

Lewis County Planning Commission

Public Meeting

In-Person & Virtual Meeting via Zoom

August 23, 2022 - Meeting Notes

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

Planning Commissioners Excused: Lorie Spogen, District 1;

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

Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Draft Meeting Notes – July 26, 2022
- Staff Presentation: Good Avapollo Mining Opt-In Rezone
- Staff Presentation: Adna Grocery Rezone
- Staff Presentation: De Goede Rezone

1. Zoom Guidelines

The clerk 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 Vice Chair entertained a motion to approve the agenda.

Commissioner Corbin made the motion to approve the agenda with the following changes: item six, public hearings, be changed to hold the hearing for Adna Grocery Rezone first, followed by the Good-Avapollo hearing, and finish with the De Goede Rezone hearing. The motion was second by Commissioner Alves. After discussion, the motion failed.

Commissioner Corbin made a motion to approve the agenda with the following changes: item six, public hearings, be changed to hold the hearing for Adna Grocery Rezone first, followed by the De Goede Rezone, and finish with the Good-Avapollo rezone. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes

The Vice Chair entertained a motion to approve the meeting notes from July 26, 2022. Commissioner Corbin made a motion to approve; second by Commissioner Russell. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Public Comment

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

6. Public Hearings

Tonight's we have three public hearings. All three are related to proposed rezones; however, we will do one hearing at a time for clarity. The first hearing will be the Adna Grocery Store rezone, next will be the De Goede rezone, and then the Good Avapollo Mining Opt-in rezone. These public hearings will proceed in an orderly fashion and I would like to ask everyone's cooperation. We will start with a few specific questions, then a brief staff presentation, followed by questions from the Commissioners, and finally take public testimony on each proposal individually.

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 responses.*

Is there anyone in the audience who believes that the public was not notified of the hearings in a timely manner? If so, please raise your hand in Zoom or unmute your phone and say "yes" or step up to the podium.

Clyde Burkhart expressed that he did not feel he was notified sufficiently by receiving notice in the mail and having a posted sign at the property.

Is there anyone in the audience who believes that this Commission does not have jurisdiction in these matters? If so, please raise your hand in Zoom or unmute your phone and say "yes" or step up to the podium. *There were no responses.*

Do any Commissions 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.

Commissioner Corbin asked for clarification as to whether these statements were for only the first hearing or all three hearings. Staff confirmed and entered into the record that these statements/questions applied to all three of the hearings. After clarification, there were no responses 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 responses from the Commissioners.*

A. Adna Grocery Rezone

Staff Presentation

Mindy Brooks, Senior Long Range Planner for Lewis County Community Development gave a presentation on the Adna Grocery Rezone Proposal. *See presentation for details.*

Commissioner Questions

There were no questions from the Commissioners.

Public Testimony

Commissioner Russell opened oral testimony on the Adna Grocery Rezone. Staff requested that their opening remarks and presentation be added to the record. Guidelines were given for how testimony was to proceed.

There were no members of the public who wished to provide oral testimony.

Commissioner Discussion & Deliberation

Russell: The Adna store is a real benefit to the community. I think on item three, where we oftentimes struggle with trying to figure out whether the proposal is going to be good or bad, we are not hearing anybody because this is a no-brainer.

Commissioner Corbin move 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 Agricultural Resource Lands to Small Town Mixed Use for the property identified in the Adna Grocery Store proposal. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chastain. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Russell closed the hearing on the Adna Grocery rezone.

B. De Goede Rezone Proposal

Staff Presentation

Mindy Brooks, Senior Long Range Planner for Lewis County Community Development gave a presentation on the De Goede Rezone Proposal. *See presentation for details.*

Commissioner Questions

Corbin: Of the documents I read, there was one place where it stated there would be 5 lots of 5 acres and then in other place there was a statement of 3-4 lots, and then in another place 2-3 lots. Can you clarify that? How many lots are you planning on creating?

De Goede: We would like to divide it into 3 parcels. One larger one which has a cross and a chapel on it. Then we'd like to take 2 more parcels out of that that we could possible sell to help finance the cross and chapel which is currently being finances by our business. For future planning we'd like to if possible, divide 2 smaller parcels of 2 acres each, and then that would leave roughly 23 acres for the cross and chapel. One parcel would be on the west lower end, which would be accessed from Burly Road and then the upper parcel would be accessed from Coleman Road.

Corbin: My next question has to do with fire truck access. From what I read, there was access roads that were privately maintained that are currently there. Did they meet the steepness requirements to allow adequate fire vehicles to get in there? Or is this a project level question?

Mindy: This will be addressed at the project level when there is a development permit. The applicant will be required to meet all of the Lewis County Codes, including fire access related to steepness, length of roads, turnarounds, etc.

Russell: The ARL for the other land that was 20 acres, no requests have been made to turn farmland into anything, but ARL?

Mindy: Correct, the other ARL parcels are not included in this request. All the other properties that were divided into 20 acre lots are still ARL and there's been no request to change those properties.

Russell: So there can be one house per 20 acres per Lewis County?

Mindy: Correct, all those properties would still qualify as ARL of long-term significance and minimum lot size is 20 acres.

Public Testimony

Commissioner Russell opened oral testimony on the Adna Grocery Rezone. Staff requested that their opening remarks and presentation be added to the record. Guidelines were given for how testimony was to proceed.

There were no members of the public who wished to provide oral testimony.

Commissioner Discussion & Deliberation

Russell: It looks like great use of a rezone to help our housing issue in Lewis County.

Commissioner Chastain move 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 Agricultural Resource Lands to Rural Development District 5 for the property identified in the De Goede Rezone proposal. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Russell closed the hearing on the De Goede rezone.

The Commission took a 2 minute recess before moving to the next item.

C. Good Avapollo Mining Opt-In Rezone

Staff Presentation

Mindy Brooks, Senior Long Range Planner for Lewis County Community Development gave a presentation on the Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-In Rezone. *See presentation for details.*

Commissioner Questions

Chastain: How long do you anticipate this mining to go on?

Erick Staley, Geologist: The length of the time is difficult to define because it depends on market, whether we are in a recession or a construction crunch. The timing is measured in decades so I would say more than 10 years, less than 100. This is a pretty substantial site.

Chastain: Is this property managed by MSHA or OSHA or any of those entities?

Staley: It is managed by MSHA, but not OSHA because it is a mine site. MSHA has their own oversight and there's a horde of other agencies that would be involved including Ecology and DNR.

Chastain: The presentation claims that the property will be reclaimed at the end of life.

Staley: This is correct. There's some degree of input from the county about what the reclamation goal could be, but it would go back to either commercial forestry or agricultural use afterwards. In sand and gravel sites it's common to store overburden top soil to the side, cut final slopes, and then drape those final slopes with top soil to restore a rooting medium for vegetation.

Fritsch: Looking at the DNR map of Lewis County, is the gray square east of I-5 the land in question?

Mindy: No, the land in question is not circled on this map. It's between Salkum and Ethel along the Cowlitz River, south of Highway 12.

Fritsch: Is the reason that none of that area is pink on the map because it is not an allowable use?

Mindy: This map is not about what is allowed. It is a map that shows where the state, using remote sense data, believes there's a likelihood of mineral deposit. This is the data that we receive and use to designate Mineral Resource Lands. We then allow applicants to opt in by providing proof there are aggregate resource in other locations that may show up as gray on this map. So in this case, the mine evaluation report demonstrated that there is aggregate resources.

Fritsch: And that is not shown on this map?

Mindy: Correct, it is not on this map.

Fritsch: So for our demonstrated need, is this what we're going off of? Are we reliant on individual property owners to prove otherwise?

Mindy: The County needs to provide mineral aggregate resources. If we were to tap into everything on the map in pink we would have enough resource. However, a lot of the area in pink is forest service land that's unlikely to be mined or is designated ARL land, which has to be rezoned to be mined. In order to meet our need, we do need to provide options for people to mine the existing resources within the county.

Fritsch: The demonstrated need seems like a big number that doesn't really measure what we have because not everything is going to be tapped into. Plus, there are so many acres that aren't identified.

Mindy: It is often challenging in cases like this where the state is providing data because the data is at a very high level. They are not doing site-specific work within each county. They're using remote sense data. It is the best available science that we have until an applicant comes forward and does a site analysis to determine where the aggregate resources are.

Fritsch: Is that not something the Public Works is doing? It is just up to individual landowners?

Mindy: If a landowner wants to come into mining opt-in and are not already designated in a Mineral Resource Land, they have to prove it through the mining opt-in criteria.

Staley: The map that DRN produces is based on geological mapping and some degree of field work. In order to prove the resources in 3 dimension, DNR would have to drill the site, which is obviously a tedious and expensive process that DNR could never take on. That's why it's often up to the individual landowners to do this.

Corbin: I thought I read that in Lewis County we have an inventory of 60 years' worth of aggregate mineral if everything that is aggregate that we know about was tapped and used.

Mindy: Yes, but a lot of that aggregate as you see on this map is zoned ARL, which doesn't allow mining, and many of the private property owners won't mine their land. So while there is enough aggregate to last, the question is whether we can tap those resources.

Corbin: Do we know what the current inventory would provide for of usable or extractable mineral? What is the volume and our anticipated need for it? Do we have enough extractable mineral for 10 years, 20 years, or 60 years? What do we have that we can get our hands on right now and how far short are we of what we need?

Mindy: We have no idea if private property owners would choose to go through the permitting process, which is very lengthy. There is significant project-level permitting before you begin a mining operation.

Corbin: Would it be equally hard to, with current active mines that are currently extracting, to project what our needs will be? Do you know what active mines in Lewis County are producing right now?

Staley: Mines typically don't advertise what volume they are producing because their competitors will know how long they'll last. You can usually figure out based on the permitted depth approximately what some of the resource volumes might be. I did provide a map with some DNR permitted sites in Lewis County. The maps show permitted site within a 20 mile radius of Ethel. Some of those permitted sites don't have any resources left, are in reclamation, or don't provide commercial aggregate.

Staff displayed the maps on the screen.

Staley: The first map shows 26 permitted sites within about a 20 mile radius of Ethel as the crow flies. This is a typical commercial distance for a lot of aggregate delivery. If the distance gets to be more than that, it become unaffordable for the producer. Everything

that is categorized in red is inactive, in reclamation, or complete. There are several sites that still have DNR permits, but there's no resource coming out of them. In fact, one of them is a senior living center right now. The next map takes out the sites categorized in red so now we are down to just hard rock sites (yellow) or sand and gravel sites (green). You'll notice that there's a lot more bedrock site than there are sand and gravel sites. There's a lot more rock exposure than there is available sand and gravel. The last map shows some of the larger sites. Several of the sites from Map 2 are either pretty far away from this area or are remote, where you would have to do a lot almost forestry road driving, or in some cases you would have to force road driving in order to get a reasonable transportation corridor. These are very close to I-5 or other highways and could deliver to this radium effectively. You'll notice that there's three sand gravel sites and four bedrock sites and one of them is actually not in Lewis County. Our site is very close to the center of the circle.

Corbin: I also have grave concerns about habitat, but that is something that will be dealt with during the development permitting process and not part of the decision making criteria for a rezone. I did read in some of our documentation that there may be some historical sites, but I did not see that presented to us tonight so I wanted to make sure that was part of the record.

Mindy: During project permitting, SEPA will be required. All the customary consultation with tribes would be conducted at that time as well as any research that is necessary to determine if there are cultural resources. (*Note, DNR permitting will require formal state to tribe consultation.*)

Corbin: In several documents of written testimony from members of the public there was reference to a document that property owners, when they were in the process of purchasing their properties, talked about abutting agricultural lands. There were some expectation that they were buying properties that had a long term view. Balancing that with personal property rights, they certainly have a right to make this request. Can staff give more information on that document to be added as part of the record?

Lee: Realtors, by law, have a responsibility to disclose to prospective buyers when they're in close proximity to farms or working forests. In the testimony, the individual stated that he signed that as part of his real estate transaction. The seller of a residential property has to make it available to the buyer. Also, under title 17.33.70, when someone applies for a Master Site Plan review, building permit, or subdivision, and they are next to a resource land, the following statement is noted on their permit to advise them that notice is the subject. "Property is within or near land designation for long-term, commercial, significant resource, use in which natural resource activities are permitted and encouraged, including a variety of activities that may not be compatible with residential or other types of development for certain periods extending beyond the normal work day and/or work week. In addition to other activities, these may include noise, dust, smoke, visual impacts, and odors when performed in accordance with best

management practices. These resource, utilization activities are to be expected and shall not be subject to legal challenge or public nuisance." I'd like to clarify that at this point that notice goes with the land if the property is rezoned. In addition to this notice, mineral lands in include a notice that says, "Inform the project proponent that an application may be made for mining related activities, including mining, extraction washing crushing stockpiling, blasting, transporting, and recycling of materials that goes to lands designated as MRL."

Chastain: What is the source of water and how do to plan to maintain or work around the disruption of current homeowners? The noise and the dust can play into the disturbance of people's homes and their lives. Do you have a plan already, and have you discussed it with anyone?

Staley: This is an elevated sand and gravel deposit as opposed to one of the ones along the Cowlitz River, we're going to mining this in the dry so we won't even intersect the groundwater table will actually stay at least 10 feet above it.

Chastain: That's in accordance with DNR standards? Typically moving the trucks and the equipment will cause a lot of dust.

Staley: We will have water trucks and applications of dust. There's controls about fugitive dust off the site such as landscaping large trees, leaving trees. When we did the mineral resource evaluation to come up with the value of the mineral we put down a limit of excavation on the site. We will follow DNR standards and county standards for setbacks. We use a 100 foot setback off of all the property boundaries and a 150 foot buffer off any stream. We also have to be informed by a wetland evaluation.

Russell: Has Mining Opt-Ins been done before?

Lee: Yes, we have had Mining Opt-Ins before. I believe we had one last year, but the difference is that there was a mining operation right next door to the same property in question.

Russell: Where is the Breen sand and gravel pit? Was it on the map we saw earlier?

Staley: The map shows the pits as they were named by DNR for their permit so it may be there under a different name.

Russell: I saw steep slopes right there by the river. This isn't going to be like the mine where they drag chaining through water? This is a dry pit and there's going to be a bank between you and the river, right?

Staley: Correct. I'm an engineering geologist so I always think about landslides. We would avoid the steep slope transition from the north to south part of the property.

Russell: Kathy asked a question about noise and then this MSHA. Is that Mine Safety? Do they have anything about noise in that?

Staley: MSHA is the Mine Safety and Health Administration, and they are primarily concerned with mining employees. But also the public to make sure that the mines have safe borders and restricted access. Noise is usually regulated at the county level. What I find common is that the county will actually reference state standards. So there's a WAC that covers what adjacent noises would be allowed and what would not. A sound analysis is another study that would come for specific project.

Public Testimony

Commissioner Russell opened oral testimony on the Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-In Rezone. Staff requested that their opening remarks and presentation be added to the record. Guidelines were given for how testimony was to proceed.

Harold Powell, Bill Potter, and Clyde Burkhart testified against the proposal.

Commissioner Discussion & Deliberation

The applicant asked to respond to the testimony and Russell agreed.

Applicant: Just so you know, back in the 70s on Brim Road we crushed about 50,000 tons of rock for the county. Adjacent to that, TransAlta has a pit and they've taken out a lot of rock. The people around there that are local are aware there are pits. This isn't a new site and new area that is being mined.

Russell: It is a tough one. I am a land-owner-rights kind of person. I own property much like you. When you buy it, it's yours. When I see something that's legal and it's been done before and the owner has the right to do it... that's what's weighing on me right now so I just wanted to share that with you as we move forward.

Fritsch: If it was an active mine 20 years ago most of those people would have never moved there. Being a property owner myself I feel really sensitive to what goes on around me as well because it directly affects my quality of life, as well as my family.

Chastain: I feel similarly because I have a passion for living in the country and peacefulness. I understand that this has been going on for a number of years, but then I also understand that the zoning currently is agricultural so I don't understand how a pit could have been ran on agricultural land. Could staff explain that piece?

Mindy: Anything that predates our zoning code is allowed to persist on that property. So any pit or crushing area that predated the application of ARL remain.

Russell: There was a lot of question about rock and do we need it, and how much there's going to be, and that kind of thing. We all know that every place on the corridor is booming so there's going to be more rock needed. I'm a capitalist and they won't dig rock out unless they can sell it. I think they have the right to do it. I don't like to see anything near a river, but I know that buffers and Ecology will be all over these folks. We have the knowledge that people behind us are going to make sure it's done correctly. Our view is whether it is legal.

Corbin: We have little discretion as far as you know, I can't choose to make a decision because I like a proposal, or I like this person, or any other personal preference. We have to look at the criteria. We have to look at the facts. We have to look at the law. Everything that I have heard sustains the fact that you know this is a lawful decision. Where I take comfort in this is the mitigations that will be addressed at the project level.

Fritsch: I have no doubt that the county has checked boxes to three of those four requirements. The one that we get to talk about is whether it's in the public's interest. Does it benefit more people than just the land owner? Is it bigger than just the neighborhood? Is it the entire county? Is it just that 20 mile radius that may receive that gravel? Somebody is going to make \$250 million dollars off this, but there's probably going to be 40 neighbors that lose that much money in property values or possible relocate because they don't want to live there anymore. I have no concern that they'll take care of the environmental stuff and the traffic stuff, and maybe the noise. I don't know what this process is for if we get to talk about the public, and hear from the public, and they don't feel like they have a voice.

Russell: We make recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. They can make any decision they want.

Fritsch: I am really curious to hear how you process this public interest piece? This is a real internal struggle of mine.

Russell: Thank you for asking the question, because this is the time that we get to talk about that kind of thing. When you ask how many people I am dealing with, I'm thinking 67,000 people. So, I haven't been here very long, but I've seen decisions that unfortunately, sometimes, seem like they create winners and losers. I look at my personal and professional experience and what the law says. I don't want to lean too much on the Public Interest piece because I don't want to decide on a proposal just because I do or don't like it.

Alves: I think these are the kinds of things that none of us really love to make decisions on. My house has a field behind it and we have a view of the mountainside and all that stuff. It was developed and the only thing I can see now is the house next to me. So I can appreciate that the way I look at these things is kind of similar to Bob. But you know, before my house was here this was somebody's view and somebody's field just like every house that exists. It was nothing before and now it's a house that I live in and so it's hard

for me to say it was okay for me to do what I want with my property, but it's not okay for you to do what you want with your property.

As a builder, we can't always get gravel. We've had days where we can't do certain things because stuff's not available there. Concrete companies that are coming in and buying gravel pits in the area of what I understand and so some of those things aren't accessible to builders anymore. We just approved a fair amount of land for UGA and for development and I don't think what we have currently in the area will support the growth that's coming. These are going to be other people's homes. They're going to raise their families in them and all that stuff at some point. I think property rights is a huge thing, but I don't want to minimize the frustration of neighbors. I can appreciate where people are coming from and thinking that things were going to stay a certain way, but unfortunately the only properties that we control are the ones we own.

Amber Smith, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney: If I may help gravitate back towards the decision criteria and get into greater detail by looking at LCC 17.01.300 which is our approval criteria. We know the most subjective standards in these types of rezones is the public interest portion. Looking at the factors that you're not limited to, but things you should consider, are the anticipated effect upon the rate or distribution of population growth, employment, growth, development, and conversion of land as envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. There are the anticipated effects on the ability of the county and/or other service providers such as cities, schools, water, purveyors, fire districts, and others, is applicable to provide adequate services and public facilities including transportation. Finally, you can look at the anticipated impact upon designated agricultural forest and mineral resource lands. While it doesn't state specifically in these decision criteria that we ignore or negate the concerns of what neighboring parcels may have as an effect, that's part of the overall public interest portion. Please think of the facts that have been presented here and the decision criteria that you have to apply those to. Look at the neighborhood context and the county context in light of the facts that have been presented to you.

Fritsch: I really appreciate that Amber and Jason. I have one clarifying question. Is there a difference between agricultural and mineral land? They're all considered resource lands. We have a formula, a map, and a need for gravel and rock. Do we also have that for agriculture and forest? Is any one of those things more valuable than others?

Mindy: The state rules do not have hierarchy for resource lands. We are required to designate resource lands, including forest, agricultural, and mineral resource lands. We also use the state allowance for mining opt-in. That's because we know the DNR map is not perfect, and we need people to be able to opt into the mining option. But there is no state hierarchy for the different resource types. Lands are important at the state and the county level and we need to designate those which we do through our comprehensive plan and we do allow for some shifting between them, based on more site-specific

information such as this report regarding presence of aggregate resources at this particular location. Hopefully that helps a bit.

Fritsch: Yes, that helps.

Commissioner Corbin move 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 Agricultural Resource Lands to Mineral Resource Lands for the properties identified in the Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-in Rezone Proposal. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Alves. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Russell closed the hearing on the Good-Avapollo Mining Opt-In rezone and thanked those who attended.

Staff took a 5 minute recess before moving to the next item.

7. Good of the Order:

A. Staff

On the 9th, the BOCC approved the SEPA Code Amendment that the Planning Commission recommended approval of. It has moved on to its final Commerce approval and appeal periods.

We need to submit transmittals for each of these decisions that you've been making recommendations on to the Board of County Commissioners. I drafted the ones that were prior to this evening, so the YMCA at Mineral, the three UGA expansions, and then we would draft ones for this evening. I wanted to have an open conversation with you regarding how those are set up. I structured them all the same, but they don't have to be structured all the same.

Russell: I read the transmittal letter for the Breen property for the UGA growth, and we voted no 5-2 for the project. There's a lot of information in the letter, but I thought it was missing the fact that 2 people voted no, and what if I were a county commissioner I would want to know what they were thinking and why there were votes against it.

Mindy: One thing we could do is call it out more clearly. We could say the two dissenting votes voted that way and just make it very clear. Right now it is summarized somewhat as item number 4, but you are right, it's not as clear as it could be so that would be one way to handle it.

Russell: I don't have a preference for the format and I don't want to tell you how to make your packet.

Mindy: The transmittal letters are really from Planning Commission. Staff draft the letters on your behalf to that we get all the legal information in there, but it really is your letter. So if you want something different we can make changes.

Corbin: I think if have a decision isn't unanimous there should be something that states the minority opinion. It's important that all the facts are brought to the table. We want the Commissioners to hear our testimony just like we listen to the public's testimony.

Mindy: On many of the transmittal letters prior to these, we haven't even included opinions from commissioners because everything tends to be a lot more cut and dry, like the SEPA appeal. And we don't need to include extensive comments for each decision, but certainly for those that were more of a struggle to make a decision on.

Alves: When you take context out of anything is kind of loses all the meaning. So even in a unanimous vote like this, I think anything we can do to provide some context because I know the Commissioners are bombarded with information and they can't dive deep on stuff they would like to. There's just so many decision and so much information so anything we could do to give them a quick snippet of context to accompany would be beneficial. I think it's the strength and purpose of this particular commission to bring forth lots of different perspectives.

Fritsch: I wonder if there's a way to flag it or categorize it into organize it for them. I genuinely wonder how closely they read all the document that come across their desk and so if they're just skimming, there might be a way to highlight or emphasize.

Mindy: We've given you four drafts. I will redraft the Chehalis-Breen one to make it clear at the front that there was a 5-2 vote, and to clarify the dissent of it. What I would like is for each of the commissioners to please read my summary of the opinions and provide me detailed comments back. If there's something that you want said a particular way it would be great to have it in your words. As a reminder, don't send comments to the whole commission, only to me, so that we aren't creating a serial meeting.

B. Planning Commissioners

Russell: I was surprised by Gretchen and was expecting a no during the vote on the Good-Avapollo hearing. You also had a great question regarding which should be prioritized; farmland, mining, or forests.

Foster: I really appreciated Amber jumping in when she did and offering clarity about public interest. I'd like to see staff put together a workshop outlining what Amber talked through. I think putting together a workshop and us as a group going through the information as a formal agenda item would be really good for us. I would like some structure and good solid discussion.

Mindy: Yes, we have been talking about this idea couple of times. I think we have room in our calendar to do a training session. A training session can be held just with Planning Commission and does not need to be noticed because we're not discussing any business or actions. There's a number of things that I've identified that I'd like to have additional training conversation with you guys about and I think this is an excellent topic. Of all the

things you do, this is probably the most challenging thing Commissioners have to make decisions on. We will likely do some training in October.

Amber: Thank you Corbin. If there are any topics of interest, please let us know if you would like additional training. Mindy and I have been working on this kind of workshop for a while now so we are excited about that. If there are particular areas that you feel you would more emphasis on training to that will help us guide and dictate how that training session will look. Let Mindy know what topics those may be. Our goal is to make you feel comfortable about the decisions you're making, and that they're informed decisions that you're making.

Mindy: This commission is very impressive. Thank you for wanting the training and wanting to do this work as best as you can. It's not always true that you find a group of volunteers, who are giving up two evenings a month, who really take it seriously and want to do it. Thank you for all your dedication.

8. Calendar

The next meeting of the Planning Commission will occur on September 13, 2022 and the agenda items are a workshop on amendment to LCC 17.12 Public Participation Program and a workshop introducing upcoming projects to address rural housing and short term rentals.

9. Adjourn

Commissioner Corbin made a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.