the expense of upgrading the facilities, especially if a youth camp is developed. YMCA also submitted responses to some of the public testimony, which was sent to the commissioners.

Staff displayed the rezone approval criteria on the screen. As a reminder, rezones are not about the development details themselves, it's not about project impacts. Rezones are about if the use is appropriate for the site. Commissioners are not charged with the determining if future developments may impact the roads, wildlife, or other specifics. Those are project-level impacts and will be addressed at the time of project permitting. The commission is charged with determining if the use is appropriate at the site. The criteria you are using is the same criteria that the Board of County Commissioners will be using when they make a decision.

C. Commissioner Discussion & Deliberation

Lorie: Do the commissioners have any questions for staff or the applicant?

The commissioners had no questions to ask before moving to discussion.

Lorie: Would staff like your updated statements added to your previous testimony?

Mindy: Yes.

Lorie: Now that the Planning Commission has received written testimony, heard oral testimony at the June 28 hearing and reviewed the staff reports concerning this proposal, this subject is open for continued discussion among the Planning Commissioners.

The commissioners had no addition comments or thoughts to discuss.

Commissioner Corbin made a motion to send a letter of transmittal recommending that the Board of County Commissioners pass an ordinance to amend the Lewis County Comprehensive Plan map from Resource Lands to Other Rural Lands and apply a Master Plan Resort overlay zone to the properties identified in the YMCA Rezone proposal. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Alves. The motion passed with 5 yes votes and zero no votes.

D. Next Steps

Mindy: We need to draft a letter to transmit the recommendation to the BOCC. Typically the transmittal letter is written by staff and signed by the Planning Commission chair, but it ultimately it is your letter. Tonight, I would like to discuss with you what you would like included in the transmittal letter. We will ring back a draft of the transmittal letter for your consideration on July 26. I want to make sure the letter includes all information you find pertinent when transmitting your recommendation to BOCC. Perhaps we can do a round robin to see if any commissioners want specific elements of the decision highlighted in the letter.

Frank: I would like for us to focus in on the issues that the public has raised regarding things that potentially need to be mitigated. I would like to make sure that any developer be responsible for helping with infrastructure that needs to be improved for the benefit of themselves as well as the community. Far too often in this county, we have seen development proceed and the tax payers are left footing the entire bill, or a lion-share of the bill and I don't want to see that happen. Definitely emphasize that the county commissioners and planning department focus in on working with the residents of the Mineral community in this particular case, really work on mitigation.

Gretchen: I heard a lot in the testimony that there was some sense of backdoor deals and non-transparency. There were comments about internet issues, not reading the chronicle, etc. Is the other ways that the information can be distributed or be more readily available so the community can be part of the process every step of the way moving forward?

Lorie: When I was thinking about how I would decide on this, I came to the conclusion that I was going to use the definition of highest and best use to help me determine the right way. "The reasonably probable and legal use of the property that is physically possible, appropriately supported, and financially feasible." I think this rezone, which allows the property owner to realize the highest and best use of their property with county controlled impact to the community is just and that's why I made my decision. Secondly, staff informed us early on that the state of Washington, through their Growth Management Act, supports communities and counties encouraging recreational opportunities like this proposal that the YMCA is hoping to accomplish on this property. Since Lewis County, I can trust, provides the safety environmental oversight to ensure compliance with the issues like water and septic and traffic and hopefully noise issues, I felt that this seems reasonable to vote that this go forward.

Jason: I echo the things already said. I would add that the people in mineral brought up a lot of important concerns that do need to be addressed at the project level. I want to emphasize that the commissioners need to make sure they take special care to look into those issues at the project level and address them properly.

Mindy: I will bring back a draft transmittal letter at the next meeting for review. The next steps include the 60-Day Commerce review period, which is the state ensuring that all the applicable laws are met. Then in the fall the proposal will be in front of the Board of County Commissioners – we do not have a date set yet. BOCC will hold a public hearing. Gretchen, we will look into and share more with you about how we typically notice and if there are other steps. The one extra step we took this time was to do a press release, which is not something we typically do for rezones. I think it is good in cases like these that we take all reasonable steps to let people know when they have an opportunity to provide input.

Lorie: We want to thank everyone who participated in the YMCA Rezone hearings on June 28th and tonight, and appreciate the time you have taken out of your evening to attend. We are now going to move on to the next agenda item, the Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-in Rezone. We will take a couple minutes to allow those who wish to leave to exit the hearings room.

7. Workshop – Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-In Rezone Proposal

Lorie: The next item is the Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-In Rezone Proposal. I want to disclose that in light of the fact that the applicant has used details from a Jorgenson Timber application for a rezone and that I am connected with Jorgenson Timber, I recuse myself from the Good-Avapollo rezone. *Lorie left the meeting.*

Mindy: Because the Vice Chair, Commissioner Russel, is absent tonight we will need to appoint a temporary chair in order to proceed. I would recommend that the commission appoint Commissioner Frank Corbin as temporary chair because he has the most seniority. Someone will need to make a motion and someone else will need to second in order to take a vote.

Commissioner Alves made a motion to appoint Commissioner Corbin as temporary chair, second by Commissioner Fritsch. The motion passed.

Frank: The purpose of a work session is for staff to present information about the topic and the Commission to ask questions of staff and the applicant. 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 Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-In rezone proposal.

We sent a packet of materials to you, including a detailed staff report, on Friday July 1. Those materials are posted online for the public to review. A reminder that workshops are an opportunity for staff to present the proposal and commissioners to ask questions. No public

comments are taken at the workshop. Public comments can be provided as testimony during the hearing.

Staff presentation will start with the rezone process. We will do a quick reminder about what rezones are. Next I will summarize the proposal, staff findings and SEPA Determination. Then close with next steps. I will pause along the way for questions, but do feel free to interrupt me.

I know Planning Commission has seen this overview before, but we have members of the public joining the meeting tonight who are not familiar with the process. And it is always good to remind everyone of the roles and responsibilities. Rezones are when a private property owner wants to change their underlying zone designation. For example, someone may have ARL land and want to change it to RDD-20. To change the zoning, we must first change the Comprehensive Plan map. In this example for ARL to go to RDD-20, first the Comp Plan map must be amended from Resource Land to Other Rural Lands. Amending the Comp Plan map is a quasi-judicial action because it is a change to the zoning for a single site. A single site may include one parcel or a group of a few parcels. Because it is quasi-judicial, all the information Commissioners get must come through open public meetings.

Here is the process. First, the proposal is submitted by the property owner as a rezone application to Community Development. Applications can be submitted September through December every year. Next staff reviews to make sure we have all the information needed to process the application. Once staff determines an application is complete, we let the applicant know as well as post a notice of application so the public can comment. Posting notice means sending it to property owners within ¼ mile of the site and posting a physical sign on the site. Comments come to staff and are provided to the applicant. The applicant has a chance to amend their proposal based on comments – this is optional. Next staff issues a non-project SEPA Determination. The determination is also noticed so the public can comment. Comments come to staff and are provided to the applicant. Then, staff package all of the information, including all of the public comments to date, and share with the Planning Commission in form of a staff report and presentation. That's where we are tonight. After the workshop, Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive testimony. Planning Commission will weigh the evidence and testimony, and make a recommendation on the rezone proposal. Before the PC recommendation is given to BOCC, 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 for another public hearing and final decision. This is a long process. It takes at least one year.

These are the approval criteria that Planning Commission and BOCC use when making decisions about amendments to the comp plan map, including rezones. The rezone must conform to the GMA and CPP. There must be demonstrated need for the rezone. The rezone must serve the public's interest. This criterion is very subjective, but there is guidance in the code about impacts on service providers, impact on population and employment and impact on resource lands. And finally the rezone can't facilitate spot zoning.

Because this particular rezone is also a mining opt-in, there are additional criteria to be considered. The first criterion is about existing mines, which this is not so it's not applicable. The second criteria are for areas with significant mineral deposits. The third is for areas that cannot meet the second criterion but have local mining importance. The July 1st staff report included staff findings against both sets of criteria and I will go over the findings in a minute.

Staff displayed the Planning Commission process in a flow chart on the screen. The typical process is across the bottom – staff report, workshop, staff report, public hearing and a recommendation to BOCC. We are at the workshop. Workshops are where staff provides information and commissioners ask questions or request more information. You decide if you are ready to move to a public hearing or if you need another workshop to ask questions of staff or the applicant. It is also possible that at the hearing more questions are brought up and Planning Commission would like staff to provide more information. In that situation, the hearing is continued before a recommendation is made.

Last thing and then we will get into the actual proposal. Rezones are quasi-judicial. That means all information must come to Planning Commission through an open public meeting. You may not do outside research. If you need specific information, ask staff and we will get it for you. You may not talk with the public about rezone proposals outside of a public meeting. You may not attend outside meetings, such as a meeting hosted by the applicant. One question we get is what if you are getting coffee at the local shop and someone approaches you about a rezone? First, tell them that you cannot discuss the item outside of the public meetings. Let them know they can submit comments as testimony. And then tell me about the exchange so we can determine if you need to disclose it. Another question is what if you read an article in the newspaper or hear it on the news. I'd recommend that you avoid this if you can, but if you do it's not a huge deal. If the article has information that may sway your opinion on the item, then disclose it and we can present the article to everyone so people can rebut it. If you just remember that you heard a news reporter mention the item, but you can't remember the details, then there is no need to disclose. When in doubt, ask me. Disclosure isn't punitive – you didn't do anything wrong. It's about transparency and allowing people the opportunity to rebut pertinent information in the record.

Let's move to the Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-in Rezone Proposal. The site is located off Brim Road, south of Highway 12 between Ethel and Salkum. The site is 443.5 acres in size. The current zoning is ARL and the request is to be rezoned to MRL. The intended future use is mineral extraction; however, the details of a future mining operation are not known at this time. This is a non-project action. Planning Commission is not charged with assessing future potential impacts of a specific project. The actual project and development will require future permits and SEPA review to address project-level impacts. Planning Commission is only considering if the mineral resource use is appropriate for this site.

I'm going to go through staff findings against the mining opt-in criteria first and then the criteria for a rezone. Most of the details about the project are part of these findings. As I said

before, the first criterion is not applicable because the site is not an existing mine. The third criterion is only used if the second criterion cannot be met and as you will see in the next slides the second criterion is met.

The main report where the information for the findings comes from is the Mine Resource Evaluation Report. It was submitted with the rezone application and is supporting materials in the Staff Report. The report was prepared by a qualified geologist, Erick Staley, who is with us tonight. And the report is online for the commissioners and public to review.

This map shows the anticipated limits of the excavation area in orange. The excavation area is based on stream buffers and steep slopes, because those regulations will be enforced at the time of project permit. The mine report found that the aggregate resources at the site consists of gravel, sand and cobbles. Based on results of testing, and with crushing and washing, the outwash material will meet typical WSDOT specifications for use. Therefore the criterion about likelihood of mineral deposits is met.

The mine report concluded that the estimated value of the minable resource is over \$250 million. The criteria threshold for commercial value is a value of \$1 million for rock, gravel and sand. The report also concluded that there is probable commercial extraction value for the foreseeable future. Therefore, the criterion that the mineral deposits have commercial value is met.

Frank: What is the definition for foreseeable future?

Mindy: That is not clarified in the code, so there is no specified time limit.

The next criterion is about the size of abutting properties. The criterion states that no more than 50% of the abutting properties can be 2.5 acres or smaller. None of the abutting properties are less than 2.5 acres. The smallest abutting property is 10.87 acres. Therefore, this criterion is met.

And it's not in a UGA, therefore this criterion is met.

Based on the analysis of the information in the record to date, staff finds that the Good-Avapollo application to opt-in to the mining resource land zoning designation meets the approval criteria of LCC 17.30.720.

Gretchen: Looking at the map of the abutting sites, do you have a map that shows the residential dwellings in relationship to the site?

Staff displayed the Public Works GIS map on the screen to show the structures located around the site. The Public Works GIS map is available to the public on the Lewis County webpage.

Mindy: You can see that there is a number of properties on the west side with residential structures.

Frank: Is the diagonal parcel an easement?

Erick Staley, NV5 Geologist: I prepared the mining report as well as a lot of the application materials. That parcel is an old utility easement that had been sold off. It is one of the parcels owned by the Avapollo portion of the group that is making this proposal. There are two narrow parcels as well that stem off the NW corner that are similar.

Mindy continued her presentation. Now, let's go over the criteria for deciding on a rezone. You've seen these a few times now because you use them for all rezones and UGA expansions.

The findings against the applicable GMA rules and Countywide Planning Policies, as well as the Lewis County Comprehensive Plan, are found in Attachment E of the July 1 staff report. There are many requirements and there are 10 pages of findings. I'm not going to go over them all here. The bottom line is that the proposed amendment conforms to the requirements of the Growth Management Act and is consistent with county-wide planning policies and the Lewis County Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, this criterion is met.

Staff displayed a map on the screen. You don't need to read this map. This is on the Community Development webpage and is part of the record. You are allowed to open and study it. This is a 2015 map from a report produced by Washington Dept of Natural Resources. It shows all the known aggregate resources in Lewis County. Based on the DNR report, and the 2017 periodic review of the LC Comp Plan, Lewis County has sufficient aggregate reserves to last through 2060. That is based on an assumption that all mineral reserves would be accessed during that period. Mineral resource use is an allowed use in MRL as well as FRL, RDD-5, RDD-10 and RDD-20 zones. However, in reality mineral extraction within areas of existing aggregate rock doesn't frequently occur, even though it is allowed in many cases. Mineral resource use is not allowed in the ARL zone and, per the DNR map, there are aggregate resources in ARL zoned areas that will not be accessed unless the area is rezoned. The proposal is to rezone ARL to MRL to allow for mineral extraction, which aides in Lewis County meeting the need of providing rock aggregate by accessing existing reserves. Therefore, this criterion is met.

Determining whether the rezone is in the public's interest is a subjective criterion. That makes it harder for you because it isn't black and white. But it allows you to consider what you hear from the public. The code does provide guidance, which is what staff have addressed in the staff report. There is no impact on population growth or development. If approved the mining operation is anticipated to provide 10 jobs. There is no development with the mining operation so no impact on septic, fire services. There would be a potential impact on roads, but that is addressed during future County project permitting. The site would remain a resource land, although shifted from ag to mining. Mining requires a reclamation plan with DNR, meaning after mining is completed, the site must be restored. Therefore, based on the information in the record to date, the proposal is in the public's interest.

Frank: Does the zoning use revert back to the original zoning once the mining is retired?

Mindy: I'm not sure if the zoning reverts back, I don't think it does. I think you just have to restore it to previous use or the use that is specific within the reclamation plan, which the state oversees.

Lee: Not to my knowledge, but we have not had any sites be reclaimed, so that may not be a solid answer.

Mindy: I would assume that if a site was restored and the owner wanted to use it for agricultural resources, they would come in and ask for a rezone.

Frank: The reason that question was triggered because you used the word temporary. That's why I wondered if it was an automatic reversion back to the previous zoning.

Erick: I've done a few of these and they don't get reclaimed very often because they are long term projects, but they are always heading towards reclamation. Reclamation for the site is usually discussed at the local level, such as the county's Hearings Examiner. The next stage of this process would establish what the reclamation goals are at the site. DNR would be charged with watching that process happen and making sure there are guard rails and that they are compliant with the permit as they go through the reclamation plan. There's very strong controls on that, even if it is merely proposed at the county level. I don't know anything about the zoning afterwards, but I know if it is heading towards commercial forestry or agricultural use it will go there.

Gretchen: How long do these types of project usually go on since they are defined as temporary? It sounds kind of indefinite. Does that mean that as long as there is money coming out of the ground they keep going? Are there any limits – financially, time, or geological?

Erick: I would say yes to a lot of that. There are geological limits that control a mine plan be it the inherit quality of the resource itself, some of the practical limits of the site such as setbacks. Also, in the case of a dry excavation like this you would want to stay out of groundwater so typically that would be a depth limit. Once you have that volume of material that you could conceivably pursue with a mine, there is some diffuse boundaries on this because the market conditions are going to dictate how fast you mine it. If we go through another recession it would prolong the process quite a bit. If we are going through the current rate of construction it might go faster than anticipated. It is reasonable to expect the project to last decades, but not infinitely.

Mindy continued her presentation. This is a situation where the state laws explicitly allows zoning that would otherwise be considered spot zoning. The reason it is not considered spot zoning is because mineral resources exist where they exist. And the state law supports mineral extraction. In addition, going from ARL to MRL keeps the site in a resource use. And there is a required reclamation plan, which means the site is restored to previous use or use stated in the reclamation plan. Therefore, the proposal rezone is not spot zoning.

Based on the analysis of the information in the record to date, staff finds that the Good-Avapollo application to amend the rezone the site from Agricultural Resource Land to Mining Resource Land meets the approval criteria of LCC 17.12.100.

The Planning Commission is not charged with evaluating potential future impacts of development. Planning Commission is charged with determining if the use is appropriate for the site and if the approval criteria are met. Please keep this in mind when deliberating, you are making a recommendation based on the approval criteria I just covered.

Next I'll review the SEPA determination. Rezones include a change to the comprehensive plan map and require a non-project SEPA review. The determination was issued on May 31, 2022. There are no probable adverse impacts of the rezone. Public comments were received on the DNS and I'll go over those.

The public comments included:

- Negative impact on property values
- Noise
- Air pollution
- Impacts to water quality in streams
- Aquifer contamination
- Impacts on fish and wildlife
- Visual impacts to surrounding properties
- Increased truck traffic on local roads

These are project-specific impacts that would be addressed during future County project permitting, these are not addressed during the non-project rezone.

A reminder about what is required in the future if the rezone is approved and the applicant applies for County project permits. Project level permitting for new surface mining areas located in MRL zoning classification will require, at a minimum, the Lewis County Hearing Examiner's decision be based upon compliance with the criteria established for the requirements of the LCC sections on the screen (this is not an exhaustive list). In addition, surface mining must comply with air quality standards adopted by the Southwest Clean Air Agency. The public concerns raised can be addressed during future County project permitting through compliance with existing state and local regulations.

The Cowlitz Indian Tribe submitted comments on the SEPA Determination. Their concerns include; impacts to fish bearing streams, impacts on wildlife, formal consultation during project permitting, and Inadvertent Discovery Plan. During project permitting, LCC 17.25, Shoreline Management, and 17.38, Critical Areas will need to be met. That includes a 150-foot buffer around two fish-bearing streams on site. There are also wetlands and hydric soils that will have to be addressed at County project permitting. At the time of future County project permitting, the site will be reviewed for mapped historic and cultural sites. Project level SEPA will be sent to

the Indian Tribes and Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation. Project permit conditions could include archaeological site investigation cultural resource study and an Inadvertent Discovery Plan.

Local and state agencies provided comments about future project level requirements including; traffic impact study for Highway 12, access improvement for Brim Road, new or modified road approaches, and potable water supply. All applicable state and local regulatory requirements will be address during future project permitting.

Gretchen: Is the mined product meant to be used in the county in which it is harvested? Is there stipulations on that? Will this aggregate be for Lewis County Public Works projects?

Mindy: There are no stated county rules regarding that, but I don't know if there are state rules related to it.

Erick: There aren't. The primary controls on any aggregate mine is going to be the distance to market. It's not a very high margin material, not like gold, so you can only travel so far before it becomes unaffordable. It is unlikely to go outside of the county.

Gretchen: In the 2015 report from DNR it says that there are reserves for up to 2060, assuming that it would be used in Lewis County. However, the Jorgenson report rebutted that half of that isn't actually going to be accessible. Will there be an updated report on the actual availability or are we just relying on this outside report to tell us that? The population growth has exceeded what we thought it might be. Will there be an update?

Mindy: The bigger update will be done during the periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan, which is due in 2025. We will be scoping next year. That will be an opportunity to have a wider conversation with you. There is new aggregate information from DNR. But at this time we are relying, as we do for most of our rezones, on the adopted comp plan and what went into making the initial determinations.

Erick: Part of the reason that they (*Jorgenson*) discuss it that the way is because DNR is more focused on just the inherit geology that is a potential aggregate resource. But to actually develop a site you need setbacks, overburden removal, other practical constraints that reduce how much you can actually take off a mining property. You can't just count total acreage and raw reserves as the available resources for the county.

Mindy: Are there any other questions? (*There were none.*) If you are ready to move forward to public hearing the notice of hearing will go out on July 21st, the final staff report will be on July 29th and the hearing will take place on August 9th.

The Commissioners decided they are ready to move to a public hearing.

8. Good of the Order:

A. Staff

Mindy showed a figure of the SEPA Appeal code amendment final adoption schedule. The resolution to post the notice of hearing was today. There will be no Wednesday Workshop because it's a relatively simple amendment. The hearing will be on August 9th.

Mindy presented the 2nd quarter development permits. The first graph shows the 2019-2022 building permits. The second graph is 2022 Building permits issued by type.

Frank: It looks like just a bit of a cooling off period for June compared to the previous three years.

Mindy: Maybe, but it could jump back up next month. We will see what happens. The overall trending is pretty typical, but it does look like slightly less than it has been in the past Junes.

Gretchen: Have you in the past broken the report down by geography?

Mindy: Lee, do you know if that is an easy thing for us to do?

Lee: In the past, we have broken them down by Commissioner District, but it didn't prove to be helpful. Maybe you have another idea you are interested in?

Gretchen: I would like to see how much is happening in unincorporated areas, such as Packwood.

Lee: All of our permits are for unincorporated Lewis County – we do not issues permits for the cities.

Mindy: That is part of why it is difficult to break it down by geography. We could try zip code. We will see what we can do.

Corbin: What is the miscellaneous category on the building permits issued by type?

Mindy: New cell towers / upgrades, demolition permits, bridges, mini storage, reroofs, signs, fences, and probably other stuff too. We will keep that as a footnote so we can remind ourselves each time we look at the quarterly reports.

B. Planning Commissioners

There were no items from the commissioners.

9. Calendar

The next meeting of the Planning Commission will occur on July 26, 2022 and the agenda items are a public hearing on the Centralia and Chehalis UGA expansion proposals and a workshop on the De Goede and Adna Grocery Store rezone proposals.

10. Adjourn

Commissioner Alves made a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:09 p.m.