**Thurston County Mineral Resource Lands**  
**Draft Designation Options Public Hearing**  
**March 7, 2018**

The summary provided is intended to capture the main points of a public comment and is not intended to be a verbatim representation of the comment. Please see the referenced comment for the full public comment. If a comment is not listed, but was submitted as part of the record, please contact Thurston County staff as soon as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1              | David Lindeblom           | (Feb. 17, 2018) Opposed to the prohibition against selling minerals. Please place statement in law allowing a private landowner to sell basement spoils if they wish to do so. Incidental mineral discoveries on a small scale (< 1 acre) should be allowed on a limited basis. Opposed to government of any kind proposing limits of personal freedoms.  
(March 5, 2018) The easy way out is to declare the entire county as designated mineral lands based on geology. There is a huge amount of gravel that is not on your maps. Establish a guideline for anybody to sell from their acreages when they have a surplus. I am told that I cannot sell my sand and sandy loam and have to spread it on top of my own land, yet others tell me this is a high quality product golf courses would be interested in. Why can’t I sell this? Don’t limit operations without due process. | This update does not restrict in any way the sale of mineral resources; it determines which areas commercial mining may seek a permit. Not all mining requires a permit; for example mining for a personal driveway or to maintain a forest road. This update would increase the areas eligible to apply for a permit. |
| 2              | Michelle & James Brigham  | Concerned with new draft options. Why is their parcel and neighboring parcel designated, when both parcels have wetland buffer. Surrounding areas that are designated are otherwise undevelopable. Pollutants would run into Wheeler Creek and the Nisqually River.  
Requested current Mineral Lands designation map.                                                                                                                                                                                | Responded to Michelle. Designation does not mean permitting. This process serves to identify which properties have minerals of long-term commercial significance. Some areas may be excluded based on criteria available. Some criteria is better addressed at the permit scale. Provided links to current map M-43 and options under consideration. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cornelia O’Leary</td>
<td>The following should be considered: 1) All minerals mined from Thurston County MRL can only be sold/used within the county; 2) seems to protect prospective permit holders, and provide little protection to local residents; 3) 1,000 foot distance is insufficient to protect from noise, health and property impacts; 4) presence of critical areas on site; 5) provide resource use notice; 6) 20.30B.010 minimization of conflict with surrounding land use; 7) minimum 5 acres parcel size; 8) review of critical areas; 9) mineral lands shall not include habitats of threatened or endangered species – with gopher habitat removed is there much left?; 10) no negative impact on surface or ground water; 11) 20.30B.010 uses “shall” or “must” whereas same requirements in comprehensive plan state “may”</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lance Rahey</td>
<td>Put the welfare and safety of people first ahead of business interest and activities. Exceed the minimum requirements to keep commercial mining activities away from residential areas.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grace Kronenberg</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long-term agriculture as mineral lands.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurston League of Women Voters</td>
<td>Long Term Agriculture is too precious to co-designate. A 14% loss of LTA for a 1.6% gain in Mineral lands designation is a severe cut to farmland. Reclamation of LTA after mining is lengthy and expensive, and might not result in viable farmland. Farmland is necessary for increased population too.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Walter Jorgensen</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long term agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lee Riner</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long term agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maureen Canny</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long term agricultural lands. Thurston County is gravel rich, meaning we have much more than is needed for the County. We should not become an exporter of resources that will degrade our ecosystems, landscapes and infrastructure. Please protect areas identified as “critical” areas. Please include County regulations so that permit seekers have to abide by all the rules for a sustainable future.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Phyllis Farrell</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long term agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Carol Gross</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long term agricultural lands. Reclamation is lengthy and expensive.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Julie Frick</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long term agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Melanie Boots</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long term agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nancy Rogers, Cairncross on behalf of Segale Properties</td>
<td>Recommends Draft Map Option #1. This option designates the entire 594 acre parcel known as the Segale Gravel Mine. In 2012, the County issued a formal determination that the entire parcel is a legal non-conforming mineral extraction site (copies enclosed). Because the site is legal non-conforming, any permitting for expansion of this mine will be conducted to DNR, including environmental review. The County will be able to provide comments at time of permitting. (March 7, 2018) The Planning Commission must recommend adoption of 1A, or give direction to County staff to do additional work and bring back additional options for review. Only map 1A meetings state law requirements. On the June 15, 2017 memo to the Planning Commission, Thurston County’s MRL history is summarized. The GMHB approved the County’s designation criteria when the County removed the prohibition on co-designation of MRL with forest lands and critical areas. Therefore, proposals shown on options #2 and #3 are illegal. Next, it also violates GMA to under-designate, as shown on maps 2 and 3. To conform with state law, we ask the commission to recommend adoption of 1A.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Diane Crutcher</td>
<td>Do not co-designate long term agricultural lands. In 2006, Jeavons of Ecology Action demonstrated 75% of the planet is unable to grow food, due to oceans, urbanization, deserts, etc. Protect all existing agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dr. John Ruhland</td>
<td>Please do not designate more of Thurston County for mining. Mining causes pollution to air, groundwater, noise and traffic. Please reduce the amount of land designated for mining.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Victoria Harper-Parsonson</td>
<td>I oppose the proposed legislation to update the Mineral Lands Designation.</td>
<td>The Growth Management Act requires counties to designate mineral lands of long term commercial significance as part of their Comprehensive Plan (RCW 36.70A.170). Counties must approach designation as a county-wide process, and not review designation on a parcel-by-parcel basis (WAC 365-190-070(1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chantal Lafont</td>
<td>Concerned of the following: 1) In summary of the Plan, “May” is used rather than “shall” or “must”; 2) In view of the map for the protected gopher, is there any land left? The two plans seem to be in conflict; 3) Critical areas examined at time of designation sounds open to potential unjustified rapid changes; 4) the 1,000 foot distance is insufficient to protect from noise, health and other property impacts; 5) there is not much there to protect property rights and values from mining operations.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Iris A. Moore</td>
<td>Mining in designated areas of Thurston County is a dirty idea. Proposed areas are near water sources and wells. Has the County done an Environmental Impact Study on these areas yet?</td>
<td>Designation does not imply that mining-related activities will occur there. SEPA will be required as part of the Comprehensive Plan update. Additionally, SEPA is required at the site-level for any permit application to mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Catherine Alexander</td>
<td>Mining in residential areas does not have the best interests of the environment and the people’s safety and well-being in mind.</td>
<td>Comment Received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>George Mye Jr.</td>
<td>Bald Hills is one of the areas being considered for designation. This area is mostly residential and small farms. I am against having Bald Hills be designated for mining. Mining would contaminate our aquifer, air, decrease property value and impact quality of life.</td>
<td>Designation does not imply that mining-related activities will occur there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nancy Spain</td>
<td>I am in opposition of proposed mining in residential areas of Thurston County. The Bald Hills area is highly populated and not an appropriate place for mining.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Howard Glastetter</td>
<td>In April 2017, I attended the Mineral Lands Planning meeting. Previously, I was an alternative citizen representative on the Mineral Lands Task Force in fall of 2003. The April 19, 2017 meeting opened with a discussion of Thurston County to designate all potential mineral lands, rather than a site by site basis as is done now. This is a state requirement. This was also a discussion in 2004. Thurston County is gravel rich. During the 2017 meeting, I asked “will there be any effort by Thurston County to limit the exporting of gravel out of the County?” Mike Parsons of Black Lake Resources also commented that only 6% of gravel mined in Thurston County stays in Thurston County. There should be tight rules about impacts of mining next to contiguous property. Turbidity of wells should be considered. Mining below the water tables should be avoided as this can disturb aquifers and lower well water levels. Reclamation rules should be tight and enforced.</td>
<td>County staff followed up on these questions regarding supply and demand in their December 6, 2017 and January 17, 2018 meetings with the planning commission (<a href="#">link</a>). Importing and exporting was discussed at these meetings. Per the Surface Mining Act (<a href="#">RCW 78.44</a>) Reclamation permits are required from DNR for all surface mining operations that disturb more than 3 acres, mine slopes greater than 30 feet high, or disturb more than 1 acre in an 8 acre area. Reclamation permits differ from mine to mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Daniel Meifert, Bald Hills</td>
<td>I oppose opening the County to mining. This would degrade the quality of life.</td>
<td>The Growth Management Act requires counties to designate mineral lands of long term commercial significance as part of their Comprehensive Plan (<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.170</a>). Counties must approach designation as a county-wide process, and not review designation on a parcel-by-parcel basis (<a href="#">WAC 365-190-070(1)</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bob Metzger</td>
<td>The Plan needs to incorporate the best available information and be as realistic as possible. I strongly support a modified Option 2 Mineral Lands Designation because it considers most existing critical areas and high density residential developments. It provides the most realistic assessment of areas that might be feasible to mine under existing law and policy. Option 2 needs to be strengthened by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Excluding wetlands in the current county wetland inventory from proposed mineral designation. This was done in Option 3 but was not included in Option 2. Category 1 and 2 wetlands are designated Critical Areas under Thurston County code (20.30B.030.1.f.ii.) It makes no sense not to use the available wetland information for long-term planning at this point. There will always be an opportunity to adjust wetland delineations and boundaries at the site scale at the permit phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Excluding any areas within 1,000 feet of existing platted subdivisions from proposed mineral designation. There are numerous platted residential sub-divisions outside of the urban growth boundary that may not meet the density required for LAMIRDs. The criteria requiring at least sixty percent of the area within one thousand feet of a site must have parcels five acres in size or larger will likely address many existing residential areas, but not all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am opposed to Option 1 as it does not attempt to address residential or existing concerns. It overstates the amount and location of land that would realistically by available. I am also opposed to option 3, which considers some environmental issues, but not all. The legend for Option 3 is misleading because it infers that only mining proposals for wellhead, habitat, or wetlands would need additional review. All proposed mineral extraction activities will need additional review. Finally, Option 3 places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>the burden of proof on the County to evaluate and reject mineral developments that conflict with critical areas.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am strongly opposed to co-designated mineral lands and long-term agricultural lands. The Comprehensive Plan must set priorities and identify the best long-term use. I encourage the Planning Commission to reconsider co-designation of mineral lands and long term forestry. Rather than co-designated mineral lands and long-term forestry lands, a more realistic approach would be to include small rock pits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Norma Klinger</td>
<td>Concerned of the following: 1) In summary of the Plan, “May” is used rather than “shall” or “must”; 2) In view of the map for the protected gopher, is there any land left? The two plans seem to be in conflict; 3) Critical areas examined at time of designation sounds open to potential unjustified rapid changes; 4) the 1,000 foot distance is insufficient to protect from noise, health and other property impacts; 5) there is not much there to protect property rights and values from mining operations.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sam Merrill, Black Hills Audubon Society</td>
<td>We support Option #2 with modifications. This option would be stronger by excluding current county wetland inventory. We are not in support of co-designation of long term agricultural lands. The County has a very small portion of agricultural lands that do not need further conversion pressures. The legend of Option #3 states that some designated mineral lands “may require further review at the permit level, based on environmental or land use factors”. This statement is misleading because all designated lands will require additional environmental review for mining. We request that this information be placed on all maps to avoid any confusion that designation allows extraction activities. Staff has emphasized that all mining operations undergo review at the permit level. In reality, a citizen challenge of a mine permit is a huge endeavor requiring immediate notification, sufficient funding and time to prepare a position, legal representation and expert opinions. Additionally, the aggregate and hard rock needs of the County are much smaller than those of urban areas. Please consider and plan for the possibility of an excess of mining proposals.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Janet Ferrari</td>
<td>I urge the Planning Commission to reject any plans that would impact residential areas. I am concerned with mining impacting fresh water, rivers, wells, clean air, noise and traffic. Commercial mining would seriously threaten quality of life.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dave Lewis, Miles Sand and Gravel</td>
<td>The narrow approach (Option 2) would mostly conform to Chapter 3 of the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan, but is in conflict with WAC 365-190-040(7a) and (7b), and other GMA guidelines. The broad approach appears to be the best approach for designation. Please review GMA guidelines, the Comprehensive Plan, and TCC 20.30B. When the GMA requirements and the Thurston County codes match mapping, then proceed.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 30             | Loretta Seppanen, South of the Sound Community Farmland Trust | There are currently 16,000 acres in Thurston County designated as Long Term Agriculture. Keeping those lands in farm production is vital to the viability of farmland in the region.

Of the LTA land, 2,060 acres also have mineral resources and are being considered for co-designation. It is our recommendation that you do not co-designate agricultural land with mineral resource land. Please consider these factors that lead us to oppose co-designation of LTA and MRL:
- Co-designation of LTA as MRL gives a small gain for total mineral land acreage, but a significant removal in total amount of LTA.
- Reclamation of LTA land after mining is lengthy and expensive that may not result in viable agriculture. | Comment received. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kela Hall-Wieckert</td>
<td>Co-designation of agricultural land as mineral resource lands proves a direct threat to the conservation of agricultural lands, a stated goal in the Comprehensive Plan. Option 1A would open up 13% of the County’s LTA to mining, putting a risk at farmland. This risks to take farmland out of production for a decade or more and offers only a small increase in commercial mineral deposits, primarily of Type 3. When topsoil and subsoil are mixed during mining, the results disturb topsoil and make farming incredibly difficult. Reclamation of agricultural lands after mining would require costly additional of soil amendments and cover crops year after year with no guarantee of success. As presented by Rian Skov of DNR (1/17/2018), successful reclamation occurred in other counties such as Grant and Whatcom, with different soils and farmland uses than Thurston County.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 32             | Mary Castle, Weyerhaeuser | We recommend that the data be refined further by practical application around the quality and the location from market of the bedrock resources as required by WAC 365-190-070. The reasons for this request are:  
1. A large majority of the identified bedrock resource has not been mapped in detail and our experience in these geologic formations is that the quality and depths are highly variable. There is also opportunity for increasing the available mineral resource lands in areas where thin layers of glacial deposits cover quality bedrock not shown on current geologic mapping.  
2. Transportation and access to market from some resources located in mountainous areas are challenging topographically and inaccessible during winter months.  
Other comments include:  
1. Without simultaneous modifications to the Comprehensive Plan and Critical Areas Ordinance, the proposed mineral lands designation will not represent actual minable acreages.  
2. The least impact to surrounding communities and environment is to create a streamlined expansion of existing operations.  
3. If there is no pathway to modify the mineral designation map options currently presented, our recommendation is Option 1A. | Comment received.     |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Alex Foster</td>
<td>I am strongly opposed to co-designating mineral lands and LTA lands. Most LTA occurs along major waterways (Deschutes, Nisqually, Chehalis), and these riparian areas are used highly by wildlife. Mining near these areas will disturb many resident and migratory species. Many of the LTA areas also have priority wildlife habitat designation. For example, the land just south of Lake Lawrence is next to waterfowl concentration area. A parcel cannot be both a mine and agricultural land. Mining is a short-term use while agriculture is a long-term business committed to good stewardship to keep the land productive. Mining cannot be restored if the topsoil is lost. How will mining on LTA lands impact tax and use guidelines?</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kent Canny</td>
<td>I do not think we should designate any more gravel resources than what meetings the Counties internal requirements, plus an equal amount that could be exported. I also oppose gravel designation near sensitive farmland.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bob Jacobs</td>
<td>If any gravel mines leave behind lakes, these lakes should become public property for public recreational use.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 36             | Ryan Ransavage, Miles Sand and Gravel | The mapping proposed is based on new data from AESI, but the mineral resource overlay was language created with far less applicable data and used more specific designation criteria. The current map shows bed rock with potential economic value, but bedrock is highly variable and won’t always meet WSDOT standards. Sand and gravel have vast testing to meet standards, yet are weighted the same as hard rock for MRO designation. The initial MRO does not adequately address potential impacts with buffers. There is also no language on expansion of mines. Miles proposes the following to be addressed:  
- Map MRO using AESI’s data as the primary source for reserves,  
- Prioritize sand and gravel  
- MRO language needs to be based to include information from AESI  
- Allow for mine expansion through Reasonable Use Process | Comment received.     |
| 37             | Warren Kronenberg           | Please protect areas identified as “critical”, agricultural and residential areas from mineral lands designation.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Comment received.       |
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<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Bruce Chattin, WACA</td>
<td>Thurston County has done a good job of obtaining new information from AESI to characterize mineral resources. Staff correctly points out that the county has not been in compliance because they have only designated existing and permitted sources. The documents regularly compromise some of their own positions on broad or narrow. In the narrow option, the documents say it could “create an expectation that mineral extraction is a reasonable use of all properties in the designation”. Based on geology and as a designated property that is the correct intent to suggest. However, the documents already dispelled that notion. The narrow approach would exclude some lands “not eligible” for mining and would provide a more “realistic” estimate where mining activities would ultimately occur. One area where this makes little sense is immediately adjacent to an existing or active MRL land. We respectfully ask the commissioners to consider and adopt option #1 and #1A.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>John and Merry Whitten</td>
<td>Who decides who gets to dig what on what land? Can private property owners dig? Our concern is rock pit operations are noisy, pollute, and have no place in the small farm and rural country.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The summary provided is intended to capture the main points of a public comment and is not intended to be a verbatim representation of the comment. Please see the referenced comment for the full public comment. If a comment is not listed, but was submitted as part of the record, please contact Thurston County staff as soon as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Steve Hizel, <em>Granite Rock Company</em></td>
<td>Mineral lands options before the commissioners fail to meet state guidelines and goals (RCW 36.70A.020 and WAC 365-190-040(5)). Adopting any of the proposed options will eliminate large swaths of viable sand and gravel. The purpose of designation is to protect these resources from competing development. Designation does not remove the other permitting requirements that operations must take before mining. The planning commission must recommend option 1A to meet state law requirements of MRL.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Meryl Bernstein, Tom Rutledge, &amp; Wendy Rutledge</td>
<td>Rocky prairie is more than just a prairie. It has many sensitive species and habitat. Map 3 shows a new designation on prairie land as an area “where additional review may be needed”. This mention is not sent in stone.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thurston County Mineral Resource Lands
Draft Designation Options Public Hearing
March 7, 2018

The summary provided is intended to capture the main points of a public comment and is not intended to be a verbatim representation of the comment. Please see the referenced comment for the full public comment. If a comment is not listed, but was submitted as part of the record, please contact Thurston County staff as soon as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Christy White</td>
<td>I request that the Planning Commission reconsider Capitol Forest designated as mineral lands. 1) Reduce the Capitol Forest designation to 1/3 or less of current recommendation. 2) Implement a joint regulatory platform and restrictions with DNR management staff. 3) Environmental protections must be added in excess of current critical areas buffers. 4) Protect rural residential homes and property. 5) Planning Department staff and DNR resources must be a priority to support and protect private property from impacts of mining.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Marilyn Gregson</td>
<td>Several maps exclude areas from mining. I am concerned about the environmental impact. I remember destruction. The Earth cannot be replaced.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sue Danver</td>
<td>I support option 2 with modifications. This option would be stronger by excluding county wetlands. I do not support co-designation of agriculture. Assess long term importance of agriculture through bees, birds, food, open space, wintering grounds. I am also concerned about Lake Lawrence; options 1A and 3A would compromise LTA in this area. Additionally, I am concerned about the cumulative impact on the aquifer.</td>
<td>Comment received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maya, county commissioners, land use planners, et al

What I am opposed to is the prohibition against selling the minerals, one digs out of a basement building area and requiring it to be distributed on the property.

Could you please place a statement in your proposed law allowing a private landowner to sell basement spoils if the landowner wishes to do so.

Also, other incidental mineral discoveries on a small scale less than 1 acre, such as gold, yellow ochre, high quality sand, coal, peat, basalt, etc. (although coal and peat are not mineral, they are organic) should be allowed on a limited basis.

Now before anyone jumps to conclusions, I personally do not have all those items on any property I own.

I am aware that behind a certain church on Pacific Avenue, several acres were mined of gravel several decades ago. This was done to level the ground for a ball field for a private school and as the minerals were of value, they were sold to help pay for the project. Would this type of activity be banned under your proposed rules? I would hope not.

In general, I am opposed to government of any kind proposing any limits on personal freedoms ahead of time, not on the basis of any existing infringement on others, but by the increasing use of philosophies (philosophies include religions such as secular humanism, declared by the U.S. Supreme Court to be a religion) different than the landowner's. (Example: Dairy farm restrictions based on shellfish pollution when shellfish eating is prohibited by certain religions and their purpose is to clean up pollution, or requiring prayers by Native American traditional religious practioners at public events while excluding prayers by other religious groups which has happened in our area.)

David Lindeblom

---

**The Unusual Link Between Alzheimer's and Coconut Oil (Watch)**
Memory Repair Protocol
http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3242/5a889189aaf1f1189052d8l01vuc
The easy way out of this is to declare the entire county as mineral lands based on that everybody has geology under them and noone knows what all lies underneath everywhere. And that mineral needs vary and change. There is a huge amount of gravel that is not on your maps, also a huge amount of high quality sand and sandy loam.

Establish a guideline for anybody to sell minerals from their acreages when they have a surplus such as carving out a basement or driveway.

I am told I cannot sell my huge pile of sand and sandy loam and have to spread it on top of my own land. Yet others tell me that I have a high quality product that golf courses might be interested in. Why cannot this be sold?

My neighbor's land crosses on a slope over two different soil types.

We are not talking a high volume (commercially speaking) mining operation, just the chance discoveries or the dig outs from previously approved construction, on a limited time frame of operation.

But don't make such limited operations illegal without due process.

David Lindeblom

After Weeks Of Rumors, Joanna Gaines Comes Clean

risingstarnewspaper.com
http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3242/5a9cc83be955a483b64c3st04vuc
From: Michelle Horkings <michellehorkings@fairpoint.net>  
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 9:10 AM  
To: Maya Buhler  
Cc: Jim Brigham  
Subject: Concerns with Proposed Mineral Resource Lands in Thurston County

Dear Maya,

My husband and I have concerns about the new draft options for Mineral Resource Lands being considered by Thurston County. We would like to know why our small parcel, as well as our neighbors’ ten acres (where my husband and I have just spent $60,000 defeating their construction of a massive two-Tier unpermitted marijuana enterprise), been designated? Both properties are situated at the buffer edge of acres of wetland with a single lane easement that supposedly cannot be widened due to the wetland. Why would this location even be in consideration for mineral extraction? Adjacent neighbors to the south are not even allowed to develop the north end of their properties. All pollutants would run into Wheeler Creek and make their way across Yelm Prairie to the Nisqually River.

Could you please provide a map of the existing Mineral Resource Lands designation on the County’s website so that concerned citizens can compare what changes officials are now proposing.

Sincerely,

Michelle and James Brigham
Dear Maya Buhler,

Having read all of the relevant texts linked with your notification for this hearing - and some more. I have the following suggestions, concerns and comments which I would like to be put before the Planning Commission for deliberation of the merits and consequences:

1. Requirement to be included: All minerals mined from Thurston County Designated Mineral Resource Land can only be sold/used within and for Thurston County purposes. This way, the benefits of TC resources go to Thurston County and its residents.

2. There seems to be all consideration in this Plan to protect the prospective permits holders and any complaints/objections from affected residents and little or none to protect the local residents and their property rights/values, locale etc from the permit holders mining operations.

'Protecting these mineral deposits of long-term commercial significance for mining use is an important goal of the policies, as is preventing residential and other incompatible uses from locating adjacent to these deposits.'

3. The distance of 1,000 ft. from UGAs and RRAs required in the Plan is insufficient to protect for noise, health and property impacts and disruption due to mining at that proximity.

NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS Thurston County Comprehensive Plan Revised 01/14 3 - 16 2. Location. To qualify for a mineral resource designation, at least 60% of the area within 1,000 feet of a proposed site must be made up of parcels 5 acres in size or larger, excluding parcels owned by the applicant.

4. Designation process. The presence of critical areas on the site may prohibit or restrict mineral extraction operations.

6. Long-term commercially significant (designated) mineral deposits should be conserved for long-term resource extraction. To this end, the following measures shall be implemented: • Resource use notice shall be provided to new developments within 1,000 feet of: 1. Designated mineral lands and, Thurston County Comprehensive Plan NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS Revised 01/14 3 - 17 2. Existing mining operations outside designated mineral lands, informing prospective property owners of the long-term resource use nearby.

These measures are intended to assure that the use of lands adjacent to designated mineral lands shall not interfere with the continued use, in accordance with best management practices (BMPs), of the designated lands for mineral extraction.
7. 20.30B.010 - Purpose. This chapter establishes the requirements and procedures for a mineral extraction site to receive designation as mineral resource lands of long-term commercial significance. The requirements and procedures are designed to conserve long-term commercially significant mineral lands and to minimize land use conflicts by allowing designation status only where a long-term mining operation would be compatible with surrounding land uses and by providing notification to surrounding property owners of the long-term nature of a designated mining operation. This chapter also provides increased protection to designated mineral extraction operations by limiting nuisance claims from neighboring property owners. Sites must be designated under this chapter before new mineral extraction activities may occur.

8. At least sixty percent of the area within one thousand feet of a site must have parcels five acres in size or larger at the time of the application for designation (see Appendix Figure 18) excluding parcels less than five acres in size owned by the applicant. c. An area proposed for mineral resource lands designation shall be at least five acres.

9. Critical Areas: Critical areas will be examined at the time of designation review using the county's geographic information system.
Comment: It seems to me this is very open and a dangerously moving target!

10. iv. Mineral resource lands shall not include habitats of primary association to species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act or state law and their buffers as established by the critical areas ordinance at the time of designation. Comment: In view of the map for the protected pocket gopher map in Thurston Co. is there much left? The 2 plans seem to be in conflict/opposition here

11. v. Mineral extraction activities shall not negatively affect nor endanger surface and ground water flows and quality. vi. Mineral resource lands shall be located away from geologically hazardous areas such as marine bluffs, the bluff area in the Nisqually Hillside Overlay, or areas that would cause a public safety hazard, but may include steep and/or unstable slopes as provided by the critical areas ordinance.

12. Note that the summary given of the Plan in your advert for the Hearing etc. contains the word 'may' in places, where on checking, I found the actual 20.30B.010 mostly says 'shall' or 'must'. As you can imagine this is an important legal distinction in any regulation. Therefore the bold type is my added emphasis. I wonder why the County overview Summary does not use the correct word used in the Actual Comprehensive Plan/GMAct?

Sincerely,

Cornelia O'Leary, MD
Thurston County
From: Rahey, Lance A CIV US ARMY MEDCOM WRAIR (US) <lance.a.rahey.civ@mail.mil>
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Maya Buhler
Cc: 'erahey@yahoo.com'
Subject: Thurston County Planning Commission Public Hearing on Mineral Resource Lands Designation Options - March 7, 2018 (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development

Dear Maya Buhler,

Please put the utmost welfare and safety of people first and ahead of any business interests and activities. Error on the side of certainty by exceeding the minimum requirements and keep any commercial mining activities far outside of and away from all residential areas. I urge you to please put yourself in the peoples' place and craft any plans for commercial mining activities or the approval thereof in such a way that you would not mind living there and having your children play nearby.

Sincerely,

Lance Rahey
5216 81st Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501
CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED
Dear Ms. Buhler,

I write as a member of the Thurston League of Women Voters and concerned citizen about the Planning Commission's mineral lands inventory now being considered.

I believe that our long term agricultural land is too precious to co-designate as mineral land. The 2,200 acres in question is 14% of our LTA land, and only 1.6% of mineral lands. This is a severe blow to total agricultural land acreage, and only a small gain for gravel mining.

Reclamation of LTA land after mining is a lengthy and expensive process that might not result in viable agricultural lands. Why take that risk? We can't eat gravel, and with increased population forecasts, we are going to need as much farmland as we can get.

Bottom line - We need to preserve the little farmland left in Thurston County and preserve it forever as farmland. It's just common sense.

I urge you to not designate long-term agricultural lands as mineral lands.

Thank you
Esther Kronenberg
Maya Buhler, Associate Planner
Thurston County Community Planning & Economic Development Department
2000 Lakeridge Dr SW, Olympia WA 98502

Dear AP Buhler,

I wish to register my position of not wanting the County to co-designate long term agricultural lands as mineral lands. The subject agricultural land is too valuable to lose for a little more gravel.

I would appreciate your acknowledging receipt of my message.

Thank you,

Walter R. Jorgensen
823 North St SE
Tumwater, WA 98501-3526
waltjorgensen@comcast.net
360-489-0764 (home)
360-819-0678 (cell)
Maya Buhler, Associate Planner
Thurston County Community Planning
Economic Development Department
2000 Lakeridge Dr SW,
Olympia WA
98502

Dear MS. Maya Buhler,

There is a proposal for Thurston County to co-designate long term agricultural lands as mineral lands. I do not agree with this effort.

Thurston County agricultural land is too valuable to lose. Mineral lands means mining activity. I do not want mining on agricultural land, farm land.

Thank you;
Lee Riner
2103 Harrison
Oly., WA
98502
360-956-0023

Dear Ms. Buhler,
As you designate mineral lands, please be careful about preserving our precious and limited agricultural land. We must protect our ability to grow local crops. Please do not turn Thurston County into a gravel-mining, asphalt-producers blight. Just because we have lots of gravel does not mean we have to become the main supplier for other counties, and beyond!
Thank you,
Maureen Canny
360-438-7424
Dear Ms. Buhler,

Please note my concern about the mineral lands designation update and its potential for proliferation of gravel mining/asphalt operations across our County. Thurston County is “gravel-rich” meaning we have much more than is needed for use in this County. We should not become the exporter of resources which will degrade our ecosystems, scar our landscapes, and negatively impact our roads and transportations systems. The potential to violate our aquifers and surface water resources with huge swaths of mining operations is of paramount concern.

In your designation planning, please protect areas identified as “critical,” agricultural and residential (and any other sensitive areas) from having mineral lands designation.

Please be sure to include County-wide regulations so that permit seekers have to abide by all the rules for a sustainable future, and not be able to push through a site-by-site review process.

Finally, please remember the mission of the long term planning commission is to look toward a sustainable future “so communities can thrive in a healthy environment.”

Thank you,

Maureen Canny
mocanny@comcast.net
360-438-7424
Proud Member

League of Women Voters

Phyllis Farrell

please convey to the County Planning Commission and the
agricultural lands and the
mineral lands.

THURSTON COUNTY RECEIVED
MAR 01 2018
 RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP

Mayo Buhler
Assoc. Planner
Th. County Planning Dept.

3000 Lakeside Dr SW

USA FOREVER
Dear [Name],

I'm writing to express my sincere gratitude for all the efforts you've put into making our community a better place. Your dedication and hard work are truly inspiring. Thank you for your commitment to improving the lives of those around you.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]
I Vote

Provincial Lands
be designated as
Agricultural Lands
Please do not let

Olympia WA
27 FEB 2018

Tacoma WA 98403

MAR 01 2018

THURSTON COUNTY
Resource Stewardship

Julie Fink
Dear Planning Commission,

I am a member of the League of Women Voters and would like to express my concerns regarding the proposed development on the mineral lands. These lands should not be turned into farmland.

Please preserve farmland in Thurston and please do all you can to keep farmland forever. Farmed forever, Farms Thurston, and please do all you can to keep farmland forever.

Voter Vote

Olympia, WA 98504
March 01, 2018

Resource Stewardship

Helen Dobler, Associate Planner

Washington Water Quality

270 Washington Way

Melanie Booths
Hi Maya — As we discussed by phone yesterday, attached is a letter and the County’s 2012 approval of nonconforming status. Please let me know if you have any issues opening the attachment. Please also feel free to reach out if you have any follow up questions. Thank you! - Nancy

CH& | Nancy Bainbridge Rogers
Attorney
Cairncross & Hempelmann
524 Second Avenue | Suite 500 | Seattle, WA 98104-2323
d: 206-254-4417 | f: 206-587-2308
NRogers@cairncross.com | www.cairncross.com | Bio

Ranked by Chambers USA 2017 in the area of Washington State Real Estate: Zoning/Land Use.

This email message may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and delete the original message without reading, disclosing, or copying its contents.
March 1, 2018

VIA EMAIL

Maya Buhler, Associate Planner
Thurston County Community Planning
and Economic Development
Thurston County Courthouse
Building 1, 2nd Floor
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA, 98502
buhlerm@co.thurston.wa.us

Re: Public Hearing Written Testimony – Mineral Resource Lands Designation for Segale Gravel Mine

Dear Ms. Buhler:

This firm represents Segale Properties, owner of the Segale Gravel Mine at 3749 Waldrick Road SE (“Segale Gravel Mine”). Segale has been monitoring and participating in the County’s Mineral Resource Lands designation process. In 2017, the County agreed with Segale that the quality of aggregate at the Segale Gravel Mine should be adjusted from the County’s original classification of A-3 to A-2.

For the following reasons, Segale asks that, as to the Segale Gravel Mine property, the County recommend and adopt Draft Map Option #1 which designates the entire 594 acre site as Mineral Resource Lands (“MRL”). As the County – and Segale – are well aware, designation of property as MRL does not authorize any actual mining or other mining-related operations. Additional approvals must be obtained before expanded gravel mining, beyond the current actively permitted 50-acre pit, could possibly occur.

The Segale Gravel Mine is unique. In 2012, following a public process, the County issued a formal determination that the entire parcel, approximately 594 acres, is a legal nonconforming mineral extraction site. Copies of these 2012 materials are enclosed. As noted in the 2012 County approval, because the entire site is a legal nonconforming use, permitting for any expansion of the mine will be conducted by the State Department of Natural Resources (DNR), including environmental review. Thus, when Segale files applications with DNR in the future, the County will be able to provide

nrogers@cairncross.com
direct: (206) 254-4417

(03502885.DOCX;1)
comments and information to DNR, including presumably comments and information related to the various exclusionary factors that the County is currently assessing in its MRL process.

In light of the enclosed 2012 Thurston County Nonconforming Mineral Extraction Determination, designation of the Segale Gravel Mine as Mineral Resource Lands is legally not necessary. However, to assure that Thurston County citizens are properly informed about what types of land uses may occur in the County, and so that the County’s mineral resource inventory adequately accounts for the quantity of gravel available to be mined from the Segale Gravel Mine, the entire Segale parcel should be designated as Mineral Resource Lands.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Nancy Bainbridge Rogers

NBR/kgb
Enclosure
cc: Mark Segale
Mark Hancock
NOTICE OF APPLICATION
Mailed On November 29, 2011

Project Name & Location: Determination of Nonconforming Status for Segale Rock Quarry Property at 3749 Waldrick Road SE

Parcel No: 11732220100; see map on reverse side of this notice

Land Use Case #: 2011103542

An application for the project listed above was submitted to Thurston County on October 5, 2011 by Segale Properties, LLC. The application was deemed to be complete for the purpose of beginning the project review on November 22, 2011. This application and any related documents are available for public review during normal business hours at the Permit Assistance Center on the second floor of Building #1, Thurston County Courthouse, 2000 Lakeridge Drive SW, Olympia, Washington. For additional information, please contact Mike Kain, Planning Manager by emailing kainm@co.thurston.wa.us, or writing to the address below or by calling (360) 786-5471.

Project Description: The applicant has requested that the County determine the doctrine of diminishing assets, as relied on by the Washington State Supreme Court in City of University Place v. McGuire, applies to the subject property and that the County sign a Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) Form SM-6. Signing the form would denote that the mine expansion is allowed without need for a County permit. This would allow expansion of an existing mine from its current 50 acres to over 500 acres on the same property.

Permits Requested by the Applicant: No County permit has been requested.

Environmental and Other Documents Submitted with the Application: Documents establishing the history of the site were submitted. WDNR will conduct an environmental review of the proposed expansion. No environmental documents were submitted to the County.

Additional Information or Project Studies Requested by the County: None to date. A Mazama pocket gopher habitat survey, a prairie habitat survey and a wetland delineation report will be submitted to WDNR as a part of the environmental review.

No preliminary determination of consistency with County development regulations has been made. At minimum, this project will be subject to the following plans and regulations: Thurston County Stormwater Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual (TCC 15.05), Thurston County Building Code (TCC 14), and State Environmental Policy Act (WAC 197-11).

Thurston County invites your comments early in the review of this request. Comments should be directed to Mike Kain at the address listed below.

THE 20-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ENDS AT 4:00 PM ON DECEMBER 19, 2011

This notice is displayed on the County website and has been provided to appropriate local and state agencies, tribes, and property owners within 2,600 feet of the project site. These recipients, and any others who submit a written request to be placed on the mailing list, will also receive the staff decision when available. Opportunities for appeal occur within fourteen (14) calendar days of the staff decision for any aggrieved party. Additional opportunity for public comment will occur during the environmental review conducted by WDNR.

MK.dll\Me\Dev\Server\Planning\Amanda Save File\Existing Gravel Mines ZT\Notice of Application2011103542_Segale SM-6.doc

2000 Lakeridge Drive SW, Olympia, Washington 98502 (360) 786-5490/FAX (360) 754-2939
TDD (360) 754-2933 Website: www.co.thurston.wa.us/permitting
February 17, 2012

Jami Balint
Segale Properties
P.O. Box 88028
Tukwila, WA 98138

SUBJECT: Segale Rock Quarry; TP# 11732220100; totaling about 594 acres
Nonconforming Mineral Extraction Determination

Dear Ms Balint:

This letter is to serve as an attachment to the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) Form SM-6, which seeks confirmation of County approval for the subject mine proposal. Segale has requested that the County sign the form. A Notice of Application pursuant to this request was issued by the County on November 29, 2011. Comment letters were received and considered in this review process.

Upon review of the information submitted by Segale on October 5, 2011 regarding the history of the subject parcel, the comment letters received, and a subsequent letter from Segale dated January 12, 2012, it is the determination of the County that the subject parcel has been intended for mineral extraction by the property owner since 1972.

The County did not adopt a zoning code until 1980. As a result, the existing 50-acre mine did not receive a permit from the County and is considered a nonconforming use. Pursuant to TCC 20.56.010, nonconforming uses are allowed to continue. Additionally, based on the County's interpretation of the diminishing asset doctrine, as clarified in the 2001 Washington State Supreme Court decision in City of University Place v. McGuire, this parcel in its entirety is considered a legal nonconforming mineral extraction site.

This determination will allow the Segale Rock Quarry to expand incrementally throughout the subject parcel without requirement for a County land use permit. However, even though a County permit is not applicable, mine expansion will require approval of a reclamation permit by WDNR.

It is the understanding of the County that prior to receiving approval of a reclamation permit from WDNR to expand the existing mine, a SEPA environmental review must be conducted by WDNR. Any interested party may provide comment during that review process. The County may also comment on that environmental review. The comment letters already received will be forwarded to WDNR for consideration during the environmental review. Rian Skov is the WDNR contact at 360-902-1433.

2000 Lakeridge Drive SW, Olympia, Washington 98502 (360) 786-5490/FAX (360) 754-2939
TDD (360) 754-2933 Website: www.co.thurston.wa.us/permitting
If you wish to appeal this determination, please do so in writing on the enclosed administrative appeal form, accompanied by a nonrefundable fee of $1710.00. Any appeal must be received in the Permit Assistance Center on the second floor of Building #1 in the Thurston County Courthouse complex no later than 4:00 pm on March 2, 2012. Postmarks are not acceptable. If your fee and completed appeal form are not filed by this time, you will be unable to appeal this determination. This deadline may not be extended.

Please contact me if you have questions.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Mike Kain
Planning Manager
kainm@co.thurston.wa.us
360-786-5471

Attachment: Appeal Form
Form SM-6

cc: Squaxin Tribe
Chehalis Tribe
Nisqually Tribe
Rian Skov, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Mining Division
Washington Department of Ecology
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
APPEAL OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

TO THE THURSTON COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER COMES NOW

on this _____ day of __________ 20__, as an APPELLANT in the matter of an administrative decision rendered on _______________ 20__, by ____________________________, relating to

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

THE APPELLANT, after review and consideration of the reasons given by the administrative official for his/her decision, does now, give written notice of APPEAL to the Hearing Examiner of said decision under the provision(s) of the ordinances marked below.

☐ 17.09.160 SEPA
☐ 17.15.410 CRITICAL AREAS
☐ 20.60.060 ZONING
☐ 22.62.050 TUMWATER UGA ZONING
☐ 18.10.070 PLATING & SUBDIVISION
☐ 19.12.010 SHORELINE PROGRAM
☐ 21.81.070 LACEY UGA ZONING
☐ 23.72.190 OLYMPIA UGA ZONING

STATE THE BASIS OF THE APPEAL AS OUTLINED IN SECTION "A" ON REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM.

(If more space is required, please attach additional sheet.)

AND REQUESTS that the Hearing Examiner, having responsibility for review of such decisions will upon review of the record of the matters and the allegations contained in this appeal, find in favor of the appellant and reverse the administrative decision.

_________________________________________________________

APPELLANT NAME PRINTED

_________________________________________________________

SIGNATURE OF APPELLANT

Address ____________________________

Phone: ____________________________

Please do not write below - for Staff Use Only:

Filed with Resource Stewardship this _______ day of __________ 20__, by ____________________________.

Filing fee deposit of $1710.00*, receipt no. ____________________________ by ________________.

*The filing fee deposit will cover staff time (for Planning, Environmental Health & Development Review), and Hearing-Examiner time to hear the appeal and issue a decision.
THURSTON COUNTY
PROCEDURE FOR APPEAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION TO HEARING EXAMINER

NOTE: THERE MAY BE NO EX PARTE (ONE-SIDED) CONTACT OUTSIDE A PUBLIC HEARING WITH EITHER THE HEARING EXAMINER OR WITH THE BOARD OF THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ON APPEALS (Thurston County Code, Section 2.06.030).

The following is a description of the rules of procedure for appeals before the Hearing Examiner.

A. A FILED APPEAL MUST BE IN WRITING AND CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING
   1. A brief statement as to how the appellant is significantly affected by or interested in the matter appealed;
   2. A brief statement of the appellant’s issues on appeal, noting appellant’s specific exceptions and objections to the decision or action being appealed;
   3. The relief requested, such as reversal or modification.

B. PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE
   1. All parties to an appeal hearing shall be prepared for a pre-hearing conference with the Thurston County Hearing Examiner. The pre-hearing conference is held to structure the scope of the hearing.
   2. Pre-hearing conferences may be held by telephone conference call.
   3. The Hearing Examiner shall give reasonable notice to parties of any pre-hearing conference. Notice may be written or oral.
   4. All parties shall be represented at a pre-hearing conference unless they waive the right to be present or represented.
   5. Following the pre-hearing conference, the Hearing Examiner may issue an order reciting the actions taken or ruling on motions made at the conference.

C. PARTIES REPRESENTATIVE REQUIRED
   When a party consists of more than one individual, or is a group, organization, corporation, or other entity, the appellant shall designate an individual to be its representative, and inform the Hearing Examiner’s office of the name, address and telephone number of the designated representative. The rights of such an appellant shall be exercised by the person designated as the party representative. Notice or other communication to the party representative is considered to be notice or communication to party.

D. PARTIES’ RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
   1. Although Appellants and Applicants have the right to be represented by an attorney, representation by an attorney is not required. Attorney representation is not discouraged.
   2. Where a party has designated a representative, the representative shall exercise the rights of the party.
   3. All parties and others participating in and observing hearings shall conduct themselves with civility and deal courteously with all persons involved in the proceedings.

E. HEARING FORMAT
   1. Appeal hearings, although generally informal in nature, shall have a structured format and shall be conducted in a manner deemed by the Hearing Examiner to make the relevant evidence most readily and efficiently available to the Examiner and to provide the parties a fair opportunity for hearing.
   2. The order of an appeal hearing will generally be as follows:
      a. Examiner’s introductory statement;
      b. Background presentation by Department;
      c. Appellant’s argument;
      d. Department’s presentation;
      e. Applicant’s presentation;
      f. Rebuttal;
      g. Closing argument of parties.

F. Hearing Examiner Decision will be issued within ten (10) working days of the hearing unless additional time is agreed to by the parties.
COUNTY OR MUNICIPALITY
APPROVAL FOR
SURFACE MINING
(Form SM-6)

NAME OF COMPANY OR INDIVIDUAL APPLICANT[S]
(Same as name of the exploration permit holder. (Type or print in ink.)

Segale Properties LLC

MAILING ADDRESS

P.O. Box 88028
Tukwila, WA 98138

Telephone 206-575-2000

Proposed subsequent use of site upon completion of reclamation

Residential and/or agricultural

TOTAL ACREAGE AND DEPTH OF PERMIT AREA
(Including all acreage to be disturbed by mining, setbacks, and buffers, and associated activities during the life of the mine.) (See SM-8A.)

Total area disturbed will be 594.30 acres.

Maximum vertical depth below pre-mining topographic grade is 50 feet.

Maximum depth of excavated mine floor is 208 feet relative to mean sea level.

COUNTY Thurst

No attachments will be accepted. Legal description of permit area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/4</th>
<th>1/4</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>I W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of company representative or individual applicant(s)

Mark A. Segale
Vice-President

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPROPRIATE COUNTY OR MUNICIPALITY:

Please answer the following questions 'yes' or 'no'.

1. Has the proposed surface mine been approved under local zoning and land-use regulations?
2. Is the proposed subsequent use of the land after reclamation consistent with the local land-use plan/designation?

When complete, return this form to the appropriate Department of Natural Resources regional office.

Name of planning director or administrative official (please print)

Mike Kain

Signature

Michael E. Kain

Title (please print)

Planning Manager

Telephone

360-786-5471

Date 2.17.12

Address

RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP
THURSTON COUNTY COURT HOUSE
2000 LAKERIDGE DR SW, BLDG. 1
OLYMPIA, WA 98502

DNR Reclamation Permit No.

FOR DEPARTMENT USE ONLY:

County or Municipality Approval (SM-6) Revised 1/01
March 7, 2018

VIA EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Thurston County Planning Commission
Thurston County Courthouse
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA, 98502

Maya Buhler, Associate Planner
Thurston County Community Planning
and Economic Development
Thurston County Courthouse
Building 1, 2nd Floor
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA, 98502
buhlerm@co.thurston.wa.us

Re: Public Hearing Written Testimony – Mineral Resource Lands Designation Process

Dear Planning Commissioners and Ms. Buhler:

This law firm represents Segale Properties, owner of the Segale Gravel Mine at 3749 Waldrick Road SE ("Segale Gravel Mine"). Segale has been monitoring and participating in the County’s Mineral Resource Lands designation process. We earlier provided to Ms. Buhler for the record written information specifying why the Segale Gravel Mine should be designated as Mineral Resource Lands ("MRL").

This letter and our testimony tonight describe why the Planning Commission must recommend adoption of Map #1a, or else give direction to County Staff to do additional work and bring back to you additional options for review. Only Map #1a meets State law requirements for the designation of MRL.

A memo provided to you, dated June 15, 2017, summarizes the history of Thurston County’s MRL designation criteria, including the years of review and litigation before the Growth Management Hearings Board ("GMHB"). The GMHB finally approved the County’s designation criteria, when the County removed the prohibition on co-designation of MRL with forest lands and with critical areas. As to critical areas, the GMHB explained "[r]emoval of the MRL/critical area co-designation preclusion and addressing potentially incompatible or inappropriate uses through development regulations"
addresses the Board’s concern regarding violations of RCW 36.70A.170(1) and (2), WAC 365-190-020 and WAC 365-190-040.\textsuperscript{1} The law is crystal clear that “if both critical area and natural resource land use designations apply to a given parcel or a portion of a parcel, both or all designations must be made.” WAC 365-190-020(7). Therefore, the proposals shown on Map #2 and Map #3 to exclude from MRL designation any lands that may also be designated critical areas, such as important habitats and floodplains, is illegal. Where both a critical area and a MRL designation apply, both designations must be made and one cannot preclude the other.

Next, it also violates the principles of the Growth Management Act ("GMA") to under-designate MRL, as shown on Map #2 and Map #3, even though the County allows private property owners to later seek their own individual Comprehensive Plan Amendment at some point in the future. Thurston County is currently undertaking a Comprehensive Plan amendment process. The law is clear that during the designation amendment process, “in classifying and designating natural resource lands,” which include Mineral Resource Lands, the County "must approach the effort as a county-wide or regional process. Counties and cities should not review natural resource lands designations solely on a parcel-by-parcel basis.” WAC 365-190-040(10)(b). Forcing potential mine property owners and their neighbors to propose, participate in and review many individual proposals for Comprehensive Plan Amendments also is not fair to those Thurston County citizens, and would impose significant costs and workload on County Staff and volunteers, like the Planning Commission. The GMA was expressly structured to designate all natural resource lands, and then address the specifics of any particular site through a permitting process.

We very much appreciate the hard work and thoughtful consideration of the Planning Commission regarding MRL designations. To conform with State law, we ask the Commission to recommend adoption of Map #1a. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Nancy Bainbridge Rogers

cc: Mark Segale
    Mark Hancock

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1} Weyerhaeuser Company et al. v. Thurston County, Case No. 10-2-0020c, Compliance Order, at 4 (March 15, 2013).}
Hello Maya and Thurston County Community Planning & Economic Development Department,

As a former Secretary for the Thurston Food System Council (now the 5-county South Sound Food System Network), I urge the protection of all existing Agricultural Lands, without endangering our sufficient food supply by diverting such lands to non-nutritive purposes.

In 2006, John Jeavons of Ecology Action, Willets, CA, demonstrated that 75% of the planet is already unable to grow food, due to oceans, urbanization, deserts, etc. There is already not enough arable land for meat production, unless 6 to 20 of each of our Loved Ones has "no space on earth growing food for them".

PLEASE choose "PLAN A" - All Agricultural Land is NOT AVAILABLE and "off the table" for Mineral Extraction !

Thank you for this opportunity to voice my views.

Respectfully,
Diane Grace Crutcher
Thurston County Planning Commission:

Please do NOT designate more of Thurston County for mining. Indeed, what we need to make our use of the Earth more sustainable is less mining.

Mining causes pollution in numerous ways. The air pollution from the process, the pollution of the groundwater, the noise pollution from increased traffic of polluting vehicles. In the long term, many mines will cost the community more than they will produce. I witnessed a copper mine at Lake Chelan that is costing taxpayers tremendous amounts of money, long after the company that made money from the operation is gone. And the pollution can be reduced at great cost, but never completely stopped. How much better for the long-term health of the planet if that mine had never been allowed.

Please take this opportunity to REDUCE the amount of land that is designated for mining. The health of the people, the animals, the plants including our food plants depend on you.

Thank you,

Dr. John Ruhland
14323 Plum Nelly Lane SE
Rainier, WA 98576

mailing address:
822 Olympia Avenue NE
Olympia, WA 98506
I oppose the proposed legislation to "update" the Growth Management Act under the Mineral Lands Designation, and urge you to do likewise.

Victoria Harper-Parsonson
PO Box 822, 10503 Creek Street
Yelm, WA  98597
Sir,

Here are my comments.
I am concerned about certain aspects of the plan as mentioned below:
1 - in the summary given of the Plan for the hearing, the word "may" is used many times, replacing the words "must" or "shall" used in the actual 20.30B.010. This is a very important distinction in any regulation. Why is not the correct word used?
2 - in view of the map for the protected gopher map in T. County, is there actually any land left? the 2 plans seem to be in conflict.
3 - You say that the critical areas would be examined at the time of the designation review using the county's geographical information system. This sounds open to the potential of unjustified rapid changes.
4 - the distance of 1,000ft from UGAs and RRAs required is insufficient to protect for noise, health and other property impacts or other disruption due to mining.
5 - there is not much there to protect the local residents and their property rights and values from the permit holders mining operations.

I thank you for your consideration,
C Lafont
360 446 2769
TO: Maya Buhler, Associate Planner
     Thurston County Commissioners

FROM: Iris A. Moore
     16937 Port Orford Blvd. SE.
     Yelm, WA 98597

FROM: Catherine Alexander
     14522 Solberg Rd. SE
     Yelm, WA 98597

RE: OUR OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED MINING IN THURSTON COUNTY:

FROM IRIS A. MOORE:

This entire plan to do mining in the designated areas of Thurston County is a DIRTY IDEA.
Here in Yelm, the proposed areas are all near water sources: Lake Lawrence, the rivers, and ALL in these areas have wells for water source. They moved to the country to breath the fresh air and live a peaceful life, have pure water sources.

I live in Nisqually Pines where our water source is from 3 wells that draw from an underground river. The fourth was already contaminated, so another one has to be drilled. We are close to the Nisqually River. The contamination that could happen in Bald Hills and Lake Lawrence areas could come down to our area, including the underground river via the rivers there. Lake Lawrence already has its problems. That is a beautiful community where I used to live. Can’t even conceive of an idea to contaminate it.

Has the County done an Environmental Impact study yet on these areas? Surely that has to be done before mining would be allowed.

===============================================================================
===============================================================================

FROM CATHERINE ALEXANDER:
I live very close to Lake Lawrence and have my own well that has very pure water. Whoever came up with the idea of doing mining in residential areas surely did not have the best interests or the safety of people and concern for the environment in mind. I find this almost unbelievable.

Thank you for keeping my objections in mind if this makes it to a vote. NO BE IT!
Dear Ms Buhler,

I have been informed that the Thurston County Planning Commission is having a meeting this coming week on determining rural areas that would be compatible for mining sand, gravel, rock and metal. Bald Hills rural area is one of the designated areas to be considered. I have lived in the Bald Hills area on Smith Prairie Road SE for 28 years. This area is mostly residential and small farms. I am totally against having land in the Bald Hills area determined to be permitted for mining sand, gravel, rock, and metal. Mining would contaminate our water aquifer, poison our air, decrease our property value and affect our quality of life. Our area is mostly residential and small farms and it should stay that way. Thank you.

Sincerely,

George Mye Jr.
I am writing in opposition to the proposed mining in residential areas in Thurston county. I live in the Bald Hills Area and it is highly populated. This is not a place that is at all appropriate to be mining. Please reconsider your choice to mine residential areas. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Nancy Spain

Sent from my iPhone
Howard Glastetter  
11110 Kuhlman Road SE  
Olympia, WA 98513-9605  

March 5, 2018  

Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development  
Attn: Maya Buhler, Associate Planner  
2000 Lakeridge Dr. SW  
Olympia WA, 98502  

Dear Ms. Buhler,  

Below is my comment for the Mineral Lands Planning meeting on March 7, 2018.  

I attended the April 19, 2017 Mineral Lands Planning meeting. I was interested in attending because I previously was an alternative citizen representative on the Mineral Lands Task Force that the Board of County Commissioners established in the fall of 2003. I stood in for Tom Cook for 2 meetings while he was on vacation. I attended 12 of the 13 meetings held in 2004.  

The April 19, 2017 meeting opened with a discussion that Thurston County wants to designate all potential mineral lands within Thurston County, rather than as is done currently by existing mine site. It is a state requirement that all counties do this. When we went through a similar issue in 2004, Sue Danver of the Audubon Society made a poignant comment: “You won’t just be designating these lands, you will be anointing them”. I was not part of the April 19, 2017 group and was limited in how I could participate. So, I quietly listened. Comments indicated the county will be consistent with the GMA.  

Maps of glacier till activity of around 13,000 years ago were spread around the room for all to see. Interestingly, most of Thurston County is covered to varying depths with this sand and gravel material. Thurston County is gravel rich. More interesting to me as a Nisqually Valley resident: Holroyd’s site in Nisqually Valley received the Deepest coverage.  

I did make a comment when public comment was allowed. I mentioned that the Pierce County Municipal Golf Course was the result of strip mining and the gravel was sent to Japan. I pointed out that the state requires counties to designate mineral lands sufficient for several years to fill their needs. I asked the question: “Will there be any effort by Thurston County to limit exporting of gravel out of county”. I really didn’t get an answer. However, Mike Parsons of Black Lake Resources (a mining company) followed my question with a comment: “Studies have shown that only 6% of gravel mined in Thurston County stays in Thurston County”.  

Obviously, Thurston County will have to designate gravel rich areas in the county as Mineral Lands. However, there should be tight rules about impacts mining next to contiguous property. Turbidity to nearby wells is an issue that must be considered. Mining below the water tables into aquifers should be
avoided. Beyond disturbing aquifers, this practice can lower well water levels near the mine area. Reclamation rules should be tight and enforced. Digging below the water level and "leaving a lake behind" is not reclamation. In short, rules should be in place that will prevent Thurston county from mimicking West Virginia.

Sincerely,

Howard Glastetter
Howard.glastetter@comcast.net
Dear Maya,
This is to inform you & members of the planning commission that I oppose opening the doors to mining in our beautiful county. Such a plan you denigrate the quality of life here unacceptably. Vote accordingly.
Sincerely,
Daniel E. Meifert
Bald Hills
Sent from my iPad
Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development
2000 Lakeridge Dr. SW
Olympia, WA  98502

RE: Proposed Mineral Lands Designation

Dear Maya Buhler,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Mineral Lands Designation Options. I understand the need for long range planning to assess potential land uses, set priorities, and create potential land use allocations. To be useful, the plan needs to incorporate the best available information and be as realistic as possible. Plans that are overly broad, do not set priorities, or simply show potential land use options are not helpful.

I strongly support a modified Option 2 Mineral Lands Designation because it considers most existing critical areas and high density residential developments and it provides the most realistic assessment of areas that might be feasible to mine under existing laws and policy. To better meet the stated goals of not encroaching on existing residential uses and not adversely affecting the environment, Option 2 needs to be strengthened by:

1. Excluding wetlands in the current county wetland inventory from proposed mineral designation. This was done in Option 3 but was not included in Option 2. Category 1 and 2 wetlands are designated Critical Areas under Thurston County code (20.30B.030.1.f.ii.) It makes no sense not to use the available wetland information for long-term planning at this point. There will always be an opportunity to adjust wetland delineations and boundaries at the site scale at the permit phase.

2. Excluding any areas within 1,000 feet of existing platted sub-divisions from proposed mineral designation. There are numerous platted residential sub-divisions outside of the urban growth boundary that may not meet the density required for LAMIRDs. The criteria requiring at least sixty percent of the area within one thousand feet of a site must have parcels five acres in size or larger will likely address many existing residential areas, but not all.

I am opposed to Option 1 for proposed Mineral Lands Designation. Option 1 does not even attempt to address known environmental or existing residential development concerns. It clearly overstates the amount and location of land in Thurston County that would realistically be available for viable mineral extraction operations.
I am also opposed to Option 3 for proposed Mineral Lands Designation. Option 3 considers a couple known environmental issue areas, but not nearly all, and it does not fully address existing residential development concerns. It continues to overstate the amount and location of land in Thurston County that would realistically be available for viable mineral extraction operations. The Map and legend for Option 3 is very misleading because it infers that only mining proposals that affect the identified critical areas such as well head protection areas, habitat for listed species, or wetlands would need additional review. In fact, ALL proposed mineral extraction activities will need further review at the site level during the permitting and environmental compliance phases. Finally, Option 3 appears to place the burden of proof on the County to evaluate and reject future mineral developments that conflict with designated Critical Areas and other known issues rather than placing the burden of proof more appropriately on the landowner to justify why the mineral development within a Critical Area or adjacent to an existing residential area can take place without adversely affecting sensitive environments or existing residents. Completing a number of extensive and largely unnecessary analyses for infeasible projects will put a severe strain on County staff and divert resources from more viable projects.

I am strongly opposed to the idea of co-designating mineral lands and long-term agricultural lands. In my experience in Thurston County, I am not aware of any large commercial mining areas that have been successfully reclaimed as productive agricultural lands. A parcel cannot be both a mine and productive agricultural land. The Comprehensive Plan needs to set priorities and identify the best long-term use. Productive agricultural land should not be proposed for mineral designation.

I encourage the planning commission to reconsider the decision to co-designate mineral lands and long-term forestry lands. In my experience in Thurston County, I am not aware of any large commercial mining areas that have been successfully reclaimed as productive commercial forest lands. Co-designating mineral lands and long-term forestry lands unreasonably inflates the acreage and the resources that will likely be extracted from both categories. The current mineral designation options maps show between 85% and 87% of the entire Capitol State Forest as proposed mineral lands. This will obviously never happen. To infer that it is even a possibility is not responsible. The plan needs to be better than this.

Rather than co-designating mineral lands and long-term forestry lands, perhaps a more realistic approach would be to simply include development of small rock pits for forest road construction materials as an ancillary use of the long-term forestry use designation. If specific areas of forest lands within Thurston County contain unusually high value sand or gravel resources that might actually be developed into large commercial mining areas, the Comprehensive Plan needs to set priorities and identify the best long-term use.

Thank you for incorporating my comments into the proposed mineral lands designation options.

Sincerely,

Bob Metzger
MINING DESTROYS. GREED IS A PREVELENT PLAGUE THAT HAS TAKEN SOME OF THE INHABITANTS OF THIS ONCE PRISTINE JEWEL IN THIS GALAXY BEYOND "COMMON" SENSE. THERE ARE MANY UNDERLYING REASONS FOR THIS DESTRUCTION. SOME OF THE PEOPLES HERE STILL REMEMBER CLEAN AIR, WATER, CLEAN AIR.

MINING IN AN AREA THAT SUPPORTS WHERE PEOPLE LIVE, WHERE FLORA AND FAUN STILL SURVIVE IS THE CONTINUATION OF THE GENOCIDE PROGRAMS OF THOSE WHO WOULD CONTINUE TO CULL US,

ARE YOU AWARE OF THESE PURPOSES. CAN YOU AND YOUR FAMILY, RELATIVES, FRIENDS, ASSOCIATES CONTINUE TO LIVE A QUALITY LIFE ON A DEAD EARTH????

YOU NEED TO SERIOUSLY RECONSIDER WHAT YOU ARE DOING.

OLIVIA
From: Norma Klinger <motherofpepe@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 12:34 PM
To: Maya Buhler
Subject: comments for hearing on mineral resources

Subject:

Sir,

Here are my comments.
I am concerned about certain aspects of the plan as mentioned below:
1 - in the summary given of the Plan for the hearing, the word "may" is used many times, replacing the words "must" or "shall" used in the actual 20.30B.010. This is a very important distinction in any regulation. Why is not the correct word used?
2 - in view of the map for the protected gopher map in T. County, is there actually any land left? the 2 plans seem to be in conflict.
3 - You say that the critical areas would be examined at the time of the designation review using the county's geographical information system. This sounds open to the potential of unjustified rapid changes.
4 - the distance of 1,000ft from UGAs and RRAs required is insufficient to protect for noise, health and other property impacts or other disruption due to mining.
5 - there is not much there to protect the local residents and their property rights and values from the permit holders mining operations.

Norma Klinger
March 6, 2018

Maya Buhler
Thurston County Planner
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98502
VIA EMAIL: buhlerm@co.thurston.wa.us

RE: Mineral Land Designation Comments for Thurston County Planning Commission

Dear Maya Buhler:

Black Hills Audubon Society (BHAS), a chapter of the National Audubon Society, represents over 1300 members in Lewis, Mason, and Thurston counties. We seek to protect birds and other wildlife and their habitats for the education, recreation and enjoyment of Thurston County’s current and future citizens.

BHAS has been involved in many gravel mining matters, including participation on Thurston County’s Mineral Lands Task Force which updated the Mineral Lands Comprehensive Plan. We have promoted and support the stronger environmental policies that were added to Mineral Lands Designation Criteria.

We support Option #2 with some modifications. It has the best chance of providing adequate mineral resources for the county while limiting land use conflicts where designations could lead to sensitive environmental area loss.

This option would be stronger by excluding current county wetland inventory from proposed mineral designations.

We are not in favor of option 2a which co-designates Long Term Agriculture Lands (LTA). LTA lands are a very small portion of the county already and do not need further conversion pressures.

The legend of Mineral Designations Map Option #3 in footnote #3 states that some designated mineral lands “may require further at the permit level, based on environmental or land use factors”. This statement is misleading because all designated lands will require additional environmental review for mining. We request that this information be placed on all maps to avoid any confusion that designation allows extraction activities.
The Reality and Weaknesses of the Mineral Designation and Permitting Process

1) Thurston County staff have emphasized that all Mineral Designated lands seeking a mining permit will undergo environmental review during the permit process. In reality, a citizen challenge of a mine permit is a huge endeavor requiring immediate notification, sufficient funding and time to prepare a position (which often isn’t the case), legal representation, and obtaining expert opinions. Citizen participation is vital, but challenging.

2) The aggregate and hard rock needs of Thurston County are much smaller than those of the more urban areas of the Puget Sound region. We urge you to consider and plan for the possibility of an excess of mining proposals to export gravel and rock. We hope that your primary interest would be to maintain a balanced economy, and protect healthy streams, water supplies and the natural beauty of Thurston County.

We thank the Thurston County staff and the Thurston County Planning Commission for the opportunity to comment on new options for Mineral Lands Designation.

Sincerely,

Sam Merrill

Conservation Chair, Black Hills Audubon
Ms. Buhler,

I am contacting you regarding the upcoming hearing on the Mineral Resource Lands Designation Options. I urge the Planning Commission to reject any plans that would impact our residential areas. I live near Smith Prairie Rd. S.E. and Lake Lawrence Rd. SE, and am deeply concerned about the impact of commercial mining of any kind in this area. I have my own private well, and treasure having fresh clean water daily. Local mining runs the risk of polluting our underground water supplies, and rivers. I am also concerned about air and noise pollution from the use of heavy equipment, not to mention, additional heavy trucks and machinery on our local roads.

I have lived at 16921 Reichel Rd. S.E. for 30 years and chose my location for the pristine environment, natural setting, and the peace and quiet that it all provides for me and my family. I am deeply concerned that the impact of local commercial mining would seriously threaten my lifestyle and all that I cherish and enjoy.

I urge the Planning Commission to keep commercial mining away from our residential areas in Thurston County.
Thank you for your attention on this matter.

Sincerely,
Janet L. Ferrari

Virus-free. www.avast.com
Maya Buhler

From: Dave Lewis <davel@gravelpits.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 8:57 PM
To: Maya Buhler
Cc: Karen Deal; James Essig; mary.castle@weyerhaeuser.com; Dean Smith; Mark Hancock; Ryan Ransavage; Patricia Larson; Mike Schuh; Jerry Trudeau; Bruce Chattin
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Update/Mineral Resource Lands

Maya,

Please pass the following to the Planning Commissioners.

Thurston County Planning Commissioners,
You have been working on plan updates for Mineral Resource Lands. This has not been an easy task. Thank you for all of your work, it is not an easy task. As a member of this stakeholders group and previous ones the same concerns from the past have not been resolved.
You have reviewed your consultant’s report, staff reports and input from the stakeholders. The maps being presented to you show a narrow approach and a broad approach. The narrow approach would mostly conform to Chapter 3 of the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan and TCC 20.30B. But, these codes appear to be in conflict with WAC 365-190-040(7a) and (7b) and other GMA Guidelines. It could be that the GMA Guidelines may have changed after the 2013 Thurston County Codes were approved. The broad approach appears to be the best approach for designation of mineral lands as this approach would meet the WACs and the GMA guidelines but, the Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 3, and TCC 20.30B would have to be rewritten.
Because of the above we request that Planning Commissioners and Staff take a step back and review GMA Guidelines, Thurston County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 3, and TCC 20.30B. When the GMA requirements and the Thurston County Codes match the mapping, then proceed.
Thank you for your consideration of this request.
Respectfully,
Dave Lewis

[Dave Lewis's contact information]

[Dave Lewis's company logo]
Date: March 6, 2018

To: Thurston County Planning Commission
    Maya Buhler, Associate Planner, Thurston County buhlerm@co.thurston.wa.us

From: Loretta Seppanen, Board Chair, South of the Sound Community Farm Land Trust

Re: Comments for the March 7, 2018 Public Hearing on Mineral Lands Draft Designation Options

There are some 16,000 acres in Thurston County designated as Long Term Agricultural (LTA) lands. That designation stems from the aim in the Growth Management Act (1990) to protect land of “long-term significance for the commercial production of food or other agricultural products.” These lands were selected based on soil type, historical use, distance from urban areas and other factors compatible with commercial agricultural production and have low-density zoning restrictions designed to reduce development pressure. In addition to the LTA land, Thurston County is fortunate that another 16,000 or more acres of other land, much of it close to urban areas, is also in farm production in the county. Keeping all of those lands in farm production is vital to the continued viability of farming in our region.

Of the LTA land, 2,060 acres also has geology and other factors that indicate the land may support the commercial extraction of minerals (mining), including sand, gravel, and rock. Up for consideration at this time is co-designating this vital agricultural land as Long Term Agricultural Land and Mineral Resource Land. It is our recommendation that you not co-designate this vital land as Mineral Resource Land.

South of the Sound Community Farm Land Trust is a local non-profit organization dedicated to promoting a vibrant local food and farming systems through community supported farmland preservation strategies, educational outreach, and partnerships that increase opportunities for farms and farmers to flourish. We rely on grant and community support to acquire farmland or easements on farmland with the goals of keeping the land in production and making access to farmland more affordable for future generations of farmers.

We recognize the value of the protection for farmland brought about by the designations required in the Growth Management Act. While Thurston County continues to see loss of farmland, the rate of loss today is significantly less than the before the Long Term Agricultural designation. We ask you to continue to protect all our vital Long Term Agricultural Land.
Please consider these factors that lead us to oppose co-designating the land:

- **Co-designating LTA as mineral lands gives a small gain for total mineral land acreage, but a blow to the much smaller amount of LTA land.**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Designation Adds Little to Total Mineral Lands, While Putting at Risk a Portion of Critical Long Term Ag Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Ag Lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-Designation would put at risk 13% of the vital Long Term Ag land while adding only 1.5% to the designated mineral lands.

- **If Co-Designated (2,060 Acres)**
- **Not Co-Designated Acres**

LTA lands receiving mining permits would be out of farm production for a decade or more while being mined.

- **Reclamation of LTA land after mining is a lengthy and expensive process that might not result in viable agricultural lands.**

Reclamation on Thurston County's agricultural lands would require costly additions of soil amendments and cover crops, year after year. There is a possibility that mining operations would not spend the time or money needed to return the soils to their former status that lead to their historic use as farmland.

Please join us in keeping land designation compatible with our working vision: to preserve farmland in Thurston County and keep it farmed forever.

Thank you for the opportunity to make comments on this important issue.
March 7th, 2018 Thurston County Planning Commission Public Input
Mineral Lands Designation Options

To the Thurston County Planning Commission:

Good Evening. My name is Kela Hall-Wieckert and I am a student at the Evergreen State College whose studies pertain to sustainable agricultural policy. I am a Thurston County resident of two and a half years and plan on living here indefinitely as it has become my cherished home and place. As an invested advocate for our County, I raise concerns that directly pertain to our community’s access to fertile lands, ability to grow local food, and thus, provide healthy options for Thurston County residents.

The option to co-designate currently designated Long Term Agricultural (LTA) and Nisqually Agricultural lands as mineral lands proves a direct threat to the conservation of agricultural lands, a stated goal in the current Comprehensive Plan of Thurston County. The Current Designation Criteria option for the co-designation of 2,060 acres of LTA as mineral lands (i.e. Map Option 1a) would open 13% of Thurston County’s LTA to mining, putting at risk the already dwindling acreage of arable farmlands in our County. Farmland in our County has decreased by over 75% since the 1950’s. In contrast, these 2,060 acres would only increase the total mineral land acreage in Thurston County by 1.5% (See Fig. I on p. 2).

Opening 13% of Thurston County’s agricultural land to mining risks taking it out of production for a decade or more, while offering only a minuscule increase in commercial access to mining thin deposits of primarily Type 3 sand and gravel. And this does not even account for the time and expense of agricultural reclamation after mining. When the A horizon (topsoil, the most important portion of soil for farming) and the B horizon (subsoil) of soils are mixed during mining efforts, the result disturbs the topsoil and makes farming incredibly difficult. Reclamation of Thurston County’s agricultural lands after mining would require costly additions of soil amendments and cover crops, year after year, with no guarantee of success. Examples of successful reclamations presented by Rian Skov at the last mineral lands designation meeting (January 17th, 2018) occurred in other counties, such as Grant and Whatcom County, with different soils and farmland uses than in Thurston County. Where are the examples of successful reclamation of agricultural lands after mining practices in Thurston County?

Lastly, I wish to emphasize that designating land as mineral land is the threatening first step towards the permitting of mining, and this puts LTA and Nisqually Agricultural lands at risk. Some have claimed that mineral land designations do not lead to mineral permits, but why risk designation in the first place? We cannot continue to depend on these permits not happening and instead must make steps towards the stated efforts of agricultural land conservation. Let’s step back from putting one of our most important natural resources at risk.
FIGURE 1:

Risk of Co-Designation to LTA (Long Term Agriculture) versus Minimal Gain of Mineral Lands in Thurston County

This graphic shows the disparity between the risk of co-designation to total LTA in Thurston County versus the small gain to total mineral lands in Thurston County. Considering such a small increase in total mineral lands, why continue with co-designation?

Graphic created by Kela Hall-Wiekert 3/6/18
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Thurston County
Planning Commission
2000 Lakeridge Dr. SW
Olympia WA, 98502

Dear Commissioners,

**Subject:** Thurston County Mineral Resource Lands Designation

Weyerhaeuser appreciates the work by the county planning commission and staff in compiling a wide variety of data and input on designating mineral lands of long term significance. We would recommend that the data be refined further by practical application around the quality and the location from market of the bedrock resources as required by WAC 365-190-070. The reasons for this request are:

1. A large majority of the identified bedrock resource has not been mapped in detail and our experience in these geologic formations is that the quality and depths are highly variable. There is also opportunity for increasing the available mineral resource lands in areas where thin layers of glacial deposits cover quality bedrock not shown on current geologic mapping.
2. Transportation and access to market from some resources located in mountainous areas are challenging topographically and inaccessible during winter months.

Other comments include:

1. Without simultaneous modifications to the Comprehensive Plan and Critical Areas Ordinance in this process, the resources proposed in the Mineral Lands Designation map amendment will not remotely represent actual minable acreages.
2. The least impact to surrounding communities and the environment is to create a streamlined process for expansion of existing operations. These operations have already established a presence in their communities, the transportation systems, and land impacts.
3. If there is no pathway to modify the mineral designation map options as currently presented by the staff, our recommendation is to adopt Map Option 1a.

Regards,
Mary Castle
Mary Castle
Manager, Minerals West
March 6, 2018

Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development
2000 Lakeridge Dr. SW
Olympia, WA 98502

RE: Proposed Mineral Lands Designation

Dear Maya Buhler,

Although Map 2 Option 2a has the least Long Term Agricultural (LTA) land included of the three proposals for county-wide mineral lands designation, I am still strongly opposed to co-designating mineral lands and LTA lands. Please let me explain my position below.

Most of the co-designated LTA lands are along major county waterways (i.e. Deschutes, Nisqually, Chehalis, Skookumchuck and Scatter Creek, etc.), these riparian areas are highly used by wildlife, many times acting as migration corridors between habitats across the landscape. As opposed to agriculture activities, sand and gravel mining near these waterways will disturb and disrupt resident and migratory species that use these areas. I found many of the proposed LTA parcels also have priority wildlife habitat designations in the WDFW Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) on-line mapper tool. For example, the LTA parcel proposed mining site at the corner of Lawrence Lake and Neat Road is a designated waterfowl concentration area, the LTA land parcel just south of Lake Lawrence is next to waterfowl concentrations and actually contains breeding habitat for the Great Blue Heron. This particular parcel is present and stays unaltered across all three option maps.

A parcel cannot be both a mine and agricultural land. Mining is a short-term extraction venture while LTA is a long-term business committed toward good stewardship to keep the land productive. It appears you are trying to give farmers the option of developing gravel mines on their land. Mining land cannot be restored back to agriculture land because the topsoil will be lost, this loss is irreversible. Consider this, if a landowner develops a mine on his LTA land, what are the new tax and use guidelines? Surely the parcel can’t meet the LTA use guidelines anymore. The only fair and equitable solution is to subdivide out the mine as a separate land use designation. However, as you know, we are rapidly losing agriculture lands across our region (e.g. Puyallup River valley etc.), subdividing by use will only exacerbate this problem, however co-designation is not a viable answer either. “If two or more natural resource land designations apply, counties and cities must determine if these designations are incompatible. If they are incompatible, counties and cities should examine the criteria to determine which use has the greatest long-term commercial significance, and that resource use should be assigned to the lands being designated” WAC 365-190-040(7)(b). LTA and mining are incompatible land uses.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alex Foster
P.O. Box 601
Rainier, WA 98576
From: Kent Canny <kent.canny@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 12:04 PM
To: Maya Buhler
Subject: Mineral Grounds Designations

To Whom It May Concern:

I am concerned that the current undertaking may designate too many areas as “gravel resources”. I do not think we should designate any more of these areas than meets our internal Thurston County requirements, plus an equal amount that could be exported. I also want to make sure that none of the gravel designations are near sensitive areas or organic farmland.

Thanks for including my comments,
Kent R. Canny
7848 58th Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98516
This email was created by the County Internet web server from the email masking system. Someone from the Public has requested to contact you with the following information:

To: the Thurston County Commissioners
Subject: Gravel Mining

From: Bob Jacobs
Email (if provided): jacobsony@aol.com

Message:

Commissioners:

I will be unable to attend the hearing this evening that deals with mineral lands designations, but want to make one related suggestion. If any gravel mines leave behind lakes, I believe these lakes should become public property for public recreational use. This is done in some other jurisdictions as far as I know, and is well justified considering the environmental impacts caused by such operations. There should be little objection from mining companies because they have no use for these areas after they've been mined out.

Thank you,

Bob Jacobs 352-1346

Revised 1/22/2017
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Allison Osterberg  
Senior Planner  
Thurston County Community Planning & Economic Development  
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW  
Olympia, WA 98502

RE: Thurston County Mineral Resource Overlay

Allison:

Miles Sand & Gravel Company (Miles) has been working with Thurston County to achieve the best policies impacting mining. We appreciate the work Thurston County has done to designate Mineral Resources. Miles has the following comments:

- Mapping and Comprehensive Plan Language  
  - The mapping proposed from Thurston County is based on new data from Associated Earth Science Inc. (AESI) but the Mineral Resource Overlay (MRO) was language created with far less applicable data and used on a more specific designation criteria  
  - The currently proposed MRO mapping does not take into consideration all critical area that could and/or will impact mineral extraction. Specifically limits to mining and major accessory uses to mining from Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas and Well Head Protection Areas

- Geology  
  - The current maps show bed rock deposits that have potential economic value. The hard rock in western Washington is highly variable due to volcanic and associated hydrothermal influence. This leads to large masses of rock that will not meet Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) specifications for construction aggregates  
  - Sand & Gravel deposits have a vast testing history showing compliance with WSDOT specifications, yet are weighted the same as hard rock, which does not have the same testing history, for the MRO designation

- Political  
  - The initial MRO area does not adequately address potential impacts with a generic buffers. Site conditions are different at every mine site, and should be addressed individually. This is supported by WAC 365-190-040.  
  - The data used to reduce the overall MRO area overall are not accurate to the scale needed to make either include or exclude areas that have aggregate reserves
Miles proposes the following actions and revision to address the above mentioned issues:

- Map MRO using AESI's data as the primary source for reserves
- Prioritize the designation of sand and gravel deposits, as those meet the current WSDOT specifications
- MRO Language needs to be rewritten to include new information from AESI, in addition the following items should be permit level designation
  - Make Critical Area impacts a permit level item
  - Make buffers a permit level item
  - Make major accessory uses a permit level item
- Allow for mine expansion through a reasonable process

These changes may seem drastic but, it is important to accurately and responsibly prepare for the needs of Thurston County. Miles believes the over designation of hard rock does not accomplish the goals of the Growth Management Act to protect Minerals of Long Term Significance. The majority of hard rock designations are not feasible due to the lack of WSDOT testing, unknown rock quality and, lack of infrastructure to access the hard rock, and the time and distance to market do not make it feasible now or in the near future.

We believe the suggestions allow site specific flexibility, while meeting the goals of the Growth Management Act, and protecting critical areas within Thurston County.

Sincerely,

Ryan Ransavage
Environmental
Dear Ms. Buhler,

I write to express my concerns about the mineral lands designation update and the potential harm it will cause our County in the long term if mineral lands are co-designated with long term agricultural lands. We need all the farmland we have to stay as farmland so that we will be able to provide for our projected population.

I am also concerned that mineral designation will cause a proliferation of gravel mining/asphalt operations across our County. Thurston County is "gravel-rich" meaning we have much more than is needed for use in this County and I would hate to see us become an exporter of resources that benefits only the mine operators while our County and its residents suffer the consequences of these operations in the form of more pollution to our aquifers and surface water resources.

Please protect areas identified as "critical," agricultural and residential (and any other sensitive areas) from having mineral lands designation and please be sure to include County-wide regulations so that permit seekers have to abide by all the rules for a sustainable future, and not be able to push through a site-by-site review process.

Let's keep our County beautiful and healthy for everyone, not just a special interest industry. That is the job our County government.

Sincerely,

Dr. Warren Kronenberg
3206 36 Ave NW
Olympia WA 98502
To: Thurston County Planning Commission
Re: 2018 MRL Comp Plan Designations

March 7, 2018

The Planning Commission is being asked to select a Mineral Land Designation option.

The County has done a good job of obtaining new information from AES to help identify and characterize their mineral resources for sand, gravel and hard rock. This provides a very good place to start.

In January, we reviewed the county information that shows anticipated population growth, transportation funding and consumption trends the county can anticipate. It clearly shows a need for additional mineral resources.

County staff has done a good job of putting together existing county documents for the Comprehensive Plan, Code of Ordinances, 2017 - 2018 Comp Plan Amendment Document (item 1), MRL maps, and related WACs and RCW's as it applies to the GMA designation requirements.

It is these documents that help demonstrate and support the direction should take for MRL designation.

Staff correctly points out the county has not been in compliance with GMA for a number of years because they have only designated existing and permitted sources.

As a result, since 1990, the county has elected to not conserve an adequate supply of mineral resources lands as required and has knowingly precluded the designation of known mineral resource lands. This is in conflict with WAC 365-190-170. This is also in conflict with the RCW 36.70A.020 requirement for successful achievement of the natural resources designation goal; “a land base of sufficient size and quality to maintain and enhance those industries and the development and use of land use techniques that discourages uses incompatible to the management of designated lands". WAC 365-190-040(5d)

The 2017 – 2018 Comp Plan Amendment document outlines a suggested path forward. It does a good job of documenting what designation is intended to do and what it is not intended to do.

It also correctly and succinctly states repeatedly, designation does not indicate a permit will be granted. Designation only shows a “potential” based on geology as a mineral land. The county's development regulations, permitting process and SEPA review will ultimately determine if a permit application is granted. This represents an entirely new and rigorous process for stakeholder and public engagement and comment. A good permit application should be evaluated on the merit of its application.... a poor permit application will have a hard time getting though the process.

The document also regularly compromises some of its own positions as it considers a broad or narrow approach. It supposes on what might occur or what the perception of each option might be. GMA itself makes that a moot consideration.
In the narrow approach: the documents say it could “create an expectation that mineral extraction is a reasonable use of all properties in the designation”. Based on geology and as a designated property that is the correct intent to suggest. However, the documents already correctly dispelled that notion.

The narrow approach would exclude some lands “not eligible” for mining and would provide a more “realistic” estimate where mining activities would ultimately occur.

One area where this makes little sense is when a MRL land (in the narrow approach) is not eligible when immediately located adjacent to an existing or active MRL land and or does not designate a MRL area within an already designated MRL boundary. In both cases, the resources are the same and should be designated rather than pick and choose when a land is not eligible for designation. GMA does not provide for that level of subjective designation. Permitting will provide the opportunity for further review.

The counties challenge now is they have put this responsibility off for too many years. It is now time to make up for lost time and designate what should have been designated since 1990. The longer required designation is deferred, it creates more conflict, more incompatible zoning, creates unrealistic locations where mining can occur by creating conflict with incompatible uses.

Given the non-compliant designation history of the county, to come into and be in compliance long term make more sense now and provides more certainty, predictability and consistency for the public, industry, planning commissioners and county commissioners moving forward. Predictability and consistency are the basic tenets of GMA.

If the commissioners carefully consider the documents provided by staff, the direction for the County becomes clear.

We respectfully ask the commissioners to consider and adopt the more responsible Option #1 & Option #1A as provided by staff.

Sincerely,

Bruce Chattin
Executive Director

Cc:
James Essig,
Ryan Ransavage,
Mary Castle
Mark Hancock
Who decides, who gets to dig what, on what land?

Can private property owners dig a rock pit on their land? Can Corporations come in and dig a pit mine? What rights to property owners have when rock pit mines are dug on surrounding land? Who decides?

Our concern is these rock pit operations are incredibly noisy and filthy and have no place in a small farm, rural county. We oppose all form of rock, gravel quarry mining in the area.

John and Merry Whitten
15115 Lindsay RD SE, Yelm, WA 98597
DATE: March 7, 2018

TO: Thurston County Planning and Development
    2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
    Olympia, WA 98502

FROM: Steve Hitzel, Environmental Engineer, Granite Construction Company

RE: Mineral Lands Overlay Designation

Commissioners,

On behalf of Granite Construction Company, I would like to provide input on the Mineral Resource Land Designation options that are being discussed in this public hearing today. The goal of the designation of Mineral Resource Lands in Thurston County, as stated in the Growth Management Act, is to ensure the County's needs are met as the population grows and develop. Specifically, state guidelines direct that:

"Successful achievement of the natural resource industries goal set forth in RCW 36.70A.020 requires the conservation of land base sufficient in size and quality to maintain and enhance those industries, and the development and use of land use techniques that discourage uses incompatible to the management of designated lands." WAC 365-190-040(5d)

The Mineral Land Designation options currently before the commissioners fail to meet this goal. In the Long Range Planning Staff Report dated February 28, 2018, it states:

"By designating mineral resource land, the County does not imply that mining-related activities will automatically occur there. New mining operations planned in areas designated as mineral resource lands will be reviewed before they are permitted to operate, in accordance with all relevant state and local regulations."

Adopting any of the proposed designation options will eliminate large swathes of viable sand and gravel land available for future developments, which significantly impacts the viability of new operations and the expansion of existing mines where prime mineral deposits exist. The purpose of Mineral Lands Designation is to protect these resources from competing development and should focus on promoting the development of these finite resources rather than precluding mine development before any site specific analysis has been performed. The focus should be on sand and gravel resources which are the most economically viable and the most easily transportable to the market. The majority of existing mines are currently located in the sand and gravel areas of the AESI Mineral Resource Inventory from August 2017. Access to major highways and thoroughfares directly affect the cost and environmental impact of mines and the sale of resources. All three options limit the development of mineral lands along the I-5 corridor, therefore the viability of development as a mine is limited.
The staff report calculates its available resource by acreage, however approximately 40,000 acres are located in Capitol Forest, which is far from the commercial market and the mineral resources located there are best suited for “management of state land,” as Darin Cramer of the DNR stated in his January 12, 2018 letter. The Capitol Forest, along with the large swath of forested, bedrock, lands in the southern portion of the county, represents a large portion of the designated lands which are being considered today. These areas lack developed roads and access to the commercial market, making this an unlikely source for commercial mineral extraction and usage outside of the forested lands they are contained in. Attachment D from the Staff Report maps out approximately 100,000 acres of bedrock lands in areas that would not be economical to mine. This would bring the overall inventory, for the County to consider as viable resource, down to approximately 40,000 acres and reduce the projected

Designation of Mineral Lands does not remove the other permitting requirements that mines must obtain before operation. These permits take a closer look at each site as it exists, meaning real site specific data can be obtained to make a more informed decision. The blanket designations outside of the bedrock deposits need to be less restrictive so that operators will have the ability to develop and expand a site as the need arises to meet the demands from consumers within the County.

Granite supports co-designation of Mineral Lands, Agriculture, Forest Lands and Critical Areas, as required by state law. The law is clear that “if both critical area and natural resource land use designations apply to a given parcel or a portion of a parcel, both or all designations must be made.” WAC 365-190-020(7). Therefore, the proposals shown on Map 2 and Map 3 to exclude from MRL designation any lands that may also be designated critical areas, such as important habitats and floodplains, is illegal. Where both a critical area and a MRL designation apply, both designations must be made and one cannot preclude the other. The mass exclusion of lands will cause problems in the future when greater demand is required to sustain the growth within the County. Critical Areas can be identified with additional study at the sites and addressed with mitigation measures by the agencies who are experts in that field. Leave the decision for development and mitigation measures up to the permitting phase, when the stakeholders associated with a site can work together to achieve the most beneficial outcome.

Within the Staff Report, it states “the excavation and processing of minerals is limited to lands within the Mineral Lands Overlay, and only that land is eligible for permitting of mineral operations.” By limiting the County’s available resources now, we may lose the ability to mine viable material. The options presented here to the Planning Commission fails to achieve the goals of the GMA and fails to prepare the County for the growth that it is projected to experience over the next few decades. These options will make it more difficult for operators to provide a product to our #1 customers, the County and WSDOT, who provide a crucial benefit to the public by improving transportation infrastructure.

In closing, this letter and our testimony tonight make it clear that the Planning Commission must recommend adoption of Map 1A, or else give direction to County Staff to do additional work and bring back to you additional options for review. Only Map 1A meets State law requirements for the designation of MRL.
Granite Construction Company appreciates the effort that the Planning Commission and Staff have put into this process. Mineral Lands are a complex and a vitally important aspect of the local economy and we appreciate the opportunity to participate.

Sincerely,
Granite Construction Company

Steve Hitzel
Environmental Engineer
Washington Region
steven.hitzel@gcinc.com
Dear County Commissioners, and Planning Commission;

Our public comment, and concern, is in regards to an area in S. Thurston County known as Rocky Prairie. (Bordered by Tilley Rd S to the West, 113th Ave SE to the North & 143rd Ave SE to the South.)

Rocky Prairie is more than just a prairie (albeit, one of the few remaining in the entire region): This large track of land also encompasses protected Oregon Oak stands, wetland swaths, aquifer recharge areas, and a sensitive species + habitat mix prone to noise, water, soil, machinery and traffic disturbances. Additionally, the larger the area without potential disturbance, the greater the much needed preservation of wildlife corridors, such as that which continue to allow the elk herds access through the area.

Map 3 shows a new designation on the Prairie land, being "mineral lands where additional review may be needed," which is a very large expansion of the existing mining designation. The proposed new designation of possible land use in addition to what is already a potential threat to the surrounding environment --that being the adjacent Fish and Wildlife Preserve, Millersylvania State Park, and thousands of acres of privately-owned conservation forestland, seems highly unreasonable, and greatly ill-fitted.

As mentioned in the County's notices, Thurston County is growing at a rapid rate. South Thurston County acreage is being developed left + right, at a steady pace for some years now. The need for sizable undisturbed land (which excludes managed forests and the public park), is crucial to keep "rural" rural when managing rapid growth in the rural-residential areas.

Even though the proposed new designation (option) states that "additional review may be needed," thus, it is not set in stone, adding it at all as a possibility is by far an oversight when all factors have been taken into account, such as those mention herein and more on record.

Thank you for your attention,

Meryl Bernstein
Tenino

Tom Rutledge
Tenino

Wendy Rutledge
Tenino

Virus-free. www.avast.com
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Thurston County Planning Commission-Mineral Lands Designation

I am requesting the Planning Commission to again consider that the percentage of Capitol Forest designated as mineral lands be significantly reduced and incorporating the following requirements to protect the environment and private property.

What is being requested of the Planning Commission:

1) Reduce the Capitol Forest designated mineral lands to 1/3 or less of the current recommendation. Currently nearly the entire Forest is mineral designated.

Reclamation of forestry lands that are commercially mined can take years if even possible. Capitol Forest serves as a viable, tested renewable commercial enterprise for the State. To designate 1/2 or more of designated mineral lands as Capitol Forest is not responsible. To propose Capitol Forest is a single major location for Commercial mining is irresponsible and contrary to the forest's existing public trust as a future renewable timber resource, watershed, multi-use recreational area and wildlife habitat. Capitol Forest streams contain Coastal Cutthroat Trout which have been considered off and on for possible threatened and endangered species. Capitol Forest also contains habitat for Federally threatened and State endangered species of Marbled Murrelet.

2) Capitol Forest DNR management staff and the Planning Commission must implement a joint regulatory platform and restrictions.

To meet the mining operators needs as well as Thurston County residents, the regulations between DNR and Thurston County must be cohesive, clear and concise between both agencies for any mining operations.

3) Environmental protections must be added in excess of the current critical areas buffers.

Capitol Forest and other forested areas (where much of the mineral lands is designated) in Thurston County is critical habitat for an abundance of wildlife and fish populations. Due to the magnitude of environmental damage caused by mining, additional set-backs beyond the current critical area buffers and standards must be put in place for these any mining operations.

4) Rural residential homes and property must be protected from the loss of value, environmental destruction and character due to mining operations. The following must be included in designation rules for mineral lands:

- **Buffers** to adjacent property owners must be at least be at least 2300 feet for mining operations.
- **Notification** must be made in writing by the County to residents within a 2 mile, 360 degree radius of the borders of the mining property to allow citizen input and mitigation agreements before any operations start.
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Thurston County Planning Commission-Mineral Lands Designation

- **Landslide mitigation regulations** must be applied to avert damage from mining.
- **Groundwater resources** must not suffer from mining activities affecting private or community access to water.
- **Groundwater** must not be damaged by any contamination from **mining toxins and chemicals**.
- **Quiet enjoyment** must be protected for rural residents:
  a: The operation can last no longer than 6 months
  b: Restoration must be completed in 2 months
  c: **Hours of mining operations** are restricted to Monday - Friday, 8 am-4:30 pm
  d: **Air quality** must be protected that debris and dust does not impact air quality for surrounding homes and properties.
- **SEPA is required for all commercial mining operations.**

- 5) **Planning Department staff and DNR resources must be a priority to support the protections of private property impacted by commercial mining requests.**

Adequate resources must be designated that will ensure protections and responsible projects related to Commercial Mining. Community involvement and interests are paramount and must be supported. The Docket of the County is all ready behind years in projects. How can there be enough County resources to handle this new level of commercial mining that will now be an option?

It is imperative that the Planning Commission include these requested items as listed above before final proposals are made to the Thurston County Board of Commissioners.

Thank you, Christy White
Marilyn Gresen
2512 N. Cambridge
5050
Ogden
98912

Several of the bills
have additional ones
that exclude mining
operations. However,
due to the significant
impact the environment
I am concerned about the
environment—and not
for additional predictions
to be cut in

I am all aware to
remember all the destruction
we have done by not knowing
the effects of what we did to the
environment. It can
never be replaced.
I support Option #2 with some modifications. It has the best chance of providing adequate mineral resources for the county while limiting land use conflicts where designations could lead to sensitive environmental area loss. This option would be stronger by excluding current county wetland inventory from proposed mineral designations.

No-codesignation, save miner from doing wetland and critical area inventories, and save staff time.

WAC 365-190-040 7 (a) Overlapping designations. The designation process may result in critical area designations that overlap other critical area or natural resource land classifications. Overlapping designations should not necessarily be considered inconsistent.

(a) If a critical area designation overlies a natural resource land designation, both designations apply. For counties and cities required or opting to plan under the act, reconciling these multiple designations will be the subject of local development regulations adopted pursuant to RCW36.70A.060.

(b) If two or more natural resource land designations apply, counties and cities must determine if these designations are incompatible. If they are incompatible, counties and cities should examine the criteria to determine which use has the greatest long-term commercial significance, and that resource use should be assigned to the lands being designated.

- I have not seen in Thurston County where a gravel mine, most might be large now since they are required to be deeper now, will return to farmland.
- Example I read was a coal mine in Ohio

How do you assess long term for agriculture? How do you assess forever?
- bees for fertilization
- birds for eating insects/pests
- food
- open space
- wintering grounds for waterfowl and birds in general

Chapter 20.30B.030 Designation Criteria:

1.f.iii. Mineral resource lands shall not include agricultural lands of long term commercial significance, or historical/cultural preservation sites, and any FEMA one hundred year floodplains.

Area south and east of Lake Lawrence, an LTA is surrounded by new MLDs. If option 3a or 1a is chosen, an LTA would be compromised. (25 trumpeter swan and 100s of ducks there in January—a wintering habitat).

Cumulative Impact on aquifer: mines are studied in isolation. The County should do a basic study of the cumulative impact of mines especially when large areas might be mined.

1.f.v. Mineral extraction activities shall not negatively affect nor endanger surface and groundwater flows and quality.
Dear Ms. Buhler,

I urge you not to co-designate our farmlands as mineral lands. We have only a small amount of acres in farmland and with our expected population increase we will need every acre. Keep our farmlands preserved forever!

Thank you,

[Signature]

Proud member
League of Women Voters
From: Diana Rose <dianarose08@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:14 AM
To: Maya Buhler
Subject: no mining please

I just now heard of this proposal and as an owner in the affected area - my response is NO! We don't need nor want this crazy plan. As you are a representative of the people you serve, I expect that you will take my NO response along with all the other NO responses and do the right thing - do not approve of this.

Further, in the future - you must give all of us adequate notice of such meetings and proposals. I would have attended and given my response in person, had I known of this meeting. Don't try to schedule meetings without property owners awareness and permission.

If you need more information from me, feel free to email me at this address.
Thank you,
Diana Rose

--
Diana
To: Planning Commission

Subject: Mineral lands update

From: Maureen Canny

Email (if provided): mocanny@comcast.net

Message:

Dear Long Range Planning Commissioners,

Please note my concern about the mineral lands designation update and its potential for proliferation of gravel mining/asphalt operations across our County. Thurston County is “gravel-rich” meaning we have much more than is needed for use in this County. We should not become the exporter of resources which will degrade our ecosystems, scar our landscapes, and negatively impact our roads and transportation systems. The potential to violate our aquifers and surface water resources with huge swaths of mining operations is of paramount concern.

In your designation planning, please protect areas identified as “critical,” agricultural and residential (and any other sensitive areas) from having mineral lands designation.

Please be sure to include County-wide regulations so that permit seekers have to abide by all the rules for a sustainable future, and not be able to push through a site-by-site review process.

Finally, please remember the mission of the long term planning commission is to look toward a sustainable future “so communities can thrive in a healthy environment.”

Thank you,
Maureen Canny
mocanny@comcast.net
360-438-7424

Revised 1/22/2017