From: Doug Karman

Re: Comprehensive Plan Comments Chapter 1 - 10

Following are my comments on the Comprehensive Plan. I have included my questions that I do not feel were resolved previously.

1. **Chapter 2:** I do not see goals & policies to establish economic Commercial/Industrial zones outside the Urban Growth areas. There is some reference to map M-4 but I couldn't find it. Without these areas defined we will constantly run into problems with citizens objecting when a zoning change is requested and transportation is not well thought out. Access to rail and I-5 is critical for these businesses vs the small convenience store commercial businesses. There will be expansion of commercial/industrial areas in the County. There is no room for them in most of the Urban growth areas. Also, these zones should be spread around to create employment opportunities for our current and future citizens. If it is not in the scope for this revision, I recommend that the Board add this to their docket for 2020.

2. **Chapter 4:**
   a. Table 4-2 Residential Land Supply/Demand: I do not see a column to take "Factor" into account. How much of this land is unavailable because the owner is a farmer or is held in trust or something? Also, how much of this land is not available because of natural areas, stormwater ponds and community parks required by the County when the project is put through the process of getting approval.
   b. When we significantly limit the available buildable land as we have done in Thurston County the cost of land goes up based on the law of supply and demand. We need to find a way to make more land available to keep land values down.
   c. What assurances do we give that the County won't price housing out of the reach of those families with 50% or less of median income? Regulations, permits, impact fees etc are a significant percent of the cost of new construction. We should have a goal set to not exceed a certain % of the development cost. Personally, I think putting a house on 5000 sq ft or less parcels so large parks and preserves can be included is going in the wrong direction. Safety for children is a growing concern and they are much safer in their own back yards. While this is primarily in the Urban Growth Areas, if we jump from 9 per acre to 1 per 5 acres outside the UGA it is a large jump.
   d. I question the values in table 4-6. Why don't we have values for 2000 adjusted for inflation. What about 2010 with adjustment? We should be able to figure this out. These numbers should be from Thurston County data not national data.
   e. Page 12 "allows a wide range of housing types": Does the County allow or just tolerate Homeless Encampments? Shouldn't we include the "homeless" in a discussion in the Comp Plan? Setting some goals and policies? Shouldn't we break out the homeless issue into its various segments so they can be addressed appropriately? Homeless due to lack of employment or mental illness or chemical dependency, etc. Housing means something different for each of these causes. The plan does address "Special Needs" but states we are
inadequate. Goal 3 attempts to address the requirements of "Special Needs Population" however, it does not separate out the different types of needs and how we are going to address each. A general that recognizes these differences and sets a policy/strategy to address them would be a great addition.

3. **Chapter 5**: General comment...Without establishing Commercial/Industrial sites in rural Thurston County it is difficult for this chapter to address actual needs and provide for an adequate transportation plan and road set asides. It also contributes to citizen frustration and militancy. When you combine this with what I feel is lacking in chapter 8, Economic Development, I have a problem. Following are my previous comments on chapter 5:
   a. I appreciate the work that was done to get answers from the Dept of Public Works for the questions raised in the work session. I too went to public works to find answers to my questions. Those answers gave me confidence that other groups have an eye for the questions I asked. However, the Comp Plan is supposed to be an overriding document that sets the goals and policies for these same organizations to work from/toward. Therefore, I still have questions as to why certain concepts are left out of the Comp plan. There should be a goal in the Comp Plan that encourages looking into:

b. There should be a **goal** in the Comp Plan that encourages looking into:
   i. Improving rapid transit and the impact of increased movement north or south for employment. What about provisions and set asides for expanding commuter rail into Thurston County? Where are the future park and rides, etc?
   ii. We should not leave it up to South Sound Transit to determine when they want to put in a bus turn out. The Comp Plan should give guidance on this so safety is maintained as well as right of ways purchased/provided for. South Sound Transit and the Dept of Transportation claims that it is safer if the bus holds up and delays traffic. I would put forward a theory that it actual reduces safety as drivers become frustrated and try to pass unsafely or are disturbed after getting around a bus and then takes it out on another driver. The logic for school busses is totally different. I suspect it is more a factor of cost and keeping busses on time than on safety.
   iii. I note that in Map T10 that the Rural Strategy Corridors have many roads that exceed adopted LOS standards. Where do we say in the Comp Plan that this must be accounted for and a plan developed to meet the LOS standards?

4. **Chapter 7** – I would like to see a goal and policy for putting utilities underground. The utilities have a pole replacement policy and putting wires underground rather than replacing the pole makes financial, power continuity, safety and aesthetic sense.

5. **Chapter 8**: Looking out to the future, 10 to 20 years down the road I am uncomfortable with some of the plans contained in this section. Some concerns are a combination of chapter 5 and 8.
   a. I do not have a sense that we have addressed the actual number of families/individuals who live in Thurston County and commute north or south for employment.
   b. I do not have a sense that we have addressed purchasing preference shifts from big box stores or even smaller stores to online shopping. Even if we assume that some of the online shopping products are provided by local retailers/home businesses the Comp plan does not address this. On line shopping is here and will grow significantly over the next 10 - 15
years. What will that do to the sales tax revenue, what about property taxes etc on the retail locations as well as other considerations. While the Comp Plan is not intended to answer these questions, it should direct someone to do it.

c. **Table 8-1:** This table does not include those workers who go north or south for employment and live in Thurston County. They live, spend and pay taxes in Thurston County. Therefore, they should be accounted for. Perhaps add a category for employed out of county.

d. **Gross Regional Product by Sector bar graph.** Public Administration, which I assume is government, does not produce GRP. Including government in this graph distorts the impact of the other industries that do produce GRP. Government’s relationship to other businesses as it relates to employment is shown in Table 8-1. Does Table 8-5 include Government? As stated above Gov’t should not be included.

e. **Employment and Income Trends:** This section suggests we are becoming a bedroom community. Is this a result of our focus on farming at the expense of recruiting job producing industries?

f. **Table 8-10** tells me that 99.6% of households are dual income households with .2 to .4% being unpaid family workers. If I understand this correctly, that really is important and should be emphasized as it impacts a lot of areas covered within the Comp Plan.

g. **Economic Development Opportunities:** Why have we left out high tech as a target industry?

h. **Under Goals, Objectives and Policies:** What about reducing regulations and simplifying processes? "Being business friendly" was removed from the introduction. Government and Government regulations are the number one cause of inflation.

6. **Chapter 9 - Environment Recreation and Open Space:**

a. **Water Resources 5th paragraph** on water quality testing: Water quality covers a lot more aspects than just nutrient loading, acidity, temperature and oxygen. There is also a pollutant component as mentioned in paragraph 4. However, most testing being performed by the Thurston County Health Dept does not include pollutants such as PCB's. The DFW does test fish for PCB contamination once in a while. Only when the Shellfish industry gets shut down for E. coli contamination do we test for other pollutants. Shouldn't we also talk about pollutants in this general testing statement and have a goal to expand regular testing for these pollutants in our waters?

b. **OBJECTIVE 3, POLICY 4:** Why are we removing the SMP and only referring to the Act? In Thurston County the SMP will be the guiding document.

c. **H. AIR QUALITY:** I realize this is not the economics chapter, however, shouldn't we put in a policy to encourage low greenhouse gas producing industries?

From: Don DeHan

TC Comp Plan Intro, 6. Property Rights. Is there, or should there be any compensation to property owners that are negatively impacted by a land use change?
Hi Polly, Could you send this email below to the Planning Commissioners:

Hello Planning Commissioners:

Working drafts for the Planning Commission Recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan Update are now available online at [www.Thurston2040.com](http://www.Thurston2040.com). Please send any follow-up questions to me by e-mail, or bring your discussion items to the August 7, 2019 PC meeting.

The following chapters have had changes since the July 10, 2019 public hearing, and are flagged with comment noting the change in the redline drafts:

- **Chapter 3**
  - USDA ag census updated to 2017 (3-3 to 3-5 redline/clean)
  - Fee Simple Purchase/conservation tools update (3-8 redline, 3-7 clean)
  - Goal 1, Objective A, Policy 7 adjusted (3-29 redline, 3-26 clean)

- **Chapter 8**
  - USDA ag census updated to 2017 (8-16 to 8-20 redline, 8-10 to 8-14 clean)

- **Chapter 9**
  - New Climate Change policy – Goal 6, Objective 1, Policy 6 (9-40 redline, 9-25 clean)
  - Climate Change data updated (9-15 redline, 9-10 clean)
  - VSP info added/conservation tools update (9-18 redline, 9-12 clean)
  - Date citation for open space (9-17 redline, 9-12 clean)

Sincerely,

_Maya Teeple_

*Associate Planner*

Community Planning & Economic Development | Thurston County

360.786.5578 | [www.thurstonplanning.org](http://www.thurstonplanning.org)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Thurston County Planning Commission

FROM: Maya Teeple, Associate Planner

DATE: August 7, 2019

SUBJECT: Responses to Questions Received on the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update

Please find attached questions that Community Planning staff received from Planning Commissioners regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update, and staff responses to those questions.

Attachment A: Planning Commissioner Karman’s Questions and Answers
Attachment B: Planning Commissioner DeHan’s Questions and Answers
Attachment C: May 15, 2019 Memorandum to the Planning Commission
August 7, 2019

To: Planning Commissioner Doug Karman

CC: Planning Commission

From: Maya Teeple, Associate Planner
       Community Planning

Re: Response to Commissioner Karman’s Comprehensive Plan Comments Chapter 1 - 10

Below are Community Planning responses to comments received on the Comprehensive Plan. The original question is in **bold**, and response in plain text.

**Chapter 2:**

1. *I do not see goals & policies to establish economic Commercial/Industrial zones outside the Urban Growth areas. There is some reference to map M-4 but I couldn't find it. Without these areas defined we will constantly run into problems with citizens objecting when a zoning change is requested and transportation is not well thought out. Access to rail and I-5 is critical for these businesses’ vs the small convenience store commercial businesses. There will be expansion of commercial/Industrial areas in the County. There is no room for them in most of the Urban growth areas. Also, these zones should be spread around to create employment opportunities for our current and future citizens. If it is not in the scope for this revision, I recommend that the Board add this to their docket for 2020.*

State law, the Comprehensive Plan and County-Wide Planning Policies generally encourage that major commercial and industrial zones to be siting inside of Urban Growth Areas. Commercial and industrial development in rural areas is limited by the Growth Management Act to small-scale uses that serve rural area residents. The TRPC Buildable Lands Program found there is sufficient commercial and industrial land to accommodate growth for the next 20 years. As growth continues, the county will continue to work with TRPC to assess commercial and industrial supply and adjust course as necessary (page 8-19 clean, PC Recommendation Working Draft).

An in-depth review of industrial/commercial siting, and policy language regarding siting in rural areas is not part of the Scope of Work for the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update. If a new industrial/commercial site were to be considered, it would be evaluated with the policy language in Chapter 2, the land use designations, and state law.

- Per the Comprehensive Plan, “rural areas are characterized by a balance between the natural environment and human uses with low density. Commercial uses will be small in scale and will provide convenience services to the rural neighborhood. Industrial uses will generally be those...
that are related to and dependent on natural resources...” (page 2-11 clean, PC Recommendation Version).

- Typically, industrial and commercial development should be sited and designated within the urban growth areas. According to state law (WAC 365-196-310), other criteria should also be considered, such as rail access, highway access, parcel size, access to utility line, and more. There is a special process to site major industrial developments outside of urban growth areas (WAC 365-196-465). The County Comprehensive Plan includes goals/objectives (goal 2, objective C) that encourage concentration of these uses in UGAs.

- **County Wide-Planning-Policies** must include consideration of the future development of commercial and industrial facilities (WAC 36.70A.210(3)(g)). These Policies are listed at the beginning of chapters – Chapter 8 specifically includes CWPP’s that speak to industrial development.

I could not find any reference to Map M-4 in the updated Comprehensive Plan. There is a reference to Map M-43, which is the designated mineral lands map. This map is a continuing item of the Comprehensive Plan and will be revisited at a later time.

### Chapter 4:

#### 2. Table 4-2 Residential Land Supply/Demand: I do not see a column to take "Factor" into account. How much of this land is unavailable because the owner is a farmer or is held in trust or something? Also, how much of this land is not available because of natural areas, stormwater ponds and community parks required by the County when the project is put through the process of getting approval.

Table 4-2 specifically talks about Thurston County Housing Units by Indicators of Substandard Conditions (page 4-12, clean version, PC Recommendation Working Draft). The old version of Chapter 4, Table 2 (updated 2010) is now simplified into pie charts (Figures 4-3 and 4-3, pages 4-7 and 4-8 clean version, PC Recommendation Working Draft). The supply and demand data in these pie charts is from the TRPC Buildable Lands Report, 2014.

The TRPC Buildable Lands Report measures land by first taking an inventory of all the land, buildings, and other types of uses on the ground. Land is categorized into a number of categories (water bodies; parks, preserves, and open space; natural resources; undeveloped land; etc.), and then a series of assumptions are applied to determine how and if that land can be developed in the future.

Environmentally sensitive areas are not included in the available land supply. Additionally, a factor is applied to the land supply to take into account what amount of land is not expected to be available for development over the planning period. This takes into account that not all property owners will be willing to sell or develop their land (TRPC Buildable Lands Report, 2014 page 36). For Thurston County, that factor is between 10% and 25%.
Community Planning Staff reached out to TRPC regarding how conservation easements and trust lands are considered. The following response was received:

"We consider both situations in the analysis. For lands in trust, we work with the conservation trusts to identify parcels and take them out of the inventory. We also look at owner name to try to identify other trusts that we don’t necessarily know about. We do consider easements, but generally they are on the undevelopable portions of a parcel (ie critical areas or buffers), and we take care not to double count. If the easement covers the entire parcel we would take it out."

3. When we significantly limit the available buildable land as we have done in Thurston County the cost of land goes up based on the law of supply and demand. We need to find a way to make more land available to keep land values down.

Please refer to the TRPC Buildable Lands Report (2014) and Commerce’s information on the Buildable Lands Program for more information on this process.

4. What assurances do we give that the County won’t price housing out of the reach of those families with 50% or less of median income? Regulations, permits, impact fees etc are a significant percent of the cost of new construction. We should have a goal set to not exceed a certain % of the development cost. Personally, I think putting a house on 5000 sq ft or less parcels so large parks and preserves can be included is going in the wrong direction. Safety for children is a growing concern and they are much safer in their own back yards. While this is primarily in the Urban Growth Areas, if we jump from 9 per acre to 1 per 5 acres outside the UGA it is a large jump.

The Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update includes a large focus on affordable housing. Affordable housing is discussed in greatest detail in Chapter 4 – Housing, but is also included in Chapter 8 – Economic Development, and Chapter 2 – Land Use.

Without affordable housing policies, regulations, and programs, the price of homes will continue to rise (in the existing economic climate). Permits/fees are usually 5-10% of the project cost. Overwhelmingly, the value of the land and the cost of construction labor, contribute more to the price of housing.

5. I question the values in table 4-6. Why don’t we have values for 2000 adjusted for inflation. What about 2010 with adjustment? We should be able to figure this out. These numbers should be from Thurston County data not national data.
Table 4-6 regarding Housing Cost Comparison has been removed from Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update. This has been reflected since the September 2018 staff draft was released, and is reflected in all drafts since, including the Chapter 4 PC Recommendation Working Draft.

6. Page 12 "allows a wide range of housing types": Does the County allow or just tolerate Homeless Encampments? Shouldn't we include the "homeless" in a discussion in the Comp Plan? Setting some goals and policies? Shouldn't we break out the homeless issue into its various segments so they can be addressed appropriately? Homeless due to lack of employment or mental illness or chemical dependency, etc. Housing means something different for each of these causes. The plan does address "Special Needs" but states we are inadequate. Goal 3 attempts to address the requirements of "Special Needs Population" However, it does not separate out the different types of needs and how we are going to address each. A general that recognizes these differences and sets a policy/strategy to address them would be a great addition.

Housing Diversity is discussed in Part V., page 4-17 clean version of the PC Recommendation Working Draft. There has been substantial additions to Chapter 4, Part IV. Section B. "Homelessness and special needs housing" (pages 4-13 to 4-17, clean version, PC Recommendation Working Draft).

Chapter 5:

7. General comment...Without establishing Commercial/Industrial sites in rural Thurston County it is difficult for this chapter to address actual needs and provide for an adequate transportation plan and road set asides. It also contributes to citizen frustration and militancy. When you combine this with what I feel is lacking in chapter 8, Economic Development, I have a problem. Following are my previous comments on chapter 5:

These comments were addressed in a previous memo to the Planning Commission for the May 15, 2019 meeting, and discussed at the meeting. Please refer to that memorandum for responses to those questions: https://www.thurstoncountywa.gov/planning/planningca/CompPlan%20PCMemo_05152019.pdf

You can also listen to the audio of the meeting online by scrolling down to the May 15, 2019 date, in the right hand column, at: https://www.thurstoncountywa.gov/planning/Pages/pc-meetings.aspx

8. I appreciate the work that was done to get answers from the Dept of Public Works for the questions raised in the work session. I too went to public works to find answers to my questions. Those answers gave me confidence that other groups have an eye for the questions I asked. However, the Comp Plan is supposed to be an overriding document that sets the goals and policies for these same organizations to work from/toward. Therefore, I still have questions as to
why certain concepts are left out of the Comp plan. There should be a goal in the Comp Plan that encourages looking into:

9. There should be a goal in the Comp Plan that encourages looking into:
   a. Improving rapid transit and the impact of increased movement north or south for employment. What about provisions and set asides for expanding commuter rail into Thurston County? Where are the future park and rides, etc?
   b. We should not leave it up to South Sound Transit to determine when they want to put in a bus turn out. The Comp Plan should give guidance on this so safety is maintained as well as right of ways purchased/provided for. South Sound Transit and the Dept of Transportation claims that it is safer if the bus holds up and delays traffic. I would put forward a theory that it actual reduces safety as drivers become frustrated and try to pass unsafely or are disturbed after getting around a bus and then takes it out on another driver. The logic for school busses is totally different. I suspect it is more a factor of cost and keeping busses on time than on safety.
   c. I note that in Map T10 that the Rural Strategy Corridors have many roads that exceed adopted LOS standards. Where do we say in the Comp Plan that this must be accounted for and a plan developed to meet the LOS standards?

Chapter 7:

10. I would like to see a goal and policy for putting utilities underground. The utilities have a pole replacement policy and putting wires underground rather than replacing the pole makes financial, power continuity, safety and aesthetic sense.

This would be addressed by public works planning and major utility providers. Puget Sound Energy (PSE) does currently have underground cable in Thurston County. Over half of the mileage is underground cable (1,883 miles underground; 1,332 miles overhead – page 7-4 clean, PC Recommendation Working Draft). A replacement requirement would be a development regulation change. Puget Sound Energy has guidelines on the type of service (underground or overhead) is provided; not all types of service are available in all areas.

Chapter 8:

11. Looking out to the future, 10 to 20 years down the road I am uncomfortable with some of the plans contained in this section. Some concerns are a combination of chapter 5 and 8.
   a. I do not have a sense that we have addressed the actual number of families/individuals who live in Thurston County and commute north or south for employment.

A deep-dive analysis would be required to address this comment. It is beyond the scope of work for the comprehensive plan periodic update.
12. I do not have a sense that we have addressed purchasing preference shift from big box stores or even smaller stores to online shopping. Even if we assume that some of the online shopping products are provided by local retailers/home businesses the Comp plan does not address this. Online shopping is here and will grow significantly over the next 10 - 15 years. What will that do to the sales tax revenue, what about property taxes etc on the retail locations as well as other considerations. While the Comp Plan is not intended to answer these questions, it should direct someone to do it.

This language was changed and is reflected in the PC Recommendation Working Draft (August 2019). It was addressed in a memorandum to the Planning Commission for the May 15, 2019 meeting, and discussed at the meeting.

13. Table 8-1: This table does not include those workers who go north or south for employment and live in Thurston County. They live, spend and pay taxes in Thurston County. Therefore, they should be accounted for. Perhaps add a category for employed out of county.

A deep-dive analysis would be required to address this comment. It is beyond the scope of work for the comprehensive plan periodic update.

14. Gross Regional Product by sector bar graph. Public Administration, which I assume is government, does not produce GRP. Including government in this graph distorts the impact of the other industries that do produce GRP. Government’s relationship to other businesses as it relates to employment is shown in Table 8-1. Does Table 8-5 include Government? As stated above Gov’t should not be included.

The wages paid to government workers are spent at other industries and businesses and thus contribute to the regional economy. This discussion was held at the May 15, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

15. Employment and Income Trends: This section suggests we are becoming a bedroom community. Is this a result of our focus on farming at the expense of recruiting job producing industries?

There is a trend towards a bedroom community. No, it was not caused by focusing on farming. Tacoma and Seattle Metro areas have many jobs and high housing costs, so some people choose to live in Thurston County. This discussion was held at the May 15, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.
16. Table 8-10 tells me that 99.6% of households are dual income households with .2 to .4% being unpaid family workers. If I understand this correctly, that really is important and should be emphasized as it impacts a lot of areas covered within the Comp Plan.

This chart does not address dual/single income households. This was addressed at the Planning Commission meeting on May 15, 2019.

17. Economic Development Opportunities: Why have we left out high tech as a target industry?

High tech is identified in Part IV, Future Economic Activities, Section C. Economic Development Opportunities (pages 8-22 to 8-27, PC Recommendation Working Draft, August 2019). This was addressed at the Planning Commission meeting on May 15, 2019.

18. Under Goals, Objectives and Policies: What about reducing regulations and simplifying processes?

"Being business friendly" was removed from the introduction. Government and Government regulations are the number one cause of inflation.

This was addressed in Goal 1, Objective B, Policy 4 (page 8-29, PC Recommendation Working Draft, August 2019).

Chapter 9:

19. Chapter 9 - Environment Recreation and Open Space:

a. Water Resources 5th paragraph on water quality testing: Water quality covers a lot more aspects than just nutrient loading, acidity, temperature and oxygen. There is also a pollutant component as mentioned in paragraph 4. However, most testing being performed by the Thurston County Health Dept does not include pollutants such as PCB's. The DFW does test fish for PCB contamination once in a while. Only when the Shellfish industry gets shut down for E. coli contamination do we test for other pollutants. Shouldn't we also talk about pollutants in this general testing statement and have a goal to expand regular testing for these pollutants in our waters?

Additional language was added in the Chapter. This was discussed in a memorandum to the Planning Commission for the May 15, 2019 meeting and a discussion had at that meeting.

b. OBJECTIVE 3, POLICY 4: Why are we removing the SMP and only referring to the Act? In Thurston County the SMP will be the guiding document.

The Shoreline Master Program is referenced in Chapter 3 and Appendix C.
c. **H. AIR QUALITY:** I realize this is not the economics chapter, however, shouldn't we put in a policy to encourage low greenhouse gas producing industries?

Policies addressing greenhouse gases are primarily located under Goal 6. There are currently policies included within the chapter that state the County should promote energy efficiency in businesses (Goal 6, Objective 1, Policy 1), and promote renewable energy in businesses (Goal 6, Objective 1, Policy 3).

Additional language was added in the Chapter. This was discussed in a **memorandum to the Planning Commission for the May 15, 2019** meeting and a discussion had at that meeting.
August 7, 2019

To: Planning Commissioner Don DeHan

CC: Planning Commission

From: Maya Teeple, Associate Planner
Community Planning

Re: Response to Commissioner DeHan’s Comprehensive Plan Comments

Below are Community Planning responses to comments received on the Comprehensive Plan. The original question is in **bold**, and response in plain text.

1. **TC Comp Plan Intro, 6. Property Rights.** Is there, or should there be any compensation to property owners that are negatively impacted by a land use change?

   This statement on property rights (Chapter 1, page 1-3 clean version, PC Recommendation Working Draft Aug 2019), along with the other 13 identified, is a goal directly from the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.020).

   Some policies throughout the Comprehensive Plan directly link to minimizing negative impacts on adjacent land uses and property owners.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Thurston County Planning Commission

FROM: Maya Teeple, Associate Planner
        Ian Lefcourte, Associate Planner

DATE: May 15, 2019

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Update: Follow-Up Items

Requested Changes and Follow-Up from the Planning Commission

Chapter 5 – Transportation
Below is a summary of follow-up comments and questions received regarding Chapter 5 – Transportation.

1. There should be a goal in the Comprehensive Plan that encourages the County to further investigate:
   a. The impact on traffic, safety, and roadway needs of driverless vehicles; and
   b. Improving rapid transit and increased movement north or south for employment, such as expanding commuter rail into Thurston County.

Staff has included an action item (currently housed outside of the Comprehensive Plan) to review the impact of new transportation technologies, including driverless vehicles, as information becomes available from the state.

Transit options for north-south commuter traffic is addressed in policies within Chapter 5. Under policy T.3B.1, there is policy language that encourages support of transit options appropriate to existing and future land use, including rail. Goal 6, Objective 6B has several policies around expansion of existing rail system to improve passenger travel, including T.6B.4 which specifies to support efforts of in the region for a commuter rail connection. The County also encourages
non-rapid transit options, such as a connected north-south shared use trail corridor (Policy T.3E.3).

2. The Comprehensive Plan should give guidance on bus turnouts so that safety is maintained as well as right of ways are purchased/provided for.

Staff previously requested information on bus turnouts from Thurston County Public Works. In previous correspondence with public works, they stated Intercity Transit determines when a bus turnout should be installed. One location where Intercity Transit provides guidance on in-lane and pull-out bus stops is their “Short and Long-Range Transit Plan” (page 12-8, October 2018)¹.

3. Map T-10 shows that Rural Strategy Corridors have many roads that exceed adopted LOS standards. Where in the Comprehensive Plan do we say that this must be accounted for and a plan developed to meet LOS standards?

Rural Strategy Corridors (Map T-9) are defined within the Comprehensive Plan as areas where the adopted LOS standard may be exceeded (page 5-16, redline). Rural Strategy Corridors include areas such as Old Highway 99, South Bay Road and Rainier Road, where roads are built out at two travel lanes and paved shoulders. In these areas, road widening is typically not an option and alternatives such as intersection improvements, connections to trails, and transit services are needed to mitigate congestion. Map T-10 identifies areas within the unincorporated county where routes are projected to exceed the 2040 Level of Service projections. This includes areas such as Old Highway 99 and SR510.

Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan currently states under bullet number 6 that “all known improvements needed to provide for capacity at adopted LOS standards are included in the CFP” (page 5-6, redline). The CFP is currently Chapter 6 of the Comprehensive Plan, with the six-year financing program now referred to as the Capital Improvement Program (Appendix G). A 20-year capacity projects list exists in the Transportation Improvement Program. The Regional Transportation Plan serves as the basis for city and county Comprehensive Plans, and also contains goals around alternative strategies to reduce congestion on Strategy Corridors.

**Chapter 8 – Economic Development**

On May 1, 2019, Community Planning and Economic Development Staff presented a draft of the changes to policy language from the Economic Development Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 8). The Planning Commission provided feedback and directed staff to make minor changes to the policy language. Staff has changed the policy language to the following:

---

Thurston County Planning Commission, May 15, 2019
Comprehensive Plan Update – Follow Up Items

- **Goal 1, Objective D, Policy 7** - The county should support land use regulations and land use designations that serve and/or add value (such as cold storage, lumber mills, hay distributors, etc.) to the rural economy (especially for agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting).

Planning Commissioner Karman provided written feedback for a variety of topics related to the comprehensive plan, including the economic development chapter. The questions were incorporated into the chapter where appropriate. Generally, the questions required slightly more citation/data, or were already addressed in the chapter. The chapter was updated with more emphasis, content, and citations for the changing retail landscape (big box stores, online retailers, down-towns, etc.).

*Chapter 9 – Environment, Recreation and Open Space*

At the May 1, 2019, the Planning Commission recommended additional clarification to what a “process and fugitive” means within Table 9-1. Staff revised the language in the footnote to provide clarification for what a “process and fugitive” may include.

Several members of the Planning Commission expressed concerns over using the term “balance” in the language, specifically within the 2019 critical issues section. Staff revised the language under the 2019 critical issues to remove the word “balance” for all chapters to which this applies, with the intent to better reflect the planning goals under RCW 36.70A.020.

A number of additional comments and questions were raised on Chapter 9 prior to the May 1, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. The following adjustments to Chapter 9 language were made based on those comments:

- Additional language on general pollutants has been added to language within Chapter 9 water quality section. Further information on anthropogenic sources of pollution (nutrients, fecal coliform, PCBs) is discussed within Chapter 11 - Health.
- Additional language has been added to the water quality section to emphasize climate change impacts to stormwater runoff.
- A footnote has been added to Table 9-1 to define “MTCDE”. The Table on Greenhouse Gas Emissions is directly from the Thurston Climate Action Team (2017).
- Language has been revised in the ‘Section V. Parks, Trails, and Open Space’ bullets to provide clarity to “living healthy lifestyles”.
- Additional language has been added to ‘B. County Parks, Trails and Open Spaces’ to identify the need for sustainable funding to maintain existing parks, as well as new. This is also identified as one of the parks goals within the chapter.

Other questions were received regarding Chapter 9, and below is a follow up on that information:

- There was a request for inclusion of more information on source pollution and septic systems contributing back to the aquifer. Source pollution, specifically as it relates to on-site sewage, including within the Nisqually and Henderson inlets, is discussed in more
detail in Chapter 11 – Health. Septic systems contribution back into the aquifer is also discussed in more detail in Chapter 11 – Health.

- Lake St. Clair is included under the minimum instream flow rule per WAC 173-511. This lake has varied in precipitation both seasonally and long-term per records dating back to 1988. An instream flow rule could be set based on the aquifer connected to the water body, and not solely based on the level of water in the lake. In addition, instream flow rules are determined by the Department of Ecology, with changes to the rules possible during the watershed planning efforts through RCW 90.94.

- Policies addressing greenhouse gases are primarily located under Goal 6. There are currently policies included within the chapter that state the County should promote energy efficiency in businesses (Goal 6, Objective 1, Policy 1), and promote renewable energy in businesses (Goal 6, Objective 1, Policy 3).

Decision Points

- Consider whether the updated changes are clear and sufficiently describe and capture the community’s interests, within the scope of the periodic update.