

Town of Eatonville
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY 7:00 PM, June 15, 2009
COMMUNITY CENTER
305 CENTER STREET WEST

Chairman Schaub called the meeting to order at 7:00PM .

Commissioners Present: Schmit, Lambert, Craig, Schaub, Treyz and Harris.

Commissioner Lambert led the flag salute.

Town Staff Present: Nick Bond, Kerri Murphy and Mart Kask-Town Consultant

Approval of agenda: MSC Lambert / Harris Carried

There were no communications from the commission or the public.

Public Hearings: Continued-

Lynch Creek Quarry Planned Environmental Impact Statement and Sub-area Plan

Nick Bond gave a recap of the last meeting we talked about the Lynch Creek Planned EIS and Sub-area plan. He has since sent out a new document that is a final draft EIS that contains all the parts of what was required in our grant that we received from CTED. This planning study came out of a CTED grant that was \$ 75,000.00 to do a sub-area plan and planned action EIS for the Lynch Creek Quarry area. The grant was awarded in 2007 just shortly after we had a comp plan amendment approved at Pierce County to expand into the 86 acres of land. The county at that time designated the land for "employment center". Under the county land use and zoning regulations and in that same year Eatonville also designated that land as industrial in its comp plan. The question before the planning commission this evening is to recommend approval to the council, not whether to approve or deny this plan. We are looking for a motion for approval of this plan to the town council so that it can be considered in the 2010 comprehensive plan amendments which will lead to the adoption of development regulations consistent with the plan. There is still a whole second year of public process that has to be gone through before anything in this plan can become a reality. The issue before the planning commission this evening is not whether to designate this land for industrial use, it has already been designated. The issue is whether we are going to have a cohesive plan of development for the development of 86 acres as an industrial business park type site or whether we are just going to wait for developers to come to Eatonville with a proposal to do a piece meal development approach on the property. The planned action EIS is made to streamline the permitting process to make it easier for businesses to develop and locate wherever the EEIS is performed. There have been some substantial changes since the last meeting based on the public testimony and comment letters that were received in the thirty day comment period for the draft plan action EIS. The document before the planning commission this evening contains revisions the most significant being two of the various maps identifying open space, buffers and other more conceptual elements of the design. It is a conceptual development proposal. With this conceptual plan it is a lot easier to visualize what this is going to look like in terms of having tree lined streets, conservation areas where a lot of the stands of large trees along the railroad grade will remain. Weyerhaeuser Road is to be the primary access road and Berggren Road will be used for residential access only there would be no trucks going through there. The use tables have been updated as well. The big issues were the prison and the adult uses. The state has determined that a prison is an essential public facility. It is very hard to stop an essential public facility from being built. Dumps, airports and prisons are all essential public facilities. If the state or the county wanted to locate something like that in Eatonville they could do so regardless of what our development regulations say as long as

they found a suitable site. By identifying a possible location for that type of use we found probably the least obtrusive areas of Eatonville. It would only be allowed now in areas A and F as shown on the map which are the furthest from residential areas and are well buffered and isolated from other uses. There is no proposal to have a prison in Eatonville it is something that if we could get a low security prison it would be a good employer, provide good living wage jobs and people coming off the highway would not even know it was there. The adult uses issue was different. There has been a case at the supreme court of Washington where they determined that adult uses are protected under the constitution and that cities cannot zone to exclude adult uses.

Eatonville currently does not allow adult uses in any of its zones and as a result we're proposing to allow adult uses in zones A & F because it is probably the least likely place that these would develop because they are so far off the roadway they would not be viable. We don't want to see adult uses but by providing a place where they can be located we won't end up with somebody trying to start one downtown and saying that Eatonville has eliminated all opportunities for adult uses, and we say no you must develop it in the area where we decided that adult uses are okay.

Mr. Bond reiterated that what they are looking for tonight from the planning commission is simply a recommendation to the town council that they approve the sub-area plan for consideration in the 2010 comprehensive plan amendment cycle. If the council decides to do this, it will come up in January and we will begin the comprehensive plan amendment process where the sub-area plan element of this document (pages 15-35) the text under the headings is what will be considered to be added to the plan. If the comprehensive plan amendment is adopted then the council would consider adopting development regulations which would allow those uses which are identified in the EIS under alternative 1,2 or 3. Alternative 2 is the preferred.

Commissioner Harris shared a study that she had found regarding property studies. One of the concerns that she has had is the adjoining neighborhoods about a decrease in property value. She found that any proximity to a quarry will decrease property value. She found a study that Galveston had done that is very similar to what Eatonville is looking at, in that they had multiple alternatives for development in a area adjoining neighborhoods. It said that for heavy industrial it decreased the property values. For light and medium industrial it actually increased the property values because you had people moving in wanting to live near where they could work so this was actually a positive impact. She asked Nick if these types of increase of property values for light industrial and the business type of use that alternative 2 is looking at, is this something that property owners could receive benefit from.

Mr. Bond said that the plan calls for the creation of 500 jobs as the maximum threshold in the EIS. If you bring that many jobs to Eatonville there is going to be a demand for housing in Eatonville which is going to have an impact on real estate values just having jobs here. The other thing that you have to look at is the installation of infrastructure associated with the site including water and sewer, sidewalks, parks, open space, all of these things are amenities that are going to have a positive impact on adjacent uses and the fact that even the medium manufacturing uses are the furthest away on the site.

Commissioner Treyz asked if there are any height restrictions and found that existing fire protection would not be adequate for a building over 40 feet. If alternative 1 was chosen would the town be proposing some kind of height restriction so that the light pollution and the visual pollution would be mitigated from the town itself?

Mr. Bond said that there is a height restriction under aesthetics on page 55, the height limit is set at three stories or fifty feet. Under public services, anything over forty feet is going to require mitigation in the form of providing a ladder truck for the fire department because they do not have equipment to reach a building of that height.

Commissioner Treyz asked if the town would be amendable to lowering the height restriction to two stories if it seems that this is what the public would prefer.

Mr. Bond said that for non-residential areas the height limit in both of the commercial zones is 40 feet. Three stories or fifty feet for an industrial use is consistent with the type of development we would see.

Commissioner Treyz asked if the town would be amendable to amending that to two stories if they find through the hearing process that this is what the community would prefer.

Mr. Bond explained that this decision would only come up when we adopt development regulations. This is only identifying mitigation for environmental impacts. The council is still going

to have to go through a process of amending the comp plan and they are going to have to consider adopting an industrial zone specific to this area. In this industrial zone they are going to have to identify minimum building setbacks and minimum height limits. This is something that the council can consider down the road.

Commissioner Treyz said that the list of alternative 1, light manufacturing, office and public use. He did not see that it includes retail. # 12, food, services, cafeterias and coffee shops but he did not see a clothing shop.

Mr. Bond said that they are not listed on purpose because this is made to be a job center. We want those types of uses to locate in our downtown and along major roadways.

Commissioner Treyz said it states that it will significantly impact the utilities. He asked if this would be electric and water.

Mr. Bond explained that it would be electric, water and sewer. There is going to have to be developer funded improvements unless the town can find grant money of some other source to make those improvements. That would all fall on the developer. It is not the town's responsibility.

Commissioner Treyz asked if in Nick's opinion would a significant increase in the installation of the utilities, would that have any future impact in the cost to the ordinary citizen.

Mr. Bond said that he thought that it would. Right now the town is only using approximately 60% of our sewer capacity at the sewer treatment plant and approximately 75% of our water capacity. If the numbers get closer to 85% you are going to have rate payers' paying into the system and this will help to drive down the cost of utilities for customers because the significant cost is in the infrastructure to treat the sewage or provide the water. He feels that council might be able to lower some of the utility rates once there are enough people paying as rate payers in this area.

Commissioner Treyz asked how many of the 500 jobs would be provided to existing residents and how many would be coming in from another area that would be settling here and utilizing or filling those jobs.

Mr. Bond said that he was not sure how you could calculate that. Most of these jobs would be supported by new residential growth and people who live in the surrounding Eatonville area who will choose to work here rather than work in Tacoma and Frederickson.

Commissioner Treyz said that there are 127 graduates coming out of our school this year and each one is looking for employment. We need to be looking at employment that is going to enhance our local people that are here now as well as bringing in expertise from other areas.

Commissioner Lambert asked what the plan is for the area marked as restoration area.

Mr. Bond said the restoration area is the slope of the existing Weyerhaeuser pit and the slope of the older pit that is on eastern side of Berggren Rd. Both of these areas will be reforested. In the design guidelines that were a number of species identified that could be planted on those slopes to both stabilize them and control runoff. Once mature they would be similar to the areas marked conservation area and this will take 30 to 40 years for these trees to mature.

Commissioner Lambert said that in the EIS about the different cost of utilities. How are we planning to pay for this? Is this something that the town will do up front and collect the fees later?

Mr. Bond said that there were some fees mentioned in the sub-area plan and what we propose to do is to include those in the capital facilities plan element to the comp plan. Those are estimates for what the actual cost of infrastructure to serve the area is going to run. That is something that the developer will be responsible for paying for unless the town found some other source of money but we are not proposing to finance that.

Commissioner Lambert said that Randles was on board with the town on this but what are Weyerhaeuser's feelings.

Mr. Bond said that they met with the town early on in this process. He does not think that they are very interested in being the developer. They are interested in this project because it makes it so that they could potentially sell this land to somebody that would want to develop it. Both Randles and Weyerhaeuser are coming out ahead on this because this project is adding value to their property. Randles could be interested in developing this once he has completed his mining activities on area A. We would like to see some activity occur sooner than the five to ten years projected to complete area A. Nick added that he has sent a copy of this sub-area plan to the real estate person at Weyerhaeuser and the town will try to meet with both Weyerhaeuser and Dave Randle this July.

Commissioner Lambert asked Weyerhaeuser Road from Weyerhaeuser into town, is this owned by Weyerhaeuser.

Mr. Bond said that the gravel area is owned by Weyerhaeuser and the paved area is public town right-of-way.

Commissioner Schmit asked what the width of the roads in the industrial area would be.

Mr. Bond explained that the gateway road coming in be 120 foot right-of-way. It is an extra wide right-of-way because we proposed having a separated landscape island between the travel lanes. Trees on both sides of the street with large areas for infiltration of storm water so that none of the storm water is being piped offsite. These are wide right-of-ways that are heavily landscaped to help minimize the visual impacts of this development on adjacent uses and just to make it an attractive place to work. The roads will all be engineered. This is just a concept plan.

Commissioner Craig asked if the possible train depot location would be only for industrial.

Mr. Bond said this was a possible location of a platform. When the Grand Luxe was coming to Eatonville they did not have a place to unload. This would make a location for people to safely unload with the possibility of parking. This was the most logical place. That whole area is proposed for conservation.

Commissioner Schmit asked if something like this would be a possible push to get public transportation out here.

Mr. Bond said that you would have to have a lot of people living out this far to make that a viable option.

Commissioner Lambert said that other than locations A-F on the concept plan, what is fixed and what is just concept.

Mr. Bond suggested that they read pages 35 to 62 where the impacts and mitigation are specifically included. Open space must be provided in accordance with this comprehensive plan. The road layout is something that is flexible and could be tweaked to accommodate specific geometries but conceptually should be similar to this. The uses are set in stone. The restoration, buffers, erosion control that are to occur during development are set in stone, but it's pretty clear that anything that says "shall" in the environmental impact statement is required. In the concept plan, if we had a specific development proposal we would ask if this is similar to the development plan and if not we would work with the developer to make it follow this as close as feasible. This will also depend what the development regulations say once those are adopted and what actually gets included in the comp plan. The development has to be consistent with the comp plan, with the development regulations and be in line with the EIS. If the use is above and beyond what is allowed in EIS then you will have to do additional environmental review at least and maybe deny a proposal because it doesn't meet the development regulations.

Chairman Schaub asked about a developer's agreement or an industrial park agreement that you see in some developments. Some of our streets here in town we are putting green areas along the edges of them, but they have no water sprinklers to water them and take care of them properly. Who is going to maintain these areas?

Mr. Bond said that the things we have installed in town have been retrofits of old areas, but when you install a new development you have to provide a landscaping plan for the area and it is the developers responsibility to maintain their landscaping in accordance with their landscaping plan as it's approved. Ideally they will use plants that are drought tolerant as well as plants that can tolerate water that will be located in the storm water infiltration area as rain gardens, well suited for the climate and area.

Chairman Schaub said he would hope that this concept that is being proposed would be something that they would take care of and the town would be proud to have in the community.

Mr. Bond explained that the next step after amending the comprehensive plan and done the development regulations would be to begin the annexation proceedings. That is when we want to negotiate with the property owners for conditions for development so that maybe 2 years from now we start working on a developer's agreement that would guide the development of the site.

Chairman Schaub said that the buffer areas located next to the developments should not just be planted with trees and just left with no attention.

Mr. Bond explained that the conservation area that is shown on the map is already forested and the town is not proposing to change anything there. It is in its native state and it's a healthy forest environment and it will be kept as open space.

Chairman Schaub noted that a letter was received from Mike & Tami DeGrosky who were unable to attend this evening. The letter was entered into the record. (See attached Exhibit A) All commissioners received this letter and it has also been read by town administration. He asked if anyone else wanted to sign up to speak, no one came forward.

Bob Walter, 140 Antonie Ave N. - thanked staff for providing him with the copy of the revised sub-area plan. For all the effort put into this document it's a bit bewildering and confusing in part because there are so many issues. It is good that all the issues are being addressed but then they are being applied to six different clusters, then there are three alternative plans that address possible impacts and mitigates them. There are several layers of intensity of use. This is really a lot for an amateur to try and understand. He thinks that alternative 2 that is recommended "light manufacturing" as it is described. It also includes manufacturing and this made him a little bit suspect of it. Manufacturing is different from light manufacturing in as it may include emissions to air as well as outdoor assembly. This recommended scenario is emphasized as light manufacturing but it also includes the possibility of emissions and outdoor assembly in some clusters. He is also against alternative 2 because one of its permitted uses is a low to medium security prison; something that the town was assured by Nick Bond could be taken out. Why is it being recommended after all the public comment the last time? Basically it states, after receiving testimony at a public hearing and public comments on the proposed plan in which, a lot of people talked about prisons, the town has selected alternative 2 as a preferred alternative development pattern. How many other cities and towns comprehensive plans allow prisons saying you can build a prison here and in what area?

Mart Kask, Town Consultant – stated that the prisons are an essential public facilities. What the attorneys have said is that if you have a designated area for these essential facilities you have a much better argument going to court if you ever have to go that far to argue that you have made provisions for these facilities and the state ought to abide by it and locate these facilities in these designated areas. If we are totally silent about prisons, then what happens is if the state ever decides to come in and locate a medium security prison in the area they can go anywhere. They could decide to put it by the Mill Pond Park where there is ample land or locate it at the west side of Eatonville. Then the arguments that the town may make will not be effective because they have the right to do so. But if an area is designated, in the event the state does come in and locate such a facility, we have a spot for you. This is not something that the town is promoting to have built in Eatonville. This is more of a protective measure, for Eatonville to make provisions for one and this is the same thing for adult uses. You can stop it if you have made provisions for it in your comprehensive plan and in your zoning code.

Mr. Bond – Mr. Walter mentioned that we are proposing to allow that use in our comprehensive plan. In pages 16-35, the Comp plan has no mention of a medium or low security prison. The EIS lists the prison as a possible use for which impacts and mitigation were identified. The only way that a prison would be allowed is if the development regulations which are adopted by council after the comp plan has been amended would include that as a principally permitted use in the zoning regulation. It is in the EIS and has been mitigated in the EIS but its not an allowed use until its adopted into the development regulations. This is something that can be taken out of the development regulations at which time they are considered. From the first draft of the sub-area plan to the final draft the medium to low security prison was permitted under all areas A-F. In the second draft, it is only allowed in areas A & F which are the furthest away from the residential areas and only as a manufacturing use under alternative 2 as a possible use.

Bob Walter – he understands that there are several steps that will take place including development regulations and approval by council. He asked how many towns and cities in Pierce County have listed prisons as a possible use and designated it in one of their areas. How many prisons have been located in industrial zoned areas of incorporated areas. How many welcomed them? And how many were established in communities that did not have them in their plan?

Mart Kask – said he cannot answer that question, he has not done that research. There are a number of prisons that have been built new in the state of Washington. Airway Heights has a prison in their community. The community actually went out and promoted the building of that prison because it is a job creating facility. This is a medium security prison. Medical Lake in Spokane County has a huge public mental health facility. This facility has been there a long time

and they have periodically expanded and improved. This is their job base in this community. When these prisons are done right they are secure and they are a job creating facility.

Dixie Walter, 140 Antonie Ave N- concerned about the water. How many ERU's do we have today?

Mr. Bond explained that RH2 Engineers provided a letter stating that the town has 552 connections. The town has gone from a 30% loss of water to a loss of 10% or less. This has increased ERU's 15 to 20 %. The town has been doing aquifer recharge research. We are looking at drilling into a deep well aquifer and applying for winter water rights so that we can pump winter water into the aquifer so that the water table rises and the town would be able to pump this water through the summer. At this time the town is very comfortable with the amount of water availability. There are a lot of manufacturing and industrial uses that don't require any water other than that to flush toilets and drinking water. Winter water rights require that you demonstrate that you have the ability to store the water or make some use of it to the Department of Ecology. Essentially it is a water right that allows you to pump a certain additional number of gallons of water from the river during October through May where the water is already high. Actually, removing the water potentially has positive impacts on the fish because the current would not be as strong. When there is an abundance of water, you would pump it into the aquifer and essentially save it for summer usage. The winter water right will probably take 5 to 10 years to get that right processed and reviewed. Right now the town is doing the study to determine that it is feasible in Eatonville. Once we determine feasibility we can apply for it.

Commissioner Schmit asked about having the schools in the alternative plan. Would these be primary or vocational schools?

Mr. Bond explained that these would be an extension of one of the community classes or vocational training, not primary schools.

Nick Lamothe, 753 Kelsey Lane- said his first concern would be the access roads. There is access to the industrial area through Berggren Rd. Isn't there an alternative way to use the road from the highway into this area instead of coming through the residential area. And he also asked if changing Berggren to a road that would go around the park instead of where it is going directly up to the residential homes beyond the park. Also, looking at sections A & F, there are several homes located much closer to area A & F than maybe what it looks like in the plan.

Mr. Bond explained that it was discussed at the last public hearing and earlier in the meeting. We have already proposed that there is going to be no commercial traffic on Berggren Rd., it will remain residential access only. The only commercial traffic will come from Weyerhaeuser Road. There is no other access to this site from the highway. We have proposed improving Weyerhaeuser Road so that it is paved all the way through which will cut down on dust and noise. As far as the neighbor to the northeast of the site, we have proposed keeping the surrounding trees and planting with native vegetation so that the natural forest conditions would return. These people will be quite well buffered under the uses of this concept plan.

Ken Duke, 12710 Alder Mashell Road- Asked about the traffic coming through town. In the mornings at the Carter and Washington you can't make a left hand turn any longer, with the school buses and all traffic, semis and trucks going through there. The other thing was security. Is our police force going to be going to burglar alarms over in this area and be taken out of the city or will they have their own security.

Mr. Bond said that the way that this project is suppose to develop is that as the quarry sort of goes out in terms of having mined all of their available rock. Area A that has a permit application at Pierce County right now to remove the gravel there. They are proposing to operate that area for 5 to 10 years. The larger pit to the north has probably got at least 10 years left of mining activity. This project is not going to develop over night; it will take at least 5 to 10 years for this industrial park to even really start to take off. Essentially you will have new commercial traffic replacing the existing gravel truck traffic because the gravel mine cannot be mined forever. So you have no net increase in traffic over a twenty year time line. Regarding crime, we did require a condition in the plan that all of these sites and all of the buildings are required to have surveillance cameras on site as a deterrent to crime. This has already been an effective tool in our parks and it should be effective in keeping people out of this area when they are not suppose to be there. As our population increases so will our police coverage proportionately.

Bev Coleman, 42311 Berggren Rd. – asked if this would be the only opportunity to speak.

Mr. Bond explained that this is the point at which we simply recommend that we accept the plan, essentially so we can get the rest of our grant money released to pay the bills. The action actually that is going to be to amend the comp plan and to amend the development regulations is going to require several public hearings during 2010. Our comprehensive plan says that certain things must occur during certain months. Usually the public hearing is March at the planning commission, the planning commission takes action in May, the council has a public hearing in July and takes action in August. So there are opportunities each step of the way for public input on the development regulations and the comprehensive plan. As far as the environmental documentation, that is something that we have taken our comment, we have made our changes, but this is not something that we are asking the planning commission to approve, which is just something that is published and finalized. The sub-area plan can still be changed through the process that we will go through next year as can the development regulations.

Bev Coleman said that there is only one plan that would be viable or acceptable to her and that is option 1 just because of the allowances that are in Alternative 2 & 3. She added that on page 37, under allowed uses, # 24 that there is full authority for the planning director to determine the appropriateness of other uses. If we could just insert some sort of safe guard into that so that the planning commission or some other means could help to make those determinations.

Respectfully, Ms. Coleman added that she has lived in this community for a little over a decade and it seems that over the years there have been priorities to develop more of the core business area and to work on beautification of our community. She thinks that those purposes are to help promote local economy and to have our community attractive to not only our local residents, but also to the tourists that are traveling through the Eatonville area. In her mind, to date those goals have not been achieved and she would like to see resources given to those efforts rather than having the Town of Eatonville jump on to an industrial park project of this magnitude. She asked the commissioners and the Town of Eatonville to please give our local community residents and local tax payers the confidence in fulfilling those promises already made and maybe not pursue an expensive and maybe unnecessary endeavor.

Commissioner Lambert wanted to say in regards to the whole prison issue, that this is actually a small site, we are talking about 80 acres from the boundary of F to the closes house on Kelsey Lane looks like approximately 400 feet. It does not feel that most people in the room are concerned about a prison at West Eatonville or at Mill Pond, as much as they are in their own back yard. He will not vote for anything that has a prison as an allowed use in here. There are some things in this plan that still cause him a lot of concern. He does not want to have to tell Ms. Coleman that in 40 years the view from your property won't be too bad, the trees will grow up. He does think that ultimately there will be an industrial site there. A lot of things will need to be discussed as to how it is developed and he has a lot of concerns, but certainly the prison is a deal breaker for him.

Mr. Bond explained that thing that the planning commission needs to do tonight is to recommend acceptance of the sub-area plan and put it on the agenda for next year's comprehensive plan amendment cycle. The prison is not mentioned on any of the pages dealing with the sub-area plan which are essentially pages 15-35 and it is something that the planning commission has the ability to remove when the development regulations are considered. But the actual environmental portion of the document which is the summary and page 36 through the end of the document, it doesn't allow that as a use, it simply mitigates the impacts of it if it is allowed to be a use. So nothing that you are being asked to do this evening makes the prison go forward and it is something that if it has to be struck from the EIS, he is willing to do that if it is unanimous that the planning commission or the community wants that. Right now it is in the EIS and the EIS is something that is issued by the designated SEPA official of the town. Right now it has been left in there, because it has been expressed by some that it isn't bad to have the prison in there because it does create a number of jobs and we have reduced the areas in which it can be located and he still feels it is pretty unlikely that it will even happen there. Right now he is simply asking for the approval of the sub-area plan which is what we are obligated to do under the terms of the grant.

Commissioner Treyz asked if the sub-area plan is approved by the commission at this point, would that mean that the commission would be recommending alternative 2?

Mr. Bond explained that alternative 2 is not a part of the sub-area plan that is part of the environmental document.

Commissioner Treyz said that if that is approved it will still be open to alternative 1 – 4.

Mr. Bond said yes and that would be determined when you actually adopt the development regulations, are the development regulations' going to be consistent with alternative 1, 2 or 3 and that is something that will be decided next year. You have plenty of opportunity not only that fits exactly in line with alternative 2, but you could pick alternative 2 and pick half of the uses out of there and even change some of the regulations and make them stricter.

Chairman Schaub closed the public hearing at 8:25 p.m. and opened the regular meeting of the planning commission to address or discuss the motion further.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to approve the sub area plan for inclusion in the 2010 comprehensive plan amendments process.

Commissioner Schmit seconded the motion.

Mrs. Murphy read the motion to the planning commission.

Motion Carried. 4 to 1.

There was no new business.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Lambert made a motion to ask Nick Bond to remove from the EIS under Alternative 1, Item 24, change it from Planning Director to Planning Commission. In Alternative 2, remove items 8 & 9 and change item 15 to read planning commission rather than planning director.

Mr. Bond said that in terms of that motion, he is not opposed to the planning commission asking him to remove something from the EIS but under state statutes there is a designated SEPA official for every jurisdiction and the SEPA is not subject to SEPA review and that is not a process that can be legally made under state law to have the planning commission approve something that has to do with an environmental document.

Commissioner Lambert explained that this motion is only to ask you to do that. You have said that if we asked you would do it, so he is asking.

Mr. Bond said he does not have a problem with Commissioner Lambert asking him to do this and he will do what he can to follow state law and follow the wishes of the planning commission.

Commissioner Treyz seconded the motion.

Mrs. Murphy repeated the motion made by **Commissioner Lambert** to ask Nick Bond to remove from the EIS under Alternative 1, Item 24, change it from Planning Director to Planning Commission. In Alternative 2, remove items 8 & 9 and change item 15 to read planning commission rather than planning director.

Motion failed. 2 to 3.

Commissioner Craig said that he has lived here for 20 years, born and raised in the area. He has thought a lot about this. He has lived next to a prison, and they are the cleanest and quietest neighbor he has ever had. He has talked with people in town and he has listened to the people. The planning commissioners were implored to think about what you people have said, and he has. This is a good plan. This area is the ugliest part of Pierce County next to the dump. He thinks that Mr. Kask and the Planner have really worked hard on this. It is not them that did this. He remembers when more than 10 years ago surveys were put out, "What do the people of this town want?" We did not have a community center, didn't have a motel, we didn't have a lot of the things that we have now. The people spoke and said that these are the things that we would like. We have a skate park now, lots of parks, this is the fruits of that labor of what we see here. He is the father of two young girls and he would like his children not to have to commute 60 miles for a minimum wage job. He has heard lots of ideas and lots of thoughts from elders in this town that have been here a long time...you could be here 40 years and be a newbie in some circles. When the mill closed it had a devastating impact on the town. When that mill closed, the whistle stopped blowing for the last time and people couldn't go home for lunch, weren't readily available to get to the schools and be active in that, the community is trying to hold on. It is the community and the

people who live here that attracted you to Eatonville in the first place. He implored the public in attendance to please trust the town that you fell in love with. This is all part of a greater plan that was started more than 10 years ago. It is not going to happen tomorrow. He said that he hears a lot of fear, and 90% of what we fear is probably isn't going to happen. This is a good thing for our community. If the community said we don't want this at all, he would say, well, it's what the people say, but he has heard more that this is what the people want. He would not want to live next to the train tracks, quarry or an airport, but this...this looks pretty nice. He read through this the first time, highlighting things he did not like, then by the sixth time...yes, it is kind of confusing. But when you read, and read it again, this is pretty through. Good job you guys. There will be a lot of tweaking of this plan. He is not pro adult uses or pro-prison but let's not shut the door on some things because we are trying to survive as a community. Unless you want to just be a bedroom community. He wants a place for his kids who do have to leave Eatonville to work.

The next meeting will be on July 6th, 2009.

Motion to adjourn by Harris. Seconded by Schmit. Carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:37 PM

PC Chairman, Bob Schaub

PC Recorder, Kerri Murphy

PC Secretary, Abby Schmit