

## Lewis County Planning Commission **Public Meeting**

Lewis County Courthouse  
Commissioners' Hearing Room – 2nd Floor  
351 NW North St – Chehalis, WA

### **September 23, 2014 - Meeting Notes**

**Planning Commissioners Present:** Mike Mahoney, Russ Prior, Richard Tausch, Sue Rosbach, Clint Brown

**Planning Commissioners Excused:** Bob Guenther, Arny Davis

**Staff Present:** Lee Napier, Glenn Carter, Patrick Babineau, Pat Anderson

**Consultants:** John Kliem, Creative Community Solutions

**Others Present:** Please see sign in sheet

#### **Handouts/Materials Used:**

- Agenda
- Meeting notes from July 29, 2014
- Concept Report for I-502
- Countywide Planning Policies

#### **1. Call to Order**

Chairman Mahoney called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. The Commissioners introduced themselves.

#### **2. Approval of Agenda**

There were no changes and the agenda was approved.

#### **3. Approval of Meeting Notes**

Commissioner Brown made a motion to approve the meeting notes; Commissioner Prior seconded. The motion carried.

#### **4. Old Business**

##### **A. 3<sup>rd</sup> Workshop on Marijuana Land Use**

Chairman Mahoney informed the audience that although this is a workshop, not a public hearing, he would try to allow questions or comments from them. If they have testimony to become part of the permanent record they should come to the public hearing or present written testimony. The public hearing will most likely be at the end of October or early November. Tonight will be for gathering information so the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners that is best for the citizens of Lewis County.

The Chair recognized Ms. Lee Napier, Director of Community Development.

Ms. Napier stated tonight is the third workshop on this topic. Last month the Commissioners gave Mr. Kliem some feedback and would like the same on the concept paper that he prepared. She recognized Mr. Kliem.

Mr. Kliem summarized the Planning Commission's progress so far. On July 8 the Commissioners discussed this issue to address land use issues in relationship to recreational marijuana production, processing and retailing in Lewis County. The Commission decided to move ahead with the discussion and on July 29 there was a brainstorming session. A number of questions were asked of the Commission about what its criteria might be for developing land use regulations for recreational marijuana.

During the brainstorming session the responses to his questions were written on cards and Appendix A shows the categories in which the cards were placed. Taking those notes and reviewing the Comprehensive Plan Mr. Kliem tried to find out how to address the criteria through the zoning ordinance. He came up with some potential alternatives and asked the Commissioners to ask questions at any time during the discussion. He wanted to know if he captured or did not capture the Commissioners' ideas correctly. He will use that feedback to create an ordinance that reflects what the Commissioners would like to see on this issue.

Chairman Mahoney clarified that the Planning Commissioners were not in a position to propose an ordinance to the BOCC. He understood nothing would take place until the county decides to permit it or the courts decide that the county has to permit recreational marijuana. No ordinance will be passed until that happens.

Ms. Napier stated that what Mr. Kliem hopes to get from the Planning Commissioners tonight is information that he could put into an ordinance – a draft ordinance is what the Planning Commission is working on. Chair Mahoney stated the Planning Commissioners would come up with a draft ordinance that potentially could be enacted if the time comes. Ms. Napier stated the Planning Commissioners' recommendation would be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners. Chair Mahoney stated it was his opinion that before the Planning Commission holds a public hearing it should have worked this through enough to have a draft ordinance; up until then they are just gathering information. When the public hearing is held it should be to take action. Ms. Napier stated that was correct.

Mr. Kliem stated the Planning Commission indicated it was interested in seeing the production and processing of recreational marijuana being located in industrial areas or parks. That type of location is for manufacturing uses so he checked to see where manufacturing uses go. He also looked at definitions in the zoning ordinance to see if it fits well within the term "manufacturing." In the definition that is currently in code for manufacturing processing fits but production does not. Then he looked at individual zoning districts where manufacturing appears and also at the purpose statement for each zoning district. His conclusion: marijuana production does not have a good fit as a defined term that would fit under the definitions and uses within the individual zoning districts. Mr. Kliem did not think the county would want marijuana to be considered agriculture and so he kept it separated out from typical agricultural uses.

Commissioner Prior asked how other counties are dealing with that question. He thought that growing marijuana would be considered agriculture.

Mr. Kliem stated the counties are looking at it differently. Some view it as agriculture. Mr. Kliem's difficulty in using the term agriculture was due to where the Planning Commission indicated its locational criteria would be. If it is called agriculture then it could potentially be grown in all of the different zones where crops are grown.

Commissioner Prior stated he was not able to attend the last meeting and will give a different perspective from the other commissioners.

Chairman Mahoney stated he would like to know what the WAC says about the physical separation of production and processing. He also stated when the growing of the plant was discussed at the last meeting there were two totally different growing situations: the totally confined grow inside a large metal building seemed to be the focus of discussion. Because of a perceived economic situation and production cycle, the Commission tended to ignore in-ground grow operations, either outside, inside a tunnel or inside a greenhouse. Those would meet most definitions of an agricultural production. The large metal building does not fit into the agricultural zoning but rather industrial zoning. Given the county's existing zoning there may need to be two different sets of criteria: greenhouse/tunnel, or inside a building. Chair Mahoney stated South Bend has a building for this purpose.

Mr. Kliem stated he does the planning for South Bend and that the area where the building is located is an un-zoned area at this time. It will remain commercial and is not an issue there. It is surrounded by residential uses and is in a rural area.

Chairman Mahoney stated if someone wanted to grow marijuana in the ground or in a greenhouse that is accepted in our current ordinance language for an agricultural area.

Commissioner Prior agreed with that. He stated there are grows in Okanogan. He asked if they are out in the open like a vineyard and is a greenhouse considered an outdoor grow. Mr. Kliem stated a greenhouse is not considered an outdoor grow. An outdoor grow is in an open field and under the WACs they would still need to provide security fencing.

Commissioner Prior agreed that perimeter fencing would need to be implemented. He asked the definition of an outdoor grow. Mr. Kliem stated the WACs are written as questions and they don't deal with direct definitions for producers, processors or retailers of marijuana. He has tried to develop those definitions in the ordinances he has written. He read from the WACs regarding buildings and security. He assumed there would be a variety of conditions under which marijuana is grown.

Commissioner Prior asked if the tier sizes apply whether the grow is indoors or outdoors. Mr. Kliem stated that is correct. Commissioner Prior stated the maximum size is less than an acre. He did not want to preclude someone who thinks he can make a living on less than an acre of land. He thought this should be allowed considering the constraints of the state law and he would like to see outdoor grows back in the picture.

Chairman Mahoney stated the security demands are laid out in the WAC. If the county gets to the point where it is writing permits for a marijuana growing operation, who inspects the facility to see that it is in compliance with the building codes and with the WAC? Mr. Kliem stated building codes would be the County's responsibility. A producer has to have approval from the state Liquor Control Board, as do a

processor and retailer. If they do not meet state law then they wouldn't fall under that definition and that would make them.... [Mr. Kliem was interrupted and the rest of his statement was inaudible].

Chairman Mahoney asked if he saw something that looked like a marijuana grow operation and the fencing was not adequate and the light was extreme, who would he call? The Sheriff's department? Who is going to be responsible for enforcing the WAC requirements?

Ms. Napier suggested Chairman Mahoney was jumping ahead because he was asking who is doing what before we know what people are doing. If the regulation conversation could go forward then some of those things may come out. If not we will come back. She does not know what obligations her department will be taking on at this point. Chairman Mahoney asked if this would be part of the ordinance that the Planning Commission recommends. Ms. Napier stated yes, that is part of what the county should consider in their regulations. If the Planning Commission gives the input Ms. Napier will make certain that any department that is obligated reviews the ordinance before a public hearing is conducted.

Commissioner Mahoney stated he could see Public Health being involved, State Department of Agriculture, air quality people, light and noise pollution people – some are state agencies, some are county. With something this controversial it should be pretty well defined. He did not want to catch people being wrong or set people up to fail.

Mr. Kliem stated he wanted to connect production, processing and retailing to the WACs so that if the county does move forward with an ordinance that allows these uses in certain areas they would have to meet those requirements. For those things that the Liquor Control Board is responsible for ensuring the list is here and would be included in the ordinance through this definition. Because of the unique characteristics for these three types of uses they deserve to have their own distinct definition in the zoning ordinance. They give the county the greatest flexibility in differentiating them from other types of uses to enable controlling any of the problems that have been identified in the criteria.

Chairman Mahoney asked Mr. Carter if it is appropriate for the county ordinances to be more specific in the definitions than the WAC, and can the county write a definition of what it thinks a producer in our county is going to be and to the extent of production and processing.

Mr. Carter stated the county has the authority to do that. The state has written definitions and adopted regulations but the county has the right to go further in defining what those activities mean for our purposes. If the state comes back in this legislative session and preempts the field and says the county has no authority, Mr. Carter may have a different answer. At this time the courts have determined that the state has not preempted the field and therefore the county under its police power has the authority to grant consistent definitions but might go further in terms of specifying what those activities are.

Chairman Mahoney stated it needs to be made clear that the when the product leaves the grow operation it needs to be made transportable and manageable – not loose plants. Mr. Kliem stated the WACs do address the exchange between the producer and the processor and what is required. Further along in the report there is a section on special provisions which will be discussed a little later.

Mr. Kliem asked if there were any questions or problems with the definitions that were suggested for marijuana production, processing and retailing. Commissioner Prior stated where it says "indoor growing" he would like to see the word "indoor" stricken. Mr. Kliem stated there can be a discussion about options such as tiers or places or situations where you would like to see indoor grows happen and not in others.

Commissioner Brown stated that 17.145.145 states that marijuana producing and processing facilities shall have an approved odor management plan. He asked how that gets accomplished with an outdoor grow. Mr. Kliem stated he developed the recommendations based on the Planning Commission's requirement at the last meeting that the grows would be fully enclosed.

Commissioner Brown asked if the odor control technology that eliminates off-site detection is required of the outdoor grows under the WAC. Mr. Kliem stated he did not know; he has not been to Eastern Washington where it is grown outdoors. Chair Mahoney stated he thought the odor problem that was discussed last month had more to do with processing than with growing, although a confined indoor grow might create odor.

Mr. Kliem stated in all agriculture there can be problems with odor controls and there is only so much that can be done. That is why the Growth Management Act tries to ensure separation of uses. Commissioner Brown stated that leads to the question of setbacks or distances from adjoining land in order to minimize odors. If it is going to be outdoors then there needs to be some type of planning [for odors]. Mr. Kliem stated if outdoor grows will be approved then minimize lot size may need to be considered, as well as distances from adjacent properties. There are a lot of options if the Commission wishes to explore that and also restricting it to certain tier sizes so that if you are looking at going over a certain production area it may be preferable to have that large of an area indoors as opposed to outdoors.

Commissioner Prior asked how the odor is measured. If someone 1000 feet away from a grow can smell it, is that good enough, or is there a device that is used? He would like to see a quantifiable measure in whatever [document] we produce. Mr. Kliem stated there are WACs that quantify it; odor is more subjective. Commissioner Prior would not like to have someone put a lot of energy into his operation to have one person say he can smell it and perhaps shut down the operation. Mr. Kliem stated that is difficult to deal with. If the grow is confined to an indoor grow there are systems that can help manage the odors.

Mr. Kliem stated if the Commissioners recommend an outdoor grow then he suggests looking at minimum lot size and separation from adjacent properties. Commissioner Brown didn't think an operation should be shut down because someone could smell it; he did not think an operation should be allowed 25' from a neighbor's house. Chairman Mahoney stated security rules in the WAC will take care of some of that. Along that same line, if a fence is along a right-of-way and is over 6' a variance is required to permit it. On a property away from a right-of-way he did not think the same rule applied. Some of those setbacks are in the WACs. Mr. Kliem stated the WACs are more concerned with security and obscuring the sight. Distances from adjacent property lines will be a local option. Grays Harbor County allows outdoor grows in strictly agricultural zones, and they are restrictive about allowing general residential development in agricultural areas. There it was decided to keep it out of any type of area that had concentrated residential.

Chairman Mahoney stated that several of the facilities and services criteria need to apply to the indoor operations, and he does not think the outdoor grows can be excluded. Mr. Kliem stated if the Commissioners are in favor of striking the word "indoor" on the production, then they could look at some of the different zoning districts where an outdoor grow might occur. He asked the Commissioners to keep in mind that what he suggested was based on only an indoor grow. He will need to think about that angle a little more. For indoor grows, the question is: which of the zoning districts in Lewis County outside of the UGAs and within the cities, would you allow something like that? It will be important to go through the zoning ordinance. The reason he did not use the term "manufacturing" was because according to the table of uses for different districts, manufacturing up to a certain level is allowed in a wide variety of zoning districts. The only district that drew his attention was Small Town Industrial (STI). Those areas are limited. There is one near Onalaska with 2-7 acres available; in Randle the STI is full; and the Packwood Hampton Mill site has 130+ acres for sale. There is also an STI in Mineral. Those are the only areas that are industrial that are clearly separated from residential uses and might be served by some type of urban services.

Chairman Mahoney stated there is an old pole yard in Boistfort, about 120 acres in a rural industrial area. Mr. Kliem stated it might be in a Rural Area Industrial (RAI) which is another option. There are quite a few RAIs in the County but it would require loosening the criteria that the Commissioners have suggested because many of the RAI zoned properties... (The rest of Mr. Kliem's comment was inaudible). Chairman Mahoney stated if we try to stay in an industrial setting outside of the UGAs there are very few areas within the County. Mr. Kliem stated that is true with existing zoned property; however, someone could do a rezone. They would have to go through a comp plan change to make sure the zoning ordinance and comp plan are consistent. There are avenues for change using the STI district if existing property proves insufficient.

Commissioner Prior referred to page 5 of the concept paper and stated the introduction indicates that the purpose statements for three districts, Small Town Mixed Use (STMU), Small Town Industrial (STI) and Rural Area Industrial (RAI), make marijuana production and processing an inappropriate use. STI is not in there but Freeway Commercial (FC) is included. Is the STI misplaced or is FC misplaced in this section?

Mr. Kliem stated the three districts are all manufacturing districts, allowing manufacturing at varying levels. Commissioner Prior stated that what Mr. Kliem is saying is STMU, STI and RAI are difficult to find the appropriate use. Mr. Kliem stated that is based on the criteria that were given him by the Planning Commissioners last month. Commissioner Prior stated STI is switched with FC in the discussion.

Mr. Kliem stated the point he was trying to make was to show through the discussion that given the criteria and the purposes that are written in the zoning ordinance that these three districts would be inappropriate. Commissioner Prior stated that is not what was said in the introductory sentence; it does not say that FC is an inappropriate place.

Mr. Kliem stated the STMU and FC districts have a wide mix of existing uses. In FC there may be residential areas and there was an attempt to make sure that future uses in that district would be an appropriate mix with the existing uses. There was a clear desire from the Commission at the last

meeting to separate this use from neighborhoods. If there are residential areas allowed in the FC district that would make it inappropriate.

Mr. Kliem stated a problem with RAI is that often times they are isolated making the availability of urban services difficult. If you are concerned that the STI is not going to provide enough land base you might want to consider the RAI district at least with a lower tier.

Commissioner Prior asked if outdoor grows are to be allowed doesn't agricultural land need to be included. Chairman Mahoney stated if in ground grow is considered, and unless we write an ordinance for only marijuana crops, we will have to allow that within any of the Ag zones. The distances from schools, hospitals, churches, etc. will limit some of that, which is also the major limitation within the LAMIRDS. The restriction that the Commission discussed at previous meetings was a 20,000 square foot metal building and everything that would go with it. If we are talking about a 2000 foot grow that is a totally different thing. We must decide if we want to include grange halls in the 1000 foot perimeter since 4-H clubs meet there. It was Chair Mahoney's opinion that there are two distinct grows: an agricultural grow which is done outside in the ground and one which would be industrial, in a building.

Mr. Kliem stated he can look at some of the other districts. Commissioner Brown asked if part of the problems with the WAC definitions. Someone can have a production license and a processing license together. The same person could not have a retail license. The growing and processing business could be in the same area or building. He assumed that is what most of them would want to do, that someone would grow the product and then send it off to someone else to process. Mr. Kliem stated some of the growers in Eastern Washington do that.

Commissioner Prior stated in the discussion about the criteria that Mr. Kliem goes back to residential and trying to limit a juxtaposition of a facility, whether it is a processing or growing facility, in a residential area, but he did not see in any list of criteria anything about residential. Mr. Kliem stated it was integral to what was discussed, that the Commission only wanted it in an industrial area. Industrial areas are segregated from residences and some other uses. Commissioner Prior stated if a residential area is to be precluded then that should be in the list of criteria.

Mr. Kliem asked if the Planning Commissioners wanted some kind of separation from residential. Commissioner Prior stated across a property line, yes. If someone has a Tier 2 grow in the middle of 5 acres it will be far enough away. Mr. Kliem asked if the Commissioners would allow outdoor or indoor grows in STMU or small town residential. Commissioner Prior stated if the properties are big enough and allow enough separation, why not?

Commissioner Rosbach stated if outdoor grows are going to be zoned Ag then residential areas are out. Commissioner Prior stated that is if we constrain an outdoor grow to ARL. He owns 125 acres that is zoned RDD-10 and RDD-20. Does that mean he cannot have a Tier 1 grow there? Commissioner Rosbach stated no, he could not. Commissioner Prior stated he did not agree with that.

Chairman Mahoney stated that within Lewis County, forestry is allowed in ARL, agricultural activities are allowed in FRL (Forest Resource Land). [A large percentage of this county] would be acceptable for agricultural uses. He does not believe there is a LAMIRD where a legitimate grow would not be within

1000 feet that it is precluded from; it will have to be on Ag ground, and if it has to be 1000 feet then a 5 acre parcel is not going to be 1000 feet across.

Commissioner Prior stated the residents that they have to be 1000 feet away from would be someone else's residence. Chair Mahoney stated not residences, but hospitals, churches, schools. Commissioner Prior asked if it does not have to be 1000 feet from a residence. Chair Mahoney said not from a residence, no, but should it be restricted to an area zoned Ag. Commissioner Prior stated one of the criteria is to separate residences from growing or processing operations but it appeared to him that if someone has ten acres and he lives on it and wants to farm marijuana he has a right to do that.

Commissioner Rosbach stated it would not be his own residence but is his ten acres zoned agriculture? Commissioner Prior understands that is where Commissioner Rosbach stands but he does not buy into that. Commissioner Rosbach asked if he thinks that anyone who has five acres can grow. Commissioner Prior stated if they have a small grow, yes.

Mr. Kliem stated he focused on the manufacturing and industrial side but it appears that agricultural uses are permitted uses in the R-1, R-10 and R-20 districts. If someone had a special use permit before the Hearing Examiner he could do agricultural processing facilities if marijuana processing is thrown into the Ag definition. That is why he wanted to keep marijuana processing as a distinct definition; it would be handled a little more clearly than if it is defined as agriculture.

Commissioner Prior stated it sounds like the county would be telling people that they cannot do with their property what they want to do. Reading the minutes from the last meeting, the gentleman who is growing Chinese vegetables wants to grow marijuana and he Commissioner Prior doesn't think the county should preclude that.

Mr. Kliem stated he can come back with a few more alternatives to consider for an outdoor grow given how the zoning ordinance is constructed. You can evaluate those alternatives to determine how far or how little you want to go in terms of production in different districts in different ways.

Chairman Mahoney stated the discussion tonight was based on "what if" the county does license an operation. The people will have to get a state license and it will need to be approved by the county. That hasn't happened yet.

Commissioner Brown stated law enforcement may be called upon to go from one end of the county to the other to address potential issues at these grow locations. Those are issues that will have an effect on law enforcement and county services and those issues need to be addressed and discussed. This is an extremely complicated issue. He would be interested to see what Grays Harbor County came up with, or some of the other counties that are similar to Lewis County. There needs to be a balance; folks should generally be able to use their land as they see fit as long as they don't infringe on their neighbor's rights.

Mr. Kliem stated there has been some great work done in other counties. Kittitas County is treating it as agriculture but they have minimum lot size separation. There have been a variety of reactions depending on local interest and how people feel about it. There is a lot of latitude, especially when it comes to land use regulations. He can do a survey of what other counties have done. Commissioner

Prior asked him to look at Okanogan County. Mr. Kliem stated he would also have some other alternatives if Lewis County decides to do something similar to what another county has done. That will be easier than confining it to an industrial area, especially in a rural county.

Commissioner Rosbach stated she would still like to see an indoor and an outdoor path.

Chairman Mahoney stated anyone in the audience who had a comment or question was welcome to step up to the microphone. He asked that they identify themselves for the record and sign in on the sheet.

Mr. Chris Crew, McCleary, is an attorney representing marijuana businesses throughout the state and helps people get licenses. He considers himself an expert on marijuana and knows the WACs very well. He thinks Lewis County should be pretty open in its zoning.

Mr. Crew stated some people tonight misspoke and he wanted to clarify. Indoor does not mean large, metal buildings. Most indoor Tier 1s are 1400 square feet and most people are using a small house – not a home to live in. Greenhouses are considered outdoor grows under the WAC. Six months ago the Liquor Control Board reduced the sizes of all the tiers and the largest is now about half an acre.

The Liquor Control Board (LCB) would inspect for WAC compliance. Everyone who applies for a license has a walk-through by a LCB enforcement agent before they get their license. Commissioner Prior asked if a fence had to be built before they get their license. Mr. Crew stated that was correct, plus put up all security cameras and test them, and they are tested by an enforcement agent.

He stated there seems to be a misunderstanding about what a producer and a processor is. A producer grows the marijuana, dries and trims it and puts it into a bag to sell to a processor. Usually it is the same person. The processor gets it tested by the state to make sure it is safe, they weigh it and put it into bags or containers and label it for retail. The retailers don't do any re-packaging. They take it from the processor and put it on the shelf. He stated it is not really processing; it is packaging and testing. Manufacturing is not a processor. To do this type of activity in an industrial area does not make sense.

Mr. Crew stated most producers are processors: they grow it, dry it and put it into bags. To say they have to do it separately by zoning would hurt a lot of people's business. Some will do it separately, but that is not the normal model.

The odor issue has been taken care of by past laws. You just can't be a nuisance to your neighbors. Odor has been an issue in Ag land for a long time; it is not a new thing and it won't be a new thing for marijuana. Odor from marijuana is not nearly as offensive as a feed lot or high intensity animal production.

Commissioner Prior asked if you can smell marijuana are you inhaling THC. Mr. Crew stated he did not know; that is a medical question.

Mr. Crew brought up litigation. He said Lewis County's attorney stated there is no risk of litigation and Mr. Crew stated that is untrue. He will be suing the county on behalf of his clients if the county does not allow them to have their business. If someone gets a license from the state are you going to say no just

because you don't like it? Mr. Crew stated what he thought Mr. Carter meant is that he will win that lawsuit and Mr. Crew disagrees with that, too. The county will be sued if it continues a moratorium.

Mr. Crew stated he thought the RDD zones are where the marijuana grows should be. They are resource development areas as well as residential. They are for people who want a small tree farm or a small Ag operation. That is what has been done in Grays Harbor County and others. He thinks that is what will be decided once the Commission sees what is done in other counties.

Mr. Crew thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Carter wanted to clarify a misunderstanding. The question was whether we can clarify the definition of manufacturing and processing. The question was not as to the legality of the moratorium. There is not litigation with respect to that and he appreciates that Mr. Crew is withdrawing his comment. Regarding RDD, it stands for Rural Development District, not resource development district.

Mr. Kliem stated he would bring examples from other counties and amend the concept paper to look at alternatives for outdoor grows.

Chairman Mahoney stated there will not be a public hearing in October. There were a lot of ideas tonight and for this to work he believed an agricultural production has to be allowed. The industrial production can be restricted through the code for building size, etc. He would like Mr. Kliem to work under that basis.

Mr. Kliem stated there is a side of processing marijuana into food products and he will do some research on that as well.

Commissioner Prior asked if a domestic well would be considered a water system. By law someone can have an exempt well on his property and irrigate half an acre. The criterion also says an approved sewer system is necessary. By whom would this be approved, the county? Is an on-site sewer system okay? Mr. Kliem stated the Commission said they would like to see an approved system and he assumes that can also be an on-site.

Commissioner Prior stated an approved system is also a septic system, and asked if a water system could be a public water system. Mr. Kliem stated that is up the Commission.

Chairman Mahoney stated if the water is going to be used for an agricultural grow operation the Department of Ecology is going to say that is irrigation and there will need to be water rights. Commissioner Prior stated you do not need water rights to irrigate less than half an acre. A Tier 1 could be irrigated with an exempt well.

Chairman Mahoney concluded the workshop on marijuana land use.

## **5. New Business**

### **A. Workshop on Countywide Planning Policies**

Mr. Patrick Babineau, Senior Long Range Planner for Lewis County, stated the Lewis County Planned Growth Committee (PGC), which is made up of the County Commissioners and mayors from each jurisdiction, meets early in the year to discuss growth-related issues. Those could be the Countywide Planning Policies (CWPP), urban growth area designations or population allocations.

The PGC met in April, 2014 and decided that they did not want to make any changes or amendments to the current CWPPs. Those policies are where we distribute urban growth, how we prevent sprawl, how we find multi-modal ways of transit, protect property rights and encourage economic development, and protect resource lands, etc. Their decision to the Planning Commission was to leave the CWPPs as they are. They dealt with urban growth issues. Each jurisdiction was asked if it wanted to change its boundaries. Under the Growth Management Act it is the county that decides urban growth areas (UGA) in consultation with the cities and this group decided there were no current plans to either increase or decrease their UGAs.

Chairman Mahoney asked if there were any changes to the population allocations. Mr. Babineau stated there are no changes from the Office of Financial Management. Commissioner Brown asked if a public hearing was necessary if there were no changes. Mr. Babineau stated a public hearing would be to receive public comment and then recommend to the BOCC to continue the status quo and it is part of the public record.

Chairman Mahoney stated the Planning Commission would forward a letter of transmittal to the BOCC stating that it recommended no changes. A change can still be made if something comes up during the public hearing testimony.

## **6. Calendar**

Chairman Mahoney entertained a motion to hold a public hearing on the Countywide Planning Policies on October 14. The motion was made and seconded and carried. The Chair asked if Mr. Kliem would also be on the agenda. Ms. Napier suggested keeping the items as proposed (CWPP public hearing and Public Works Transportation Improvement Program) and perhaps discussing the Jurassic Parliament that she prepared. October 28 can be scheduled for the next marijuana land use workshop which will give staff time to get information to the Commission and process what they has heard.

Chairman Mahoney asked if anyone had something to discuss on the Jurassic Parliament paper that was included in the packets. There were no comments. He stated he likes to keep the workshops as informal as possible which leads to more citizen participation. When there is a public hearing he will try to be more formal and follow all of the steps. If there are no comments there is no need to discuss this in the future. The by-laws state that we use Roberts Rules of Order and we do have that procedure in place. Ms. Napier stated she was presenting some examples of information that she was given. If this Planning Commission would like to implement them it is a tool for its toolbox.

## **7. Good of the Order**

There were no comments.

## **8. Adjourn**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn; the motion carried. Adjournment was at 7:51 p.m.

