

Lewis County Planning Commission **Workshop**

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

July 14, 2015 - Meeting Notes

Planning Commissioners Present: Russ Prior, District 3; Sue Rosbach, District 1; Mike Mahoney, District 1; Jeff Millman, District 2; Richard Tausch, District 2; Leslie Meyer, District 1

Planning Commissioners Excused: Bob Guenther, District 3

Staff Present: Lee Napier, Fred Evander, Glenn Carter, Pat Anderson

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes
- Countywide Planning Policies

1. Call to Order

Chair Mahoney called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. The Chair asked Mr. Evander, Lewis County Long Range Planner, to introduce himself and tell the Commission a little about himself. Mr. Evander explained that he came from the Thurston Regional Planning Council, for the Council of Governments for the Metropolitan Planning Organization. He worked with the towns of Rainier, Tenino and Bucoda. He also worked with the South Thurston Economic Initiative. Fred lives in Tenino.

The Planning Commissioners introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

3. Approval of Meeting Notes

Chair Mahoney entertained a motion to approve the meeting notes from March 24, 2015.

Commissioner Prior made a motion to approve; Commissioner Tausch seconded. The meeting notes were approved.

4. Old Business

- a. Update on Shoreline Master Program (SMP)

Ms. Napier, Lewis County Community Development Director, stated the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is still working on the SMP, meeting last June. The County has received feedback on the SMP from Department of Ecology and from the CAC. AHBL, the consultant, will be processing that information and taking it to the CAC on July 22. Commissioners Mahoney and Prior are the Planning Commission's representatives to the CAC and they will determine how to best present the SMP to the Planning Commission.

The SMP is a coalition of four communities (Lewis County, Centralia, Chehalis, Winlock and Morton) and the plan currently reads that way. A goal is to extract information that is related only to Lewis County. The cities will be taking separate action on their documents; the Planning Commission is not responsible for their documents and it will not need to review their documents.

At the Planning Commission meeting in March, it was a goal to bring the SMP back to the Planning Commission in August. After the meeting on the 22nd it will be known if that goal can be met. A final plan has not been presented to Department of Ecology and the County will be working with DOE to amend the contract deliverable.

Commissioner Prior asked if Mr. Evander would be involved with the SMP and if so to explain his background with SMPs. Mr. Evander stated when he was with the Thurston Regional Planning Council he worked on two SMPs: Bucoda and Tenino. Those SMPs were on a much smaller scale than Lewis County's SMP but he knows what DOE is looking for and what is supposed to be in an accumulative impact analysis. He has been looking at the plan and has discussed the plan with others. He understands what the County is trying to do and he has some ideas for streamlining the document.

Ms. Napier stated that Crissey Bailey from DOE was at the Community Development office yesterday and she understands what the Planning Commission is saying and will be helpful toward that goal.

Chair Mahoney has had an issue from the beginning of going from a 30+ page document to over 600 pages. That is not a document that the public will read or will understand if it is read. He has appreciated Ms. Bailey's attitude; however she did point out that a lot of what she is dealing with is state law. Chair Mahoney stated the consultant is working on an introduction to the main document that would include information that can be understood. If someone is interested in restoration programs, for example, they would be directed to that section of the SMP.

5. New Business

A. Workshop on Countywide Planning Policies (CWPP)

Mr. Evander stated the Planned Growth Committee reviewed the CWPPs and recommended no changes. Mr. Evander created a chart to show why the CWPPs are needed and what they do. The Growth Management Act defines how to handle urban and rural development and gives the jurisdictions a range of population that each jurisdiction needs to plan for. The CWPPs translate the statewide laws to how planning is done in Lewis County. It is very important that there is consistency between the comprehensive plans of the County and all of the jurisdictions within the County.

Mr. Evander stated the Planning Commission will be working on a revised comprehensive plan. The update required under GMA is due in 2017. Some of the policies in the CWPPs will need to be looked at as part of the 2017 comp plan update. Policy 1.12.3 on page 3 speaks to expansions of urban growth areas. The County needs to look at how the UGAs are sized and work with the jurisdictions about that. Is there sufficient land within those UGAs to accommodate future urban development?

Commission Prior stated he believed the citation WAC 365-195-335 is incorrect. He could not find it on the internet. He believes it should be 365-196-335.

Mr. Evander stated the Growth Management Act defines urban or rural lands. Urban has urban services such as water and sewer. Rural does not. Urban typically has things like streets with sidewalks; rural has shoulders. Urban has storm water treatment; rural has infiltration. Those are the ways that GMA separates the two. Mr. Evander wants to be sure that the CWPPs has the correct characterization of rural and urban. The rural character includes areas like Adna, Doty and Randle. Is the County handling those areas appropriately? Rural areas don't typically have much economic development, at least according to GMA. How do we foster that type of development with the comprehensive plan?

The CWPPs are written in a very clear way and relate very clearly to the GMA. Each of the goals represent a goal directly out of the Growth Management Act. Mr. Evander does not want people to be afraid of planning. We can be very flexible in a lot of what we do if we do our homework. There is a lot to do for the 2017 comprehensive plan update. He, too, is opposed to large, unwieldy documents. He does not want to read that a document is prepared in accordance to RCW36.70a. He wants to express the vision and what is to be accomplished and communicate that.

Commissioner Rosbach asked where the CWPPs came from. Ms. Napier stated the Planned Growth Committee (PGC) prepared the CWPPs. The PGC includes all of the cities within the County and the County. The last amendment to the CWPPs was in 2013 and that was to add the Appendices. The document is a work product of the PGC and it then goes to the Planning Commission for its consideration. Any changes suggested by the Planning Commission need to go back to the PGC.

Ms. Napier stated the PGC is responsible for the UGAs. If a city or the County wants to amend its UGA then the process called out in Appendix A explains that the PGC advises Mr. Evander in the fall of that change. The PGC meets early in the year to discuss the changes, as well as any changes it might want to make to the CWPPs.

Chairman Mahoney asked Ms. Napier about the letter she had sent to DOH and DOE regarding the notification of intent and certificate of necessity for Lewis County Water Sewer District #3. Ms. Napier stated the copy was to let the Planning Commission know about the follow up. Commissioner Prior stated he thought the Planning Commissioners were in favor of a sewer district in Packwood and he did not think the letter reflected that. Ms. Napier stated she thought there was a misrepresentation of what the Planning Commission was asked to do. What needs to be done is to look for consistency with the County's planning policies; the Commission was not being asked to take a position. By the action of the Planning Commission to ensure that the correct regulations are in place is how support is shown.

Commissioner Prior had some questions regarding the CWPPs. Section 2.3 and 2.4 speak to the expansion of sewer systems which are outside of UGAs and inside water and sewer district boundaries. He wants to make sure that the proposal for a sewer system in Packwood is consistent with these two policies. He does not want these policies to exclude a Packwood sewer system. He wants to make sure that Mr. Evander looks at this with knowledge about a Packwood sewer system. Ms. Napier stated 2.4(c) applies to Packwood. The County has not done enough research to say that a sewer system in a LAMIRD is appropriate. That is something that will be worked on with the Packwood community. One response they made is that they have modified the boundary to have sewer within the LAMIRD. If they want to extend the sewer outside the LAMIRD then the boundaries of the LAMIRD would need to be changed and also talk about the urban service within the LAMIRD. Commissioner Prior did not want the

policies to preclude a sewer system being allowed in Packwood. Ms. Napier reminded the Commissioners that the CWPPs were drafted before Packwood was a LAMIRD and that the County will do all it can to allow sewerage in Packwood.

Commissioner Prior stated 2.5(b)(ii) should also include pressure requirements in addition to flow requirements.

Policy 4 Housing – Commissioner Prior asked the County’s position on tiny houses. Ms. Napier stated the County has not taken a position other than to regulate any size of a house. Commissioner Prior asked if there is a minimum square footage for a house in Lewis County. Ms. Napier was not sure of the requirement and would ask the Building Official to look into it.

Commissioner Prior asked what a Master Plan Development is. Ms. Napier stated Master Plan is a term from the Lewis County Code which means there will be an idea of what the landscape will look like; it is reviewed for purposes of infrastructure, units, densities, setbacks, and it becomes binding on the development. A good example is Seabrook in Grays Harbor County. This was proposed in phases. It was reviewed by the Planning Commission and accepted by the Board of County Commissioners. There were design standards within the Master Plan.

Policy 5.10 – Commissioner Prior asked why “ancillary education programs” is in this section and why couldn’t it be added to every policy. Ms. Napier stated as a community, the cities and the County, this is the type of opportunity that they wanted captured in policy. Commissioner Prior did not know why that term was limited to only alternative energy.

Page 9, policy 8.5(b) has the same WAC citation: 365-195-335. Ms. Napier stated that WAC does cite to the resource land so perhaps it is trying to make the connection when designating these areas to be mindful of the criteria from the resource lands.

Page 10, policy 9.0 speaks to forestry taxation laws. Commissioner Prior stated he is a member of the Washington Farm Forestry Association and the newsletter talked about people losing their tax status in forestry. He would like to make sure that Lewis County is not doing that to people. He wants to make sure that his 125 acres of Douglas fir stays in the tax program. Ms. Napier stated she would direct that comment to the Assessor’s office.

Commissioner Prior spoke to the population projections in Appendix B. The low prediction does not change over time and he thought it should. For the year 2030 there are two different values: The first shows Lewis County’s as 99,746 and that number does not occur in the 2030 table. Mr. Evander stated the projection from the state is a range. He does not understand the low range, either. The low number should reflect some additional change. Part of what the county will need to do is identify what those new numbers will be for 2035.

Ms. Napier stated a public hearing needs to be held on the CWPPs. She suggested tabling that until the next meeting. Chair Mahoney stated the few corrections don’t need any action. Ms. Napier stated it will be determined if the WAC citation is correct or incorrect. If text needs to be added then the PGC needs to make the changes.

6. Calendar

Ms. Napier stated the next meeting will be on August 11, 2015. The Planning Commission will set a public hearing for the CWPPs at that time.

7. Good of the Order

Commissioner Prior welcomed Fred Evander.

8. Adjourn

The Planning Commission's business concluded and the meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.