<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Entered by</th>
<th>Commenter Name</th>
<th>Position on the Proposal</th>
<th>Highlighted Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Portia Wells</td>
<td>They support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Kathy Prosser</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the Amendment to Title 20.29 and how that will impact other parcels in the County; Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; and Believes there is adequate acreage dedicated to industrial uses within UGAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Susan Markey</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan; Concern over the Amendment to Title 20.29 and how that will impact other parcels in the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Michele Burton</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Believes there is adequate acreage dedicated to industrial uses within throughout Thurston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Christine Garst</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Jean Takekawa</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Name 2</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Gail Sheikhzadeh</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Andrew Newman</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Believes the County should conduct a study of Rural Warehousing needs; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report; and Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Michelle Newman</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Believes the County should conduct a study of Rural Warehousing needs; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Will Beattie</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>References 2021 Buildable Lands Report; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>David Jennings</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over compliance with the Comprehensive Plan; Believes that the CP-16 - Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs should be completed first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Karen Lohmann</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Concern over environmental impacts of proposed change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over compliance with the Comprehensive Plan; Believes the County should conduct a study of Rural Warehousing needs; and Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Alice Sharrett</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Susan Finkel</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Kevin Head</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>10/4/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Christy White</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over the amendment to Title 20.29 and comprehensive plan and how that will impact other parcels in the County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Meryl Bernstein</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over loss of rural character; Concern over environmental impacts of proposed change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Gail Trotter</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Concern over the amendment to comprehensive plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Jeri Lynn Miller</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over the amendment to comprehensive plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Christine Hartman</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over loss of rural character; Concern over the loss of farmland and habitat in Thurston County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Sally Alhadeff</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Ann Butler</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Brian Stewart</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>D Jean Pettit</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Gwen Atkinson</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Name 2</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Josh Stottlemyer</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Concern over the excessive number of warehouses being constructed and how the industry will evolve over the decade; Concern over the Amendment to Title 20.29 and how this will allow additional industrial uses to be created; and Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>William Scott</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Deborah Naslund</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Believes the County should conduct a study of Rural Warehousing needs; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan; and Believes that the CP-16 - Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs should be completed first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Patricia Holm</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Sally Vogel</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Concern over environmental impacts of proposed change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Futurewise - Tim Trohimovich</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Believes that the comprehensive plan amendment from RRR 1/5 to RRI and the amendment to Title 20.29 are in violation of state law. Please see Unique ID 136 for more information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Diana Moore</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Roberta Langill</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Believes there is adequate acreage dedicated to industrial uses in Thurston County; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Charlotte &quot;Trink&quot; Newman</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Believes the County should follow current Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Sherry Buckner</td>
<td>They support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Todd Davison</td>
<td>They would support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal if the following changes were made. Would support the proposal if the changes would only apply to the subject parcels. Provides changes to the language that would restrict industrial development to within half mile of interstate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Jodi P Kline</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Suzanne Bagdon</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Believes the County should conduct a study of Rural Warehousing needs; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan; and Believes that the CP-16 - Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs should be completed first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Gary J Wiles</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Believes there is adequate acreage dedicated to industrial uses in Thurston County; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan; References GMA priorities; Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; and Concern over economic impact of warehousing on the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Thurston County Agricultural Advisory Committee</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Concern over loss of Nationally Significant Farmland; Highlights importance of farmland preservation; Believes uses in Lewis County, adjacent to the parcels, are irrelevant; and Believes that the CP-16 - Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs should be completed first. Please see Unique ID 145 for more information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Mary Grace Jewell</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>S.E. Schwartz Jewell</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Believes the County should conduct a study of Rural Warehousing needs; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan; and Believes that the CP-16 - Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs should be completed first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Rembrandt Haft</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Miles McEvoy</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Alan Mountjoy-Venning</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Concern over compliance with Comprehensive Plan and GMA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Frank Turner</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Barbara Carey</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal. No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Linda Martin</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over industrial development in rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Wendy Steffensen</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Barbara Gross</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>References 2021 Buildable Lands Report; Believes there is adequate acreage dedicated to industrial uses; and Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Lester James Amell</td>
<td>They would support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal if the following changes were made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highlights specifics on the adjacent road, ingress/egress issues, site size and possible building capacity, and potential issues with rail line crossings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Blaine A. Snow</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Concern over impacts of industrial development in area and perceived impacts of warehousing in the local economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Peter Dederich</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Dave Schuett-Hames</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan; and Concern over compliance with Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Jessie Russell</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Matt Russell</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>C. Broom</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern over compliance with Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name Other</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Additional Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Colby Russell</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Sharron Coontz</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>References Futurewise public comment - Unique ID 136. Concern over compliance with GMA; Concern over the Amendment to Title 20.29; and Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Betty Treheway</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Joe Hotzel</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Concern over environmental impacts of proposed change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Charles &amp; Beverly Heebner</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Martha Isbister</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Nova Berkshires</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over environmental impacts of proposed change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>10/5/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Joseph Joy</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>K O'Connor</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Raymond Schuler - Proposal Applicant</td>
<td>They support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Highlights that the location is located within the Grand Mound Opportunity Zone; Highlights the location in relation to other industrial uses; Addresses the agriculture tax credit designation; Highlights long-term intentions and possibility if the property were to be rezoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Spouse/Contact</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Jane Poole</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Ruth Apter</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Linda Remmers</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County; Believes that the CP-16 - Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs should be completed first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Patsi Scofield</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the loss of farmland in Thurston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Philip Pearson</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>David and Katherine Seiler</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Believes the County should conduct a study of Rural Warehousing needs; References 2021 Buildable Lands Report; Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan; and Believes that the CP-16 - Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs should be completed first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Margaret Morgan</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>No additional topics discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Peggy Clifford</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Believes that the CP-16 - Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs should be completed first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Tom Burns</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over the Amendment to Title 20.29 and how that will impact other parcels in the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>10/6/2021</td>
<td>Andrew Boughan</td>
<td>Jessica Revelas</td>
<td>They do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal.</td>
<td>Concern over amendment to Comprehensive Plan; Highlights GMA priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Greg Falxa <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 1:55 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Greg Falxa
Email: olybatguy@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: We absolutely need to protect unique habitat for the nearby Oregon spotted frogs, prairie oak habitat dependent species, and for our children & future generations.

Time: October 4, 2021 at 8:55 pm
IP Address: 104.152.222.41
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
From: Portia Wells <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 5:12 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Portia Wells

Email: portia@portiawells.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 12:12 am
IP Address: 73.19.64.8
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Kathy Prosser <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 1:58 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [ ] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Kathy Prosser

Email: atomikeets@msn.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I believe this amendment could have unintended consequences. Thurston County doesn't need to convert agricultural land for industrial uses while adequate industrial land is available within the Urban Growth Boundaries.

Time: October 4, 2021 at 8:58 pm
IP Address: 67.168.81.235
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I urge the Planning Commission to NOT recommend the UP Castle Comprehensive Plan amendment for consideration for adoption by the Thurston Board of Commissioners. The proposed amendment skirts the intention of the comprehensive planning process and would have negative effects on the character of Thurston County. It would set a dangerous precedent of short-sighted zoning changes where long-term and community-driven efforts are needed. It substitutes parcel proximity for reasoned, citizen-based decision-making.
Andrew Boughan

From: Rose Oram <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 5:27 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Rose Oram

Email: gardenrose042@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: This is copy and pasted from a friend, please take some time to weigh in if you are in the area!!!

Hi all,
The Letter to The Editor (LTE) summarizes the proposed zoning change; the Black Hills Audubon article below that and the attachment provides more detail. It takes but a moment to cast your vote +/- or comment: this is important. Please circulate, thanks! Meryl

LTE in the Olympian 9/30/21:
AMENDMENT COULD ALLOW MORE WAREHOUSES ALONG I-5, LOSS OF FARMLAND
The Up Castle Land Use and Rezone Amendment is a backdoor way to allow warehousing on farmland throughout Thurston County. The company's rezone request would affect only 33 acres now zoned Rural Residential/Resource (RRR) next to Centralia on the Lewis County border. However, the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Zoning code amendment to allow this rezone would affect hundreds, maybe thousands, of acres.

The Up Castle location does not fit within the current RRI (Rural Resource Industrial) zoning code. The proposed changes to the code would allow any land that meets the criteria on the date the code is adopted to become “intensive industrial” (warehousing and manufacturing). The proposed criteria will include any farmland adjacent to industrial development and near an arterial road and railroad. One example is 300 acres of farmland near the Maytown I-5 exit, but many more parcels would fit these criteria.

Up Castle's former farm has highly rated soils. Thurston County doesn't need warehouses on good rural farmland. Let the current Community-Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs help inform this issue. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows we have twice as many acres of industrial zoned land for warehousing as needed for the next 20 years —within our cities' Urban Growth Boundaries.

At the Oct. 6 public hearing, urge the Thurston County Planning Commission NOT to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners approval of the Up Castle amendment. Provide pro or con comments on the county’s webpage.

Votes will be counted at 3 pm on October 6. But vote now. It will only take a minute. Thurston County's rural lands are threatened.

BY OCTOBER 6, STOP BACKDOOR RE-ZONING OF FARMLAND FOR WAREHOUSES THROUGHOUT THUR

by Charlotte Persons, BHAS Conservation Committee
Myself and my family completely oppose this rezoning proposal. These Comprehensive Plan code changes would open the door to re-zoning to intensive industrial use (warehousing and manufacturing) of land that meets three requirements on the date that the new code is accepted—any agricultural land adjacent to industrial development and near an arterial road and a railroad. The code changes would apply to hundreds, perhaps thousands, of acres of farmland, scattered around the county. One example is about 300 acres by the I-5/Maytown.

--Thurston County should NOT enact such far-reaching re-zoning as the result of the request of a single development company. To make well-considered changes to the Comprehensive Plan, County Commissioners should ask for a study to discover the need (if any) to locate more warehousing in rural areas.

--Thurston County NOT need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities.

--Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 12:27 am
IP Address: 216.128.109.102
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Michele Burton <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 5:28 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Michele Burton
Email: mburtonphoto@aol.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County is actively encouraging industrial/warehouse development and use near Interstate 5 at the Littlerock exit, near the airport and at Hawks Prairie. Lewis County/Port District are actively doing the same adjacent to Interstate 5 in Chehalis.

There seems little benefit to the Counties to rezone the Up Castle properties for similar uses when the above mentioned projects are not at capacity.

It is important to preserve the rural character of Thurston County and protect it from over development.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 12:28 am
IP Address: 97.113.80.35
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Christine Garst <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 1:55 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Christine Garst
Email: cbgarst@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Concern about losing good farmland, need for study on rural warehouses

Time: October 4, 2021 at 8:54 pm
IP Address: 67.170.94.227
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Jean Takekawa

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Please do not recommend approval of the UP Castle rezone proposal. Thurston County should not be converting agricultural lands to warehouses and manufacturing. Instead the County must stay true to the Comprehensive Plan which was developed with extensive public participation, and complies with the Growth Management Act prioritizing preservation of agricultural lands. Thank you.

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Jennifer Johnson <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 5:36 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Jennifer Johnson
Email: 22jjen@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 12:36 am
IP Address: 73.225.182.10
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Gail Sheikhizadeh <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 6:18 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Gail Sheikhizadeh
Email: gailsheik@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 1:17 am
IP Address: 73.59.90.90
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Andrew Newman <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 7:18 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Andrew Newman

Email: andynewman320@hotmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County should not enact such far-reaching re-zoning as the result of the request of a single development company. To make well-considered changes to the Comprehensive Plan, County Commissioners should ask for a study to discover the need (if any) to locate more warehousing in rural areas. Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities. Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 2:18 am
IP Address: 73.169.190.11
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Michelle Newman <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 7:19 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Michelle Newman

Email: michelle.newman@comcast.net

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County should not enact such far-reaching re-zoning as the result of the request of a single development company. To make well-considered changes to the Comprehensive Plan, County Commissioners should ask for a study to discover the need (if any) to locate more warehousing in rural areas. Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities. Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 2:19 am
IP Address: 174.204.81.151
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Such re-zoning decisions should be made on a case by case basis. The wider scale change in the Comprehensive Plan proposed by UP Castle is inappropriate. In any case, The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities.
Andrew Boughan

From: David Jennings <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 7:57 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: David Jennings

Email: nativeforest@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: 1) We need to complete our community review of our Ag policies and programs so we protect our valuable farmlands. We need to be informed before voting on CP-19
2) Industrial warehouses that are not associated with using local natural resources and do not meet the current definition of "compatible with rural character". See #1
3) it is unfair to existing landowners to do a rezoning in favor of a big generic warehouse and impact existing owners ability to develop farming or housing choices for the future of the land.

Please do NOT pass CP-19 as it current stands.

Thank you for your service! We appreciate what you do for our community.
David Jennings

Time: October 5, 2021 at 2:56 am
IP Address: 73.35.227.94
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: karen lohmann <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 7:58 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: karen lohmann

Email: karen22lohmnan@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: We must preserve agricultural land and not lose our vital food production and right livelihood resources. I want my county commissioners to represent the values that serve long-range sustainability in land use. In my opinion large scale warehousing ventures serve a few interests but do not support the big picture of healthy: water, air, species diversity and soils.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 2:57 am
IP Address: 97.113.32.136
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: William R Zachmann <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 8:00 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: William R Zachmann
Email: bztelemark54@outlook.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: This proposal is not consistent with the County's policy to achieve no net loss of farmland. If I'm mistaken, and that is currently not County policy, amending the Comprehensive Plan for this one particular use and parcel is still arbitrary. A wider study of what it means to start amending the plan parcel by parcel should be undertaken first. Please show some fortitude and forward vision to protect viable and valuable farmland in Thurston County.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 2:59 am
IP Address: 75.172.97.8
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Strongly oppose for many reasons.
Andrew Boughan

From: Alice Sharrett <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 8:15 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Alice Sharrett
Email: amsharrett@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 3:14 am
IP Address: 73.221.96.31
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Name: Susan Finkel

Email: skfinkel@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 3:17 am
IP Address: 71.227.171.10
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Changing our rural lands is not in our best interest right now. We have a comprehensive growth plan that is for a purpose to grow in the city not rural lands. No industry is good for farm land. Please do not support this.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 3:58 am
IP Address: 174.21.33.234
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Christy White <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 9:52 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Christy White

Email: wc6517@scattercreek.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: A one off change is not the solution. The ripple impact is great and a comprehensive solution needs to be developed.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 4:51 am
IP Address: 63.226.219.106
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Meryl Bernstein <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 12:53 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Name: Meryl Bernstein
Email: space4now@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Up Castle's amendment proposal that includes code changes beyond the 2 parcels of interest IS APPALLING -- a backdoor, underhanded way to make sweeping changes on a potentially massive scale. Consider what rural character currently remains in our county along I-5 and nearby communities: Not much. There has to be space for wildlife corridors, rural recreation and quality air.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 7:52 am
IP Address: 216.128.110.222
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Gail Trotter <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:40 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [ ] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Gail Trotter

Email: getrotter@comcast.net

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Don’t Rezone Good Farmland
Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 8:39 am
IP Address: 73.221.216.118
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name:</strong></th>
<th>Jeri Lynn Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jerilynn.miller@gmail.com">jerilynn.miller@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?:** I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

**Comment:** CON! Should not be passed for one single development company request especially when we have studies and plans already in place at this time. Please do not allow farm land rezoning to industrial land use!!!!
Andrew Boughan

From: christine hartman <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 6:05 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: christine hartman

Email: mstrchristeen@scattercreek.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I want to keep the rural character of S Thurston and protect the loss of habitat and farmland and increased truck traffic!!
Please do no do this!!!!!!!

Time: October 5, 2021 at 1:05 pm
IP Address: 216.128.111.197
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Sally Alhadeff <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 6:22 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Sally Alhadeff

Email: sallya@scattercreek.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Once land is under concrete, it is gone forever.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 1:21 pm
IP Address: 216.128.105.93
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
From: Ann Butler <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 6:37 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Ann Butler
Email: ann.t.butler@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 1:36 pm
IP Address: 174.21.76.229
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Brian Stewart <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 9:14 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Brian Stewart

Email: bstewart@conservationnw.org

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 4:14 pm
IP Address: 184.53.16.193
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 5:09 pm
IP Address: 73.11.220.76
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Gwen Atkinson <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 10:19 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Gwen Atkinson
Email: kaleid@ix.netcom.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 5:18 pm
IP Address: 73.35.226.183
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Commissioners,
Warehouses do not provide good long term jobs, and most of the jobs they will provide in the short term will be replaced by automation within 10 years according to experts. Further, we can't even fill all the warehouse jobs we have, there are constantly hundreds of openings at the warehouses we do have.

We are losing farmland at alarming rates and warehouses are going up everywhere with major warehouse developments at 93rd and I-5, at the Ports Tumwater property, and converting retail zoned areas to warehouses in Lacey. We do not want to become another Kent, with a high cost of living, high crime rate, and very low quality of life. The Kent valley was once the most productive farmland in the state, perhaps the country. Now it's wall to wall warehouses and parking lots. The few wooded area's left have had to be permanently protected even though on private land. Thurston Counties most valuable resource is it's rural lands and culture, please don't give those away to greedy developers who only want to buy less expensive RRR and Farmland and convert it to industrial to make more profit.

Further, the idea that if a farm or RRR property is next to an RRI or other industrial property that it can be converted to RRI is ridiculous. That will just lead to industrial creep, moving from one property to the next. It also sets a horrible president which will lead to unchecked rezoning of other zoning types as well. Look at the eastside of I5 on Old 99/507, industrial properties abut farmland and then there is a long row of farmland, all of this could and will eventually go away, one after another if this code change is allowed. Same thing on 93rd and down Case and Tilley, and down Maytown road. I am sure developers are definitely excited for all the cheap land that would be available to them with the code change.

Please do not cast a vote that started the demise of our beautiful rural county.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Josh Stottlemyer
Olympia, WA - Unincorporated Thurston County
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I urge Planning Commissioners NOT to recommend CP 19, the Up Castle proposal, for approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

Thurston County should not enact such far-reaching re-zoning as the result of the request of a single development company. To make well-considered changes to the Comprehensive Plan, County Commissioners should ask for a study to discover the need (if any) to locate more warehousing in rural areas.

Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities.

Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Thurston County should wait to change the Comprehensive Plan until after the completion of CP – 16, the county’s community review of agricultural policies and programs. This group is researching soils maps and other sources to identify additional ways to protect agricultural lands prioritized for conservation. Their recommendations will be published later this year and in 2022.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 5:54 pm
IP Address: 97.113.172.203
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Patricia Holm <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 11:35 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Patricia Holm

Email: pholm76@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I urge Planning Commissioners to NOT to recommend CP 19, the Up Castle proposal, for approval to the Board of County Commissioners.
Thurston County should not enact such far-reaching re-zoning as the result of the request of a single development company. To make well-considered changes to the Comprehensive Plan, County Commissioners should ask for a study to discover the need (if any) to locate more warehousing in rural areas.
Studies have already shown we have enough warehouses already in the County.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 6:34 pm
IP Address: 174.21.126.125
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Sally Vogel <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 11:48 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Sally Vogel

Email: sallyvogel@comcast.net

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I don’t think you all understand what a critical point we are at on this planet. All deforestation should cease. Agricultural land must be retained and regenerative processes should be employed. There is no time left to play around with. Listen to the scientists, not the economists. Please. It is up to us to act so that there will be a future for our kids.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 6:48 pm
IP Address: 73.42.183.136
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
October 5, 2021

Jim Simmons, Chair
Thurston County Planning Commission
Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development
ATTN: Andrew Boughan, Associate Planner
Thurston County Courthouse, Building One
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98502

Dear Chair Simmons and Planning Commissioners:

Send via email to: andrew.boughan@co.thurston.wa.us

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Comprehensive Plan Amendment: 2020-2021 Docket (CP-19) Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment & Up Castle Code Amendment Chapter: Title 20, Chapter 20.29. As will be documented below, these amendments violate the State of Washington Growth Management Act and the Planning Commission must recommend denial of the amendments.

Futurewise works throughout Washington State to support land-use policies that encourage healthy, equitable and opportunity-rich communities, and that protect our most valuable farmlands, forests, and water resources. Futurewise has members and supporters throughout Washington State including Thurston County.

Docket CP-19, Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment, & Up Castle Code Amendment Chapter: Title 20, Chapter 20.29 violate the Growth Management Act because they do not provide for isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses and must be denied.

The Growth Management Act prohibits urban growth in rural areas.¹ The proposed comprehensive plan amendment, rezone, and code amendments all apply to the rural area.² RCW 36.70A.030(28) defines “urban growth” as

---

growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources, rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. A pattern of more intensive rural development, as provided in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d), is not urban growth.

Warehouses qualify as urban growth because they cover most or even all of a lot with large buildings and impervious surfaces such as paving. Therefore they are “incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources, rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands …” There is simply not enough open land left to farm where warehouses are constructed. So warehouses qualify as “urban growth” and are prohibited in rural areas.

The definition of urban growth in RCW 36.70A.030(28) provides that more intense rural developments allowed by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) is not urban growth. However Docket CP-19 and the Up Castle Code Amendment Chapter: Title 20, Chapter 20.29 do not meet the requirements in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d). This section addresses isolated nonresidential uses or new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses allowed under RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii). The following section addresses RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i) and (ii).

RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii) provides in relevant part that:

(iii) The intensification of development on lots containing isolated nonresidential uses or new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses that are not principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population and nonresidential uses, but do provide job opportunities for rural residents. Rural counties may allow the expansion of small-scale businesses as long as those small-scale businesses conform with the rural character of the area as defined by the local government according to RCW 36.70A.030(23). Rural counties may also allow new small-scale businesses to utilize a site previously occupied by an existing business as long as the new small-scale business conforms to the rural character of the area as defined by the local government according to RCW 36.70A.030(23).

The Growth Management Hearings Board, a state agencies charged with interpreting the Growth Management Act have concluded that “[a]n isolated use, then, must be one that is set apart from others. The Legislature’s use of the term ‘isolated’ for both cottage industry and small-scale businesses demonstrates an unambiguous intention to ensure that any commercial uses established

---

3 See the aerial image from the Thurston County Property Map for Parcel 44160000300 and the “Basic Info,” “Structures,” and “Land” tabs in the file “44160000300 Aerial & Data.pdf” enclosed in a separate email.

by the mechanism of a type (d)(iii) LAMIRD be set apart from other such uses. But 5641 and 5505 222nd Avenue SW are not set apart from other such uses, they are immediately adjacent to several large warehouses and industrial facilities. Nor is 5641 and 5505 222nd Avenue SW the site of a previously existing non-farm business. So the comprehensive plan amendment and rezone in Docket CP-19 violates RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii). The Planning Commission must recommend denial of Docket CP-19.

The zoning text amendment to Title 20, Chapter 20.29 also violates RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii). That amendment requires the opposite of what RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii) requires. Instead of requiring the uses to be isolated as RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii) does, the text amendment provides that the Rural Resource Industrial District (RRI) may be “adjacent to an existing industrial development utilizing existing county roads …. This change very clearly violates RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii). The Planning Commission must recommend denial of the text amendments.

Docket CP-19, Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment, & Up Castle Code Amendment Chapter: Title 20, Chapter 20.29 violate the Growth Management Act because they do not provide for Type I LAMIRDs authorized by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i) or Type II LAMIRDs authorized by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(ii) and must be denied.

The Washington State Supreme Court has concluded that:

¶ 5 LAMIRDs are not intended for continued use as a planning device, rather, they are “intended to be a one-time recognition of existing areas and uses and are not intended to be used continuously to meet needs (real or perceived) for additional commercial and industrial lands.” People for a Liveable Cnty. v. Jefferson County, No. 03–2–0009c, 2003 GMHB LEXIS 34, at *2(W. Wash. Growth Mgmt. Hr’gs Bd. Final Dec. and Order Aug. 22, 2003). (In general, planning in rural zones must “protect the rural character of the area” and “contain[] or otherwise control[] rural development.” RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c), (i)).

6 See the Google Earth Aerial Image of 5505 222nd Ave SW in the file “5505 222nd Ave SW Adjoining Warehouses.pdf” enclosed in a separate email. The author of this letter is an expert in interpreting aerial images for planning purposes.
7 Id.; 5641 and 5505 222nd Avenue SW 1990 Aerial Image in the files 5505 222nd Ave SW 1990.pdf and Aerial Image 5505 222nd Ave SW 1990 Aerial Image.png enclosed in a separate email.
For these reasons the Growth Management Act contains specific standards that limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRDs) must meet. As the Growth Management Hearings Board held:

Therefore, when the Board reviewed how the LAMIRDs were defined and the uses allowed in them it found contradictions and violations of the GMA. For example, as for Type I LAMIRDs, the GMA provides: “Any development or redevelopment in terms of building size, scale, use, or intensity shall be consistent with the character of the existing areas.”\textsuperscript{184} An “existing area” or “existing use” is one that was in existence on July 1, 1990.\textsuperscript{185} The fundamental problem of the County’s approach is that its development regulations fail to limit LAMIRDs in the manner required by the GMA. Rather than determining the size, scale, use and intensity of uses that existed in a particular area to be designated as a LAMIRD, and limiting future development in the LAMIRD on that basis, the County instead allows uses in a particular LAMIRD based on the zoning designation applied to a LAMIRD, regardless of whether those uses were present in that LAMIRD on July 1, 1990.

\textsuperscript{184} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i)(C) [& RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(v)].
\textsuperscript{185} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(v)(A).

The 1990 aerial image from Google Earth shows that that 5641 and 5505 222nd Avenue SW were actively used as a farm.\textsuperscript{11} So 5641 and 5505 222nd Avenue SW do not qualify as a Type I LAMIRD under RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i) since there was no existing area and existing warehouse, industrial, or manufacturing uses in 1990.

The proposal does not involve any small-scale recreational or tourist uses.\textsuperscript{12} So it does not qualify as a Type II LAMIRD under RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(ii).

In summary, the proposed comprehensive plan amendment, rezone, and development regulation text amendments all violate the Growth Management Act. RCW 36.70A.130 requires this Planning Commission to recommend denial of 2020-2021 Docket (CP-19) Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment & Up Castle Code Amendment Chapter: Title 20, Chapter 20.29.

Separately, Futurewise is concerned that Thurston County is considering amending the comprehensive plan designations for land that potentially qualifies as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance before the County completes its ongoing reevaluation of its agricultural land

\textsuperscript{10} Futurewise, Governors Point Development Company, Triple R. Residential Construction, Inc. and the Sablin Family, Eric Hirst, Laura Leigh Brakke, Wendy Harris and David Stalheim, and City of Bellingham v. Whatcom County, Growth Management Hearings Board Western Washington Region (GMHBWWR) Case No. 11-2-0010c, Final Decision and Order & GMHBWWR Case No. 05-2-0013, Order Following Remand on Issue of LAMIRDs (Jan. 9, 2012) Page 92 of 177.
\textsuperscript{11} 5641 and 5505 222nd Avenue SW 1990 Aerial Image in the files 5505 222nd Ave SW 1990.pdf and Aerial Image 5505 222nd Ave SW 1990 Aerial Image.png enclosed in a separate email.
\textsuperscript{12} Comprehensive Plan Amendments: 2020-2021 Docket (CP-19) Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment Staff Report pp. 1 – 12.
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designations. We urge the County not to increase the allowed densities and intensities of use on agricultural lands until that reevaluation is completed.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you require additional information, please contact me at telephone 206-343-0681 Ext. 102 or email: tim@futurewise.org.

Very Truly Yours,

Tim Trohimovich, AICP, WSBA No. 22367  
**Director of Planning and Law**

Enclosures in separate emails
For more information, Please Click to access Assessor's Home Page.

**Owner/Taxpayer Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>Name/Street</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>KAUFMAN REAL ESTATE LLC</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>98501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxpayer</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>KAUFMAN REAL ESTATE LLC</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>98501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parcel Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situs Address:</th>
<th>6109 RIVER DR SE, TUMWATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviated Legal:</td>
<td>S12 Township 17 Range 2W Plat DESCHUTES INDUSTRIAL PARK BLA 001176 TR A Document 3351134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sect/Town/Range:</td>
<td>12 17 2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Code:</td>
<td>69 Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCA Number:</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood:</td>
<td>235EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Type:</td>
<td>WHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Living Units:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District:</td>
<td>TUMWATER S.D. #33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Source:</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Type:</td>
<td>SEWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations:</td>
<td>3900211884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Searching for Sales**

For your convenience, and for greater transparency, the Assessor's office offers three separate sales listings:

- **Owner History**: displays all transfers of ownership for the selected parcel.
- **Sales**: returns a list of all sales within the subject neighborhood that carry a sale price greater than $0. Many of these sales have not been verified and are not considered valid, arms length sales for assessment purposes. They include transfers between banks, sales between relatives and business partners, estate sales, etc. that do not typically represent market prices.
- **Value Report**: includes a list of valid, arms length sales that were used in determining values for assessment purposes. They include bank sales of foreclosed properties that may have been discounted in price and that have a weighted influence on other market transactions.

**Office of the Assessor**

2030 Lakeland Drive SW - Olympia, WA 98502
### Commercial Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>No. Floors</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIB-WHSE OFFICE</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10725</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Detached Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAVG-CONCRETE</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVG-ASPHALT</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>77382</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please click to access Assessor’s Home Page.
### Land Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Flag</th>
<th>8840</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Square Footage</td>
<td>244320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Acreage</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Frontage</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Depth</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Source</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Source</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Influence(s) | LT-LIGHT TRAFFIC

**Office of the Assessor**

2000 Lake Ridge Drive SW - Olympia, WA 98502
Customer Service (360)867-2200 -- Fax (360)867-2201 -- TDD (360)754-2933
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 7:20 pm
IP Address: 97.126.67.112
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I think we have sufficient land zoned for industrial use at this time. There is a good comprehensive plan which should be followed.
Andrew Boughan

From: Charlotte Trink Newman <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:11 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [ ] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Charlotte "Trink" Newman

Email: tnewman@northwestern.edu

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I urge our Commissioners to please continue to follow the current Comprehensive Plan to preserve our rural areas and building codes. There is already too much land area in Thurston County devoted to commercial development. Our county needs to preserve it's unique characteristics.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 8:11 pm
IP Address: 71.197.240.173
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Sherry Buckner <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:28 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Sherry Buckner
Email: bucknersherry@hotmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 8:28 pm
IP Address: 174.204.201.219
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I would support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal if the following changes were made. (Please add suggestion(s) in comment box)

Comment: Only if this very clearly only applies to these parcels. And perhaps if it only applied to changing uses directly adjacent to the Interstate Corridor for a maximum 1/2 mile feet as I feel land near such high intensity Internal Combustion use routes is likely not suitable for growing food for human consumption, the air quality sucks and the noise factor is terrible.
From: jodi p Kline <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:52 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: jodi p Kline

Email: jgb929@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities.
Andrew Boughan

From: Suzanne Bagdon <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 3:22 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Suzanne Bagdon
Email: suzbagdon@Yahoo.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County should not enact this far-reaching re-zoning from a single development company. To make well-considered changes to the Comprehensive Plan, County Commissioners should ask for a study to discover the need (if any) to locate more warehousing in rural areas.

Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities.

Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Thurston County should wait to change the Comprehensive Plan until after the completion of CP – 16, the county’s community review of agricultural policies and programs. This group is researching soils maps and other sources to identify additional ways to protect agricultural lands prioritized for conservation. Their recommendations will be published later this year and in 2022.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 10:22 pm
IP Address: 71.197.253.159
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I am a resident of Thurston County and oppose this proposal for several reasons, as follow:
1) Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. These can be built on lands already zoned for industrial, with plenty of these lands already available in the county.
2) Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.
3) Thurston County should not enact such far-reaching re-zoning as the result of the request of a single development company.
4) We don’t need more warehouses in the county, especially at the cost of losing farmland. Warehouses support small numbers of low-paying jobs and add little economically to the county, and therefore do not add value to the county.
October 5th, 2021

Andrew Boughan, Associate Planner
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98502

Subject: Comp. Plan Docket Item CP-19: Up Castle Rezone Amendment

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed rezone. The Thurston County Agricultural Advisory Committee is strongly opposed to the proposed rezone for the following reasons:

First, the rezone will result in the loss of about 30 acres of Thurston County farmland. This loss is significant, given that Thurston County is rapidly losing its farmland—about 60% since 1950. Alarmingly, these farmland losses are occurring in the face of rapidly rising demand for local farm products resulting from (1) the continued rapid growth of our county’s population, (2) a large increase in the percentage of county residents wishing to buy local farm products, and (3) a recent reduction in the availability of out-of-state farm products due to drought and transportation problems. We simply can’t afford the loss of more farmland just when we need it most.

Second, the rezone could result in the loss of two small parcels of Nationally Significant Farmland identified by the American Farmland trust. Farmland of this quality is a rarity in Thurston County; we have only limited acres in our entire county. We cannot afford to lose any more of it.

Third, preserving farmland has huge environmental benefits in addition to just growing crops. Farmland also provides cover for wildlife, helps control flooding, protects wetlands and watersheds, and helps maintain air quality. These environmental and agricultural benefits have a real and large economic value, which we believe is greater than the economic benefits of fragmented industrial development.

Fourth, the fact that adjacent property in Lewis County is zoned for industrial use is irrelevant for two reasons. First, Lewis County's zoning decisions should not and cannot control zoning decisions in Thurston County. Thurston County officials have an obligation to base their zoning decisions on what is right for Thurston County, not on what has been done in Lewis County. Second, the fact that one parcel of land is zoned for industrial use should not use as the basis for rezoning adjacent farmland for more industrial use. Applying this specious rationale would result in the steady march of industrial zoned land across Thurston County, ensuring the obliteration of even more of our precious and dwindling farmland in the process.
Fifth, the timing of this rezone request is all wrong. Thurston County should not act on this request until it has completed its current Community Driven Review of Agricultural Policies and Programs. The two parcels involved in this rezone request have long been farmed. Past and current owners have paid reduced property taxes under the current use tax program. The soils on the parcels may qualify them for Long Term Agriculture under current standards. Or the Long-Term Agriculture zoning standards may be revised to include these parcels no matter what the status of their soils. Therefore, any final decision on this rezone should await the completion of the Community Driven Review Process.

For all of these reasons, the Thurston County Agricultural Advisory Committee strongly opposes the proposed-Up Castle Rezone. Please feel free to contact our Committee if you have any questions or need more information.

Very truly yours,

Joe Hanna
Vice Chair and Acting Committee Chair
lookn4psa@gmail.com
(253) 691-1445
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 10:57 pm
IP Address: 67.168.6.139
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Comment: Thurston County should not enact such far-reaching re-zoning as the result of the request of a single development company. To make well-considered changes to the Comprehensive Plan, County Commissioners should ask for a study to discover the need (if any) to locate more warehousing in rural areas. Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities. Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary. Thurston County should wait to change the Comprehensive Plan until after the completion of CP – 16, the county’s community review of agricultural policies and programs. This group is researching soils maps and other sources to identify additional ways to protect agricultural lands prioritized for conservation. Their recommendations will be published later this year and in 2022.
Andrew Boughan

From: Rembrandt Haft <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 4:19 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Rembrandt Haft

Email: beastofsnergl@hotmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 11:18 pm
IP Address: 134.39.241.130
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 5, 2021 at 11:42 pm
IP Address: 73.254.139.127
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Alan Mountjoy-Venning <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 4:50 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Alan Mountjoy-Venning
Email: amvenning@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: It doesn’t seem prudent to convert farmland now, especially with piecemeal rezones. We have a comprehensive plan, the urban growth boundaries, and the growth management act. How is this consistent with those? What compelling benefits to county residents are there? They aren’t evident to me.

Time: October 5, 2021 at 11:50 pm
IP Address: 67.168.4.214
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Frank Turner <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 5:12 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [ ] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Frank Turner

Email: turnerfandp@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 12:11 am
IP Address: 67.170.90.252
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Barbara Carey <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 5:14 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Barbara Carey

Email: barbmcoly@comcast.net

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 12:13 am
IP Address: 174.211.40.178
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Linda Martin <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 5:58 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Linda Martin
Email: ljmjmartin076@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Back door politics need to he stopped. Is this unnecessary development intended to free up land already allotted for warehousing in or near larger urban areas?? Quit dumping on rural communities!

Time: October 6, 2021 at 12:57 am
IP Address: 174.204.65.40
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Wendy Steffensen <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 6:25 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Wendy Steffensen
Email: Wsteffensen@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Dear Commissioners,

I believe that we should preserve farmland in Thurston County. This is the highest and best use of the land and it supports community values, sustainability, and a healthy environment.

Additionally, my sources say that the 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities.

Please say no to this rezone.
Sincerely,
Wendy Steffensen

Time: October 6, 2021 at 1:25 am
IP Address: 67.168.86.139
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Barbara Gross <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 7:29 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Barbara Gross

Email: bgrossintheworld@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Please do not change the county code for one company. The 2021 Buildings Report has shown that Thurston County has more than enough warehouse space within the Urban Growth boundaries for many years to come. There is no need to destroy mote agriculture land for this purpose. The current Comprehensive Plan works to preserve agricultural lands. This should be followed. What will we have if more and more agricultural and open lands become paved industrial area? What will happen to our way of life and at whose expense for whose profits? This will not serve the overall Thurston County community well.

Time: October 6, 2021 at 2:28 am
IP Address: 206.214.234.4
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Hello to everyone involved. Please share this with all involved.
Reside at 5707 222nd avenue S.W.
To the following Rezone:
I believe it can be rezoned with huge exceptions. 222 nd Ave. is a rural gravel road with chip seal coating.
Egress and ingress is in unsustainable for any traffic other than rural.
Intersection at Old 99 and 222nd is not proportionate for any truck traffic on to 222nd (Smith Road)
The Sight is 1,500,000 square Ft. Should be no more than A 50,000 square ft. Warehouse. No 500,000 Square Ft. Warehouse. Even with good egress and ingress.
The rail line would need to be a overpass for any traffic other than rural.
I hope this goes in to your meeting tomorrow the 6th of October 2021, It is now 7:20 PM October the 5th 2021.
Lester James Amell 360-219-7409 Feel vary free to call.

Sent from Mail for Windows
Andrew Boughan

From: Blaine A. Snow <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 7:36 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Blaine A. Snow

Email: snowinolympia@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I've been a Thurston County resident for 38 years and a Washington resident for my entire life (65 years) and I do not support endless commercial development and the slow elimination of our local farms and green spaces. Rezoning will not create jobs in our local economy but only make congestion worse and enrich a corporate few. Please do not rezone our peaceful lands into congested asphalt and box warehouses.

Time: October 6, 2021 at 2:35 am
IP Address: 206.214.234.4
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Peter Dederich <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 8:13 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Peter Dederich
Email: pkdederich@yahoo.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Any changes to the comprehensive plan should be done through an overall approach, not on an ad hoc basis to benefit one applicant, otherwise the plan has no real effect

Time: October 6, 2021 at 3:12 am
IP Address: 71.212.157.121
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: It is not appropriate to make an ad hoc change in the comprehensive plan to accommodate a zoning request for a single applicant, particularly because it could result in the loss of significant amounts of farmland elsewhere in the party and is in conflict with the intent of the comprehensive plan to preserve agricultural lands.
From: Jessie Russell <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 8:40 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Jessie Russell

Email: jessie17527@hotmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 3:40 am
IP Address: 216.128.109.9
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 3:40 am
IP Address: 216.128.109.9
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: At this time, I question that the amendment is in compliance with the intent of the comprehensive plan or that the change is compelling.
From: Colby Russell <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 8:42 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Colby Russell

Email: cprussell@protonmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 3:41 am
IP Address: 216.128.109.9
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: First, this proposal as written, if enacted, would be a violation of the Growth Management Act (GMA). Futurewise has submitted details explaining why that is so.

Second, it's appalling that a zoning request for one specific project would apply to many other properties throughout the county, all of which have gone through an often-painstaking zoning process of their own: one rezone could undo all the hard work done before by citizens and staff. There would be no individual re-evaluation; it would mean a blanket change, a sort of bait and switch, making a mockery of the zoning process.

Third, our county has committed to protecting farm land; this proposal would guarantee destruction of it instead.

Thank you.
Andrew Boughan

From: Betty Tretheway <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 8:49 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [ ] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Betty Tretheway
Email: btretheway@thurston.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Please do not take valuable farmland away. Do not destroy the beauty of this area. We do not need any more industrial building to spread into rural areas.

Time: October 6, 2021 at 3:48 am
IP Address: 216.128.111.227
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Joe Hotzel <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 9:19 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Joe Hotzel
Email: hotzeljw@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Prime farmland and underground aquifers need to be conserved and not destroyed for convenience and short term profits,

Time: October 6, 2021 at 4:19 am
IP Address: 174.204.80.17
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 4:25 am
IP Address: 97.113.44.172
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Martha Isbister <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 9:52 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Martha Isbister
Email: mjisbister@yahoo.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities.

Time: October 6, 2021 at 4:52 am
IP Address: 174.204.76.249
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Nova Berkshires <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 10:16 PM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Nova Berkshires

Email: novaberkshires@comcast.net

**Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?:** I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

**Comment:** More industrial development threatens every dimension of the environmental quality in this vicinity. Please make it a priority to "live and let live" and protect the existing eco-system habitat.

---

Time: October 6, 2021 at 5:15 am
IP Address: 73.19.68.210
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 5:16 am
IP Address: 24.18.107.120
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: My wife and I purchased 29 of the 33 acres in the Amendment application in 2017. Ryan and Katie Hoover reside on and own the other 4 acres. We are the proponents.

Both properties are in the Grand Mound Opportunity Zone, created by the Federal Government, and endorsed by the County to incentivize job creation in low income census tracts. In addition, the parcels are bordered by rail lines East and West, a large warehousing operation to the South and a County road to the North. This is not-very-rural property, in a rural area.

We inherited our property's agricultural property tax designation from the former owners. We do not believe it is economical to farm the sites. The former owners abandoned their modest Christmas tree operation years before. Until last year, we were having to PAY to have the hay cut. Last year, we found someone to take it for free. Hardly a good business operation, and unlikely to result in job creation.

We believe the best use of the property, consistent with the County and Federal Opportunity Zone designation, is development as a storage and distribution operation. This would ultimately create Jobs, by making use of the level site, its proximity to I-5 and its access to the neighboring rail infrastructure. It will also get these properties RE-assessed once developed, generating significant property tax revenues for the state and local governments.

Thank you.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: I do not support this proposal. We must continue to preserve the critical farmland resources of Thurston County as the development in the county continues. I support the current process of identifying/preserving these resources using the Comprehensive Plan.

I am a 32 year resident of Thurston County, am a member of a CSA and try to support local farmers in my purchases as often as possible. We must make decisions about our land very deliberately - choosing to preserve our farmland.

Thank you for considering public comments.
Andrew Boughan

From: Ruth Apter <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 8:53 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Ruth Apter
Email: Rakuruth@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Agricultural land needs to remain protected. We have too little of it as it is at this point in time. Covering this resource with warehouses is not good long term planning.

Time: October 6, 2021 at 3:53 pm
IP Address: 71.212.219.51
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Linda Remmers <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 9:09 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Linda Remmers
Email: lremmersfarm@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: The Up Castle proposed changes to the current Comprehensive Plan would potentially open the door to rezoning of agricultural parcels to intensive industrial use. Our rural farmlands would become punctuated by industrial acreage, defeating the intent of the current Comprehensive Plan. The county should wait to change the plan until after the completion of CP-16 so they have more information on which to base their decision. Rural/farmlands need to be protected for future generations and valued for their contributions as carbon sinks in our battle against climate change. Save our rural land.

Time: October 6, 2021 at 4:08 pm
IP Address: 172.242.242.68
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Please! We need farmland and big warehouses destroy our rural communities
Andrew Boughan

From: Philip Pearson <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 10:27 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Philip Pearson
Email: philip_pearson@yahoo.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 5:27 pm
IP Address: 73.254.139.30
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: David and Katherine Seiler <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 10:43 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: David and Katherine Seiler

Email: kndseiler@gmail.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County should not enact such far-reaching re-zoning as the result of the request of a single development company. To make well-considered changes to the Comprehensive Plan, County Commissioners should ask for a study to discover the need (if any) to locate more warehousing in rural areas. Thurston County does not need to convert farmland to warehouses and manufacturing. The 2021 Buildable Lands Report shows that we have more than double the amount of industrial land needed for the next twenty years – within the Urban Growth Boundaries of our cities.
Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.
Thurston County should wait to change the Comprehensive Plan until after the completion of CP – 16, the county’s community review of agricultural policies and programs. This group is researching soils maps and other sources to identify additional ways to protect agricultural lands prioritized for conservation. Their recommendations will be published later this year and in 2022.

Time: October 6, 2021 at 5:42 pm
IP Address: 174.246.51.207
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
From: Margaret Morgan <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 10:54 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Margaret Morgan

Email: pegmrg3@aol.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment:

Time: October 6, 2021 at 5:54 pm
IP Address: 67.168.83.240
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Andrew Boughan

From: Peggy Clifford <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 11:09 AM
To: Andrew Boughan
Subject: [] Comment on the Up Castle Land Use & Rezone Amendment

Name: Peggy Clifford

Email: pegoly@aol.com

Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County should wait to change the Comprehensive Plan until after the completion of CP – 16, the county’s community review of agricultural policies and programs. This group is researching soils maps and other sources to identify additional ways to protect agricultural lands prioritized for conservation. Their recommendations will be published later this year and in 2022.

Time: October 6, 2021 at 6:09 pm
IP Address: 24.18.99.150
Contact Form URL: https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-up-castle-land-use-rezone-amendment/

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: This "plan amendment" would undermine if not completely eliminate what the Growth Management Act was designed to do, i.e., prevent paving over Western Washington. I do not support the amendment and would encourage you good folks to deny the amendment. It's simply a green light to allow another Kent Valley, Hawks Prairie commercial development in Thurston County in a rural farmland zone. Thank you for allowing me to comment.
Do you support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment?: I do not support the Up Castle Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal.

Comment: Thurston County should preserve the values and vision of the current Comprehensive Plan. That plan follows the Growth Management Act in prioritizing preservation of agricultural land and of the rural character of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.