

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
May 17, 2004

(Note audio tape (#3) dated May 17, 2004
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

(This document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript)

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Steve Clayton at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Steve Clayton, Wendy Ervin, Terri Jeffreys, Mark Drain, Bob Sund, and Diane Edgin. Bill Dewey was excused.

Staff Present: Bob Fink, Allan Borden, Darren Nienaber, Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0055) Steve Clayton: We'll call to order the Mason County Planning Advisory Commission meeting for May 17, 2004. I'm Vice-Chair this evening. The format for this evening is we will have a workshop from 6:00 pm until 7:00 pm on the Belfair Urban Growth Area plan. Then at 7:00 we will have the public hearing and take testimony from the public.

(#0100) Bob Fink: My name is Bob Fink and I am the Planning Manager for the Department of Community Development. I scheduled this workshop because the recommendations of the sub-area planning committee was made some time ago and at some point in the future there will be a document produced in response to it. A number of people I talked to have said that there have been comments made and what are they and is there a response to the comments or a new draft? I thought it was important to let you and the public know that we've been holding back creating a new draft even though we have received a number of comments that we think are relevant and should be responded to. They are not really substantive changes but things that would clean up and improve the draft. We've not issued any revisions because we didn't want to have too many drafts to confuse what was going on with the process. There's another reason why we haven't felt it was appropriate to issue a new draft and that's because the SEPA analysis hasn't been done. When the committee met and Makers, the consultant, was hired and they developed a scope of work one of the things they left out of the scope of work, primarily because of cost, was the preparation of the environmental documents to support the action. So one of the things the county has been working on since the time that the recommendation of the sub-area committee came in was to try to do SEPA analysis. There's a number of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

elements to SEPA analysis and one of the things the county now has that it developed after the sub-area committee ended was better mapping capability, GIS capability, within the county. That allowed us to take a little bit more quantitative look rather than simply a qualitative look at what was going on with the impacts from development and with what the potential for development is. We worked with the GIS department to try to develop a number of informational layers. These are layers that look at things like where wetlands have been identified, where there are streams known to exist, where the slopes are so steep as to inhibit development, where there are buffers to those areas and other restrictions, where there are hydrid soils. The county was able to develop a map that you see here that looks at land use suitability and essentially we're able to look at the different zoning districts and how restricted development was on those districts. That gives us a more realistic idea of what the true buildout is in a given area. So through this exercise we're able to identify a lot more realistically that they're suitable for building and economical to build on.

The county developed a layer of parcels of property ownership at an extremely high rate of accuracy but the other layers that the county has to work with, particularly those from the state, their target for accuracy is really plus or minus 40 feet so there's a big difference from inches and plus or minus 40 feet. So when you get to individual parcels you have to keep in mind that it may not be true. You're not going to get site specific information at the level of detail that is suitable for things like for actual development. This gives us a good guidance of what probably is out there. But just remember that it is still only a general picture.

Another thing we can generate easily is the existing land uses. The existing land uses, along with what is the natural characteristics of the land, we also look at what's there now. There's a couple of reasons for looking at what's there now. One is we're looking for lands that are available for development; lands that are already built on. The other thing we look for is uses that are not compatible with the proposed uses; the non-conforming uses. We've received comment on some of those already so as we go through this process we want to consider those comments and how they interact with the regulations and what we have as conforming and nonconforming.

Looking at the map you see this orange-red is commercial; the various greens are agricultural, forestry or simply vacant as categorized by the Assessor. This light yellow is single family; this darker yellow-green is multi-family; the blue is public institutional. We divided it into a more simplified approach because it's harder to interpret so many different shades. The Assessor divides their land uses into hundreds of different land uses so we had to simplify it in developing these codes.

(#0535) Bob Sund: Bob, you talked about nonconforming businesses.

(#0538) Bob Fink: Some are residences in a business area. You have to recognize that the current draft doesn't allow residential uses in some of its commercial areas. So we look at land suitability and the existing land uses and other information that's available to do our analysis. The county had critical aquifer recharge areas which there are certain restrictions on, particularly industrial development. There are prohibited activities such as mining and there are restricted activities which are almost anything that handles toxic chemicals. This other map here shows the wellhead protection areas that were mapped by the health department as part of a countywide project that they pursued. The wellhead areas are based on the water system plans of the local water district, Belfair Water District.

(#0700) Terri Jeffreys: Do the protection measures, do they somewhat match the critical aquifer recharge protection measures?

(#0730) Bob Fink: They're essentially identical. Since these are tied to particular well operators there is an additional provision that even though the activity that's being proposed might be a mile from the wellhead, we would still notify the operator of that well system to give them an opportunity to comment. Things like subdivisions, would go to that wellhead operator so that they could have a chance to comment on that proposal.

So this is the kind of information that we've been gathering and trying to work with that wasn't available when the Belfair sub-area committee made its recommendation. We've used this information to try to do a buildout analysis of what the actual capacity of the land is. In the handout I gave you today there's a summary sheet that's a draft of what the analysis shows. It breaks out the different districts and we tried to do an analysis

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

showing the land supply summary. It starts with 'gross acres available'. Now, gross acres available isn't 'gross'; it's not the total acres in the zoning district. It is the acres in the zoning district less the already developed parcels. The next column is 'percent unsuitable'. There was an analysis done within each zoning district of the total area of the zoning district and the area of the zoning district where these restrictions like slopes, etc. So if the slope is greater than 15% it's generally not suitable for development. It's not that you can't develop on steeper slopes. You figure a slope by the rise divided by the run. This table was largely drawn for analysis of population capacity. If you go to Belfair you'll see some things that normally wouldn't be done very much. There's one warehouse storage building that's built on a very steep slope and you see how they had to regrade the slope and tier the buildings. So 'percentage unsuitable' is shaded out on this map as being unsuitable in each zoning district. So if you reduce the 'unsuitable acres' then you end up with 'net suitable acres'. Then there's a standard factor for roads which is about 20%. Then there's a 'market factor'. The 25% 'market factor' is also a standard factor. It's the factor the county adopted in response to the GMHB remand. They've accepted the 25% as a reasonable market factor. The market factor itself essentially allows for there to be undeveloped land within the UGA. If you didn't have a market factor and you set your UGA for a 20 year development. At the end of those 20 years there wouldn't be room to turn because all the land would be developed. The market factor allows for there to be an extra available amount of land as you move towards your buildout but you haven't expanded your UGA then you're going to have more land available and you're not zeroing down the amount of available land so you're not driving the price of the land out of reach. So the average for the county is 2.5 persons per household and so you multiply the number of units times 2.5 people and that gives you essentially what the capacity of the UGA under this zoning would be. You've all heard about population allocation and the relationship between the population allocation and the sizing of the UGA. So the capacity for this UGA under this zoning is approximately 7,000 people. During the discussion that led to the development of this plan there were some speculation on what kind of buildout was possible here but none of the speculation was based on any specific analysis.

(#1205) Terri Jeffreys: I'm interested in everything that's involved in 'percent unsuitable' because I know you can get pretty detailed. Considering setback requirements and lot lines; is any of that included in this?

(#1214) Bob Fink: We didn't address lot lines because when you say, do a subdivision, and you want to know how many units are available, the setbacks from the lot lines aren't going to matter. In these regulations, critical areas are actually deducted from your density that's allowed. So even if you cluster your development away from the wetlands or on part of your lot, the way these regulations are written you still lose that acreage from development so this reflects the way these regulations are written.

(#1235) Terri Jeffreys: Do these reflect the current regulations or the proposed regulations?

(#1238) Bob Fink: These are entirely proposed.

(#1240) Terri Jeffreys: So it also includes the requirement for parks and open space?

(#1244) Bob Fink: There's no adjustment here separate for parks. You could probably incorporate that in here and it wouldn't be a great factor but it depends on how the density is. I don't know that there's anything that says the density of the park area couldn't be used elsewhere on the site. Plus part of your park area is likely to be the sensitive area so it becomes difficult to really factor in until you get down to a site specific level.

(#1275) Terri Jeffreys: Would it be safe to say that the numbers generated in this column are pretty much pulling off of this map?

(#1278) Bob Fink: Right. I basically ran through the analysis. If I didn't mention it as a factor then it wasn't a factor. The suitability is based on this kind of analysis and the density is based on the zoning code. Roads and market factor were standard adjustments and the number of people per units are all standards. The boundaries of the zoning districts which affects the acreage of the zoning and the number of units per acre that that zoning allows are the real variables.

(#1310) Terri Jeffreys: And the persons per household were based on existing?

(#1314) Bob Fink: The 2.5 persons per household is the standard for the county. It's also census supported based on the 2000 census.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

(#1324) Terri Jeffreys: Did you do the assumption that the OFM did of what it will be in 20 years?

(#1326) Bob Fink: We'll get to that. This just tells you what the capacity of the UGA is. It doesn't get to what you're asking about. What the GMA requires is that there be enough room in the UGA for the people that are allocated to it. No more and no less. That was an issue in Mason County during the last 10 years since we adopted our first GMA plan. That was an issue in Belfair in particular where at one point Mason County was using a 1.7 persons per household based not on the area of Belfair and not on the area of the county as a whole but based on the area of the Lower Hood Canal Watershed. The 1.7 persons per household was not an appropriate number to use in estimating the UGA even though it was true for the watershed and the county at that time was using a watershed based analysis.

We did some buildout analysis and this is the proposal we had. As part of the SEPA analysis we actually have to look at more than just the preferred alternative. One of the things that you need to look at is a 'no action alternative'. The no action alternative is where the urban area is one large urban area and so it's basically one large mixed use area and the number of people allowed there is only 4 houses per acre and then there are commercial and industrial uses allowed. Essentially what we did to address this is allow development at 4 units per acre using all urban mixed use but I left them in the same format as the other table. So you see the number of people that results is significantly less. Another difference is at the bottom I added an urban non-residential adjustment and essentially what that is is an allowance for an expected level of non-residential development; commercial, industrial, parks and utilities.

(#1500) Terri Jeffreys: So you're saying 4 units per acre?

(#1502) Bob Fink: Four units per acre is what the current regulations allow. We use that as a standard and there are options because people may build less than buildout so these are buildout projections. It's not always the case that they do that and in urban areas in particular since the GMA there has been concern expressed that people were not always building out to capacity that's allowed and therefore they're not filling up the urban areas as densely so they need more land for urban areas than would otherwise be required and they're putting more pressure on the rural areas which is one of the intentions of the ACT to protect as rural. Assuming they build out at what they're allowed then 4 units per acre is what the standard density is. There is a provision that allows people to do a performance subdivision but those weren't factored in. We also developed another alternative which I also prepared a table for. This reflects the concern the county has with the number of people that would be required to be allocated to the Belfair UGA by 2025 in order to meet the GMA requirement of capacity. So when we say the capacity of this UGA is just under 7,000 people that means that we have to allocate 7,000 people and we have to plan for 7,000 people to come. The question is is that a realistic projection? As most of you are aware the current population in the Belfair UGA is somewhere between 750 and 1000 people. The current growth rate within the UGA is fairly low and there's not a lot of construction going on as far as new residential construction. There is a lot of commercial construction and industrial construction going on and we expect that to change. As services are provided, roads improved, sewer provided we expect the current to change. It will be several years before sewer is provided and it will be after that that people can expect and start expanding and building in the way they will do when these services are there. So the question is how many people can you expect to live here? There was an estimate that was generated as part of this study in the economic analysis and they projected approximately 3,000 people as compared to the 7,000. These numbers are best estimates as far as projections and they're very likely to be incorrect but the question is how much higher or lower are they going to be. The State OFM deals with their projections; they are the entity that actually sets projections on county wide basis for what growth is and the GMA requires the counties and cities to stay within the range of projections that the OFM uses but it's the responsibility of the local governments to decide how to allocate that population and there's a difference between an allocation and a projection. A projection is your best estimate of what will happen if current trends continue. An allocation can also include a target. You can intervene and you're trying to change the current direction and the question is how successful are you going to be? That's something you can monitor and track. The question we faced is we have one estimate which is more of a projection by the economist and we have another estimate which is the buildout of slightly less than 7,000 people and we wanted some reduction to the buildout possible because we think that is a more realistic target. This alternative was the removal of a significant portion of R-10. It was over 200 acres that we changed from R-10 to R-5 and analyzed it to see what the effect of that would be. The effect is a reduction

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

down to about 5,600 in the capacity as we estimate it.

(#1785) Terri Jeffreys: And you did that thinking that was a more realistic buildout for that area?

(#1790) Bob Fink: There's a number of reasons for the specific site where we did this. The reason we did a reduction in the densities is because of what we think is a realistic goal. Not just what's most likely to happen but what is a realistic goal that the county should be planning for. I don't know that 5,600 is the perfect number but that's what we came up with in this first cut analysis. The reason why that area was taken is because this other area here is already platted and it has preliminary plat approval and it's also more remote from the town center. This other R-10 area is fairly far removed from the commercial area and town center so essentially that remoteness from the more intensive area was the reason why those areas were selected for this analysis. What they show is that you can have a significant impact on the overall capacity of the area. Even with this reduction in density you're still within the GMA guidelines of concentrating growth but you've got a more realistic goal. This is what we proposed and developed a map to show what that is so we're considering proposing this with the SEPA analysis as an alternative.

There are a couple of other alternatives that we're looking at that we don't have maps to illustrate and one is in the adoption of the recommendations there were concerns expressed about the LTA here because right outside here is long-term ag area that's designated by the county for long term preservation as ag. This land is owned by the same family and is part of an integrated management for their farm so they were interesting in preserving it as ag and they were concerned about the impacts. So an ag zone inside the urban area was developed, the LTA, and it's allowed by GMA and ag area does provide open space within the UGA which is a valuable commodity. One of the provisions for providing for ag land within the urban area is that you have transferrable density so that you don't develop this particular site at urban densities but you transfer the density out to some other area in the urban area. That's a provision in the GMA.

I think it was fair to also consider the alternative of removing this other area from the UGA and redesignating it either ag resource land or simply low density rural zone. That's also one of the alternatives we'll look at. As you can see it's a relatively small parcel of land and it doesn't affect the capacity of the UGA much one way or the other. There was some concern expressed about what that might do, for instance, to utilities running up the road but on consideration I don't think that is an issue that should really stop considering this.

(#1995) Bob Sund: Didn't CTED object to that?

(#1998) Bob Fink: Yes, in one of the comment letters that was sent out to you there was one from CTED and that was one of the few comments they made. They worded it more strongly that what the ACT provides for but it was their opinion that it should be removed. I don't think there's any requirement under the ACT that it be removed.

(#2040) Diane Edgin: I am a proponent of agriculture and these little parcels that end up inside of cities and you look at the cumulative effect of the amount of ground that we lose in this nation as agricultural ground and it does become significant. It starts with little pieces like this. I want to see it out of there.

(#2065) Darren Nienaber: When I lived in Bellevue part of the central portion of Bellevue there's a very large acreage of open space, park and a substantial berry farm. That berry farm produced tremendous amenities, aesthetic and otherwise, and they had roadside flower stands and berries that you could buy there. CTED's wording that it's inappropriate to have this designation in the urban area is just wrong. Here you have in the middle of Bellevue this great amenity that I think improved all of Bellevue. That is a different case from what you have here and I don't have a problem either taking it out or leaving it in. That's for your discussion.

(#2180) Bob Fink: Another alternative or minor variation that we're looking at is to include provisions to phase out existing signs. There is a new sign code proposed in the Belfair regulations and at the last meeting of the committee there was a lot of discussion about trying to phase out the signs. I think there was a vote for the county to address that and the county has received a number of comment letters for us to look at this.

(#2210) Bob Fink: There are general provisions in the Mason County Code for the rural area and resource lands that allow for the transfer of development into urban areas. This deserves some consideration because there's importance here not only to the UGA but also to the maintenance of the viability of ag land. The

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

existing county regulations were written so that they had a standard density and then they had a maximum density. This farm operator would be able to give us the density on his ag land and transfer it to land inside the urban areas and get compensated for doing that and that would allow people to build up to the maximum density without having to go through the performance subdivision. Under the current proposal there really isn't any consideration of maintaining this capability. This wasn't really a topic that was discussed so there's no real guidance from the committee but it is an issue that came up and I think it's one that needs some consideration.

(#2300) Terri Jeffreys: In the current provisions for transfer of development rights that exist do they target specific areas for where that ...

(#2310) Bob Fink: Urban areas. There's lots of ways these things could be done but I'll give you an example of the way the county does it. In the R-10 density it could be reduced to R-8 with the ability to transfer in development rights to go up to 10. That would provide an incentive for people to go out and purchase those development rights on that ag land and help bolster your wish to preserve that ag land.

(#2345) Terri Jeffreys: Who sets the price?

(#2348) Bob Fink: It's market driven. Transferrable development rights have not been used, to my knowledge, in this county since we first created the capability. The evidence for this to be a truly effective tool it has to be used and the way it gets used is when the city or county take a programmatic approach to it to develop various ways to it and make it easy to do to create a market for it. There was a community in Maryland where the county actually set aside money to start buying up those rights and they created a market for them.

(#2450) Wendy Ervin: If you have this little LTA and if between the owner of that property and some other piece of property if they decided between themselves and set on a price and other area bought the rights from the LTA is there anything in the county that would then prevent them from implementing those purchased rights or is this truly market driven?

(#2475) Bob Fink: There would be no zoning restriction from using those rights but there would have to be capacity on the property receiving those rights. They would record that transfer on the title of the properties and that would be official recognition of that transfer and those development rights. The county would then take that into account in determining the number of lots they could locate on that property. The physical constraints on the site would still be in play.

(#2515) Allan Borden: Ideally you'd have an area that would be receiving it so that you could focus more intensive development in the appropriate place in the appropriate zone.

(#2530) Bob Fink: I also wanted to go over the population allocations that I made tables of in the handout I gave out. There is a table with existing allocations in the county which run from 1990 to 2014. Obviously one of the reasons we want to revisit it is because 2014 isn't 20 years from now. The county would have revisited these numbers next year when the 2005 Comp Plan update is required. The population allocation has come up in public comment a few times in this urban area adoption and so in one way or another I think we need to address it. The second table is proposed allocation. The population number here 25,683 is the OFM project for Mason County. That is the number of people they expect to move to Mason County in that time period.

(#2600) Bob Sund: Is that in addition to the 25,344 on the other table?

(#2610) Bob Fink: It overlaps. The one runs to 2014 and this one starts at 2000 so there's overlap between those two projections. The population that OFM estimated for April 2003 is 50,200. That's the current population. What I don't have here is their projection for this year.

(#2675) Bob Sund: The question in my mind is are we on track for Shelton growing at 30%?

(#2692) Bob Fink: The previous projection from OFM is that we're just slightly below the medium projection. There was an economic downturn and a significant slowing of growth for a couple of years that we're

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

recovering from.

(#2720) Diane Edgin: Is that Shelton or for the whole county?

(#2724) Bob Fink: For the whole county. I don't know for Shelton. In the 2025 projection on the second table the additional number there is actually the City of Shelton's projection. That's the allocation that they want to go into the Shelton UGA. That's based on their population analysis on the Comp Plan update that they just completed. They actually did their analysis to 2023 and we talked to them and they were doing a 2% annual growth rate for the UGA as a whole. We checked with them so we extended it another two years at 2% additional growth to get to that 6,581. The Allyn UGA projection here; we haven't really revisited Allyn yet so what we did was take a proportional growth to Allyn that was done previously. The same for the Fully Contained Community Reserve. Just to review for you, there's a provision in the GMA that allows for new towns. These are called Fully Contained Communities in the sense that they're new urban areas that have urban densities of residential development and commercial/industrial centers. If you think of them as new towns that's what the Fully Contained Community Reserve is. The difference between that and say, Lake Limerick or Lakeland Village, is that the Fully Contained Communities can't be totally residential; they have to provide for a mix of uses. If they were built onto an existing commercial area that would be different and you'd include that. The county decided to allocate 1,000 people which is basically 400 houses to allow the potential for a large development to be located at some site not know at this time. This is required that we put that out front or they wouldn't be able to do it at all. You have to reserve a population for them or it's not a capability.

(#2888) Bob Sund: You said that Shelton was basing their population on 2%; that looks like 1% to me.

(#2908) Bob Fink: It's the share of the total growth. The share of the growth is the share of the total county growth. That's why those numbers don't seem to add. The rural lands is where people go if they can't move into the UGA. The Comp Plan and the GMA both require that counties and cities encourage growth in the urban area. The current county allocation is 38% to rural lands with the balance going to urban areas. I can tell you that hasn't been the trend in the past. I haven't had the luxury to sit down and calculate what that is but I expect it's something in the neighborhood of 85% of the growth in population going to the rural areas.

(#2975) Terri Jeffreys: That's based on the fact that you don't have the Belfair figures.

(#2985) Bob Fink: Right. The preferred alternative would say that you have to allocate 7,000 people to the Belfair UGA which means it's not quite a projection but it's a goal and is that what you're going to provide services for? The balance would go into the rural area. The existing conditions says about 4,200 people going to the Belfair area. Is that more reasonable? That's certainly greater than the existing trend. I hope you found all of this useful.

(#3080) Darren Nienaber: Bob, as you know, there's probably no place that fully builds out. Where can we get that information about what would be reasonably anticipated? Could we get current short plats that are filed with the county within the UGA's?

(#3100) Bob Fink: I'm not sure what was used. There was a buildable lands analysis done by the central puget sound counties done and I've heard many complaints about them and I'm sure every county made their own assumptions. I don't know that there's real guidance as to how to come up with that number. You have land that's already developed and it doesn't redevelop very easily but it can and particularly as you approach buildout more and more of that land is going to be suitable for redevelopment. You also have to realize that the allocation you do in the UGA's is kind of a rolling mechanism of planning because the GMA requires that you revisit the UGA every 10 years. The GMA currently requires that you revisit your Comp Plan as a whole every 7 years. So before you ever buildout your UGA the assumption is that you then identify land suitable for urban growth and make adjustments to your UGA and your zoning to incorporate additional lands in your UGA or as a combination you may also increase the allowed densities inside the UGA to provide additional capacity. Over time you also get more turnover of land and the relative value increases inside the urban area.

(#2342) Terri Jeffreys: Is that realistic in a rural county like Mason County where you've got so much

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

available rural lands?

(#3255) Bob Fink: That's another factor. You've got a number of things that are going on at the same time that are interrelated. Under the ACT you have to have the UGA sized to the allocation. How many people are going to move to the UGA? How do you encourage growth? The GMA doesn't explicitly encourage growth in urban areas by discouraging growth in rural areas but the effect of very low densities in the rural areas is obviously going to have an affect in the long term on the availability of lots that are suitable for building. You run out of land or the land gets driven up in value and the land inside the urban area becomes more attractive so those are negative incentives for locating in the rural area. There is a large backlog of existing properties and lots in the rural area of the county. That's another reason why to the extent these negative reasons to go to the urban area exist. Those negative reasons aren't really that big now but they'll increase over time. Over time the suitable lots in the rural area will buildout and the land that's suitable for division will buildout up to the limits that are allowed for that land to remain rural. It has to remain rural even as it develops and that's why the densities are so low. As that land develops and is divided where possible they will be presumably at a relative disadvantage to moving to the rural area. That's intended by the GMA that that distinction be there between urban and rural.

(#3500) Steve Clayton: Let's take some questions from the audience and then we'll start the public testimony.

(#3512) Bob Harris: You were talking about an agricultural area on the Old Belfair Highway. That's the Davis Farm, isn't it?

(#3515) Bob Fink: Yes.

(#3517) Bob Harris: I think that should probably be left agricultural.

(#3520) Bob Fink: The original farm and most of the farm is outside the UGA altogether. This is additional land which has recently been added to the farm operations. We have comment on the record regarding that.

(#3588) David Overton: Based on your planning horizon you proposed an alternative. What is the time horizon for that alternative?

(#3600) Bob Fink: We're trying to move to a 2025 time horizon.

(#3605) David Overton: So the alternative the county is proposing is a different timeline than what the committee is proposing?

(#3615) Bob Fink: The committee didn't propose a specific timeline.

(#3620) David Overton: But the county's alternative is 2025.

(#3622) Bob Fink: Right. We're looking at if we adopt these regulation or something close to them we would be looking at doing that based on a 20 year timeline.

(#3640) Steve Clayton: Okay, we'll take a short break before we start public testimony.

Break in meeting.

(#0110) Darren Nienaber: Bob, can you give a general statement of what you're bringing to the PAC tonight.

(#0120) Bob Fink: What's actually proposed is the Belfair Plan draft which is from December 2003 and the Belfair Urban Growth Area Development Regulations which are dated 12/15/03. As I prefaced my discussion, those are the drafts that have been in circulation since that time that we haven't actually proposed amendments to although we have been working on amendments that will be presented for consideration. The alternatives that we discussed are a part of the SEPA analysis and may or may not result in actual proposal for draft changes to the regulations or the sub-area plan itself. What I wanted to do was to let the PAC and

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

the public know what the department was working on as part of the SEPA analysis and also we would invite comments on the alternative that we're working on as well.

(#0185) Steve Clayton: What was the date you had for the DR's? I have a November date.

(#0190) Bob Fink: November 18, 2003. Those not familiar with the actual process at that meeting the sub-area planning committee made a recommendation but the recommendation included changes to the draft they had before them that Makers was to incorporate in the draft so the actual draft wasn't produced on the date of the meeting but was produced subsequently but it was as approved, both the plan and the DR's, on that date of 11/18/03 by the sub-area committee.

(#0222) Steve Clayton: That's now on the county website. Let's begin the public testimony.

(#0230) Bob Harris: My name is Bob Harris. I've lived in Belfair since 1969. I own a 2 ½ acre commercial property in Belfair. I've owned that property since 1979. The aspect of this plan that I want to talk about is the transportation aspect. There's a lot of questions being asked about what's the right and best thing to do as far as building an alternative route or improving the access through town. My opinion is that both should be done but for those of you have spent any time on Highway 3 lately it's more of a raceway than it is a highway. That's because the volume of people going through are not turning; most of them are just getting through town. I've got some questions about whether continuing a center turn lane is really a viable option at this time simply because of the amount of traffic on the highway and they're not turning. I don't think they're going to utilize that center turn lane. I think they want to get through town. These aren't just people like you and I; these are big trucks, busses, logging trucks. My contention is ... and I realize there's some legal problems with the Overtons and that is overshadowing everything but I think that this alternative route should be built first based on public safety. I don't think this highway is safe now. I think the ideology here should be to remove traffic from Highway 3; traffic that is not going to shop or stop in Belfair. There was something in the paper the other day about the fact that the Belfair Bypass would be a followup project but the funds that they're going to be looking for are going to be state funds instead of county funds. So my question to you is there really going to be county funding available to both of these projects? There's quite a few people in town who would really like to have more of a say in this and there is a movement to actually have a vote on this. There are people like me who don't necessarily agree with this remanufacture of Highway 3.

(#0385) Terri Jeffreys: What type of business do you own?

(#0388) Bob Harris: Originally I built the building in '81 or '82 and it was a cabinet shop. It was converted to a convenience store and it was run as a convenience/video store until I sold it in 1997. Then I reacquired it about two years ago and now it's an antique business.

(#0405) Steve Clayton: What's your impression on the amount of traffic that you feel would use the bypass?

(#0410) Bob Harris: I would say between 30% and 40% you could get off that highway on a daily average but what you'd be getting off the highway are the big transports. Right where I'm at there was an accident right across in front of me (there's an espresso stand in my parking lot) and there was an accident there a month and a half ago and there was an accident just down the road from me about two weeks ago. These are people getting rear ended.

(#0426) Allan Borden: They were trying to turn left.

(#0428) Bob Harris: No, they weren't turning; they were just slowing down and people were slamming into them. I think this bypass would pull a lot of the kind of traffic you don't want on this Highway off this Highway and probably provide a better development of the area in the long term. I think this is an inadequate short term fix.

(#0465) Bob Sund: I have a question about the number of cars going up and down the hill on Highway 3 at the 106 junction. Has there been any statistics as to whether those people are headed for Bremerton or just to Belfair? Where are they headed for?

(#0490) Bob Harris: The last figures I saw it was in excess of 20,000 cars per day on this strip through Belfair

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

and I see in the paperwork that I read this evening that growth is projected at around 2%. I don't know if that takes into consideration the salmon center down here which two different sources are saying 300,000 or 500,000 visits per year which is that much more traffic on that highway.

(#0505) Wendy Ervin: In one of the letter I read it appeared that maybe that projection for the salmon center had an extra '0' in it so it was more like 30,000 visits.

(#0515) Allan Borden: A lot of those visits will be from schools coming on busses. That doesn't discount the fact that the salmon center is going to bring more traffic.

(#0535) Wendy Ervin: Has the traffic been counted in that lower section and then where Old Belfair Road cuts off and then up where it goes to Kitsap County? Have you put traffic strips down there and what was the result of those counts?

(#0550) Steve Clayton: That's a technical thing and something we didn't address.

(#0575) David Overton: My name is David Overton. I'm the managing partner in a family partnership that's been a property owner in Mason County for almost 90 years. I'm the fourth generation in a timber company and a long term land owner. In fact, I've been owning property in Mason County as long as I've been alive and it's probably something that will continue to go on that way based on the nature of our long term timber interests in the area and the way that we feel a part of this community. So I'm happy to be here to talk about what our plans are and what our interests are in the area. They're very heavily represented in Belfair from a real estate standpoint. So I'm going to talk to you about a couple of different things. One, the task before you is, and what I thought the task before the planning group was, and where we are in that process and two, kind of where our best guess in the market is going and where we think this plan doesn't address that and three, what we think are steps that should be addressed before you finish your work. The first thing I'll touch on is some of the methodology that you look at when you're looking at community planning. One of them is you want to ask the question 'what do we want to create in Mason County?' We've been asking that question very intensely since 1996; very intensely since the beginning of GMA and very specifically in Belfair since 1996. The other question is 'how do you want to achieve this vision that you create and why will people or other uses that we want to attract move to this area?' They're very easy questions to get lost when you look at the technical information and when you're trying to balance numbers out versus growth projections you lose that vision of what you're trying to do. So I'm here to encourage you to keep asking those questions.

You've gotten two very different documents out of the community up there. One is kind of a scoping document and the other is a very technical document that talks about the implementing ordinances and you get lost in the implementing ordinances so I'm encouraging you to stay focused on the messages you've gotten out of Belfair consistently in the 1996 plan, the 1999 plan and this current plan you have before you. I wouldn't look at them out of context; I'd look at them as an evolution over time and really look for the commonalities in those different plans because there are some very common messages. I think specifically those common messages are in the community and that the community wants 1) a pedestrian friendly environment. That's the vision that's always been common to Belfair. People want to be able to get out of their cars and live in their community and it's a big shift from how this community was established. It was a cross-roads community and it always will be a cross-roads community because of the confluence of two state wide significant roads that will never be move and never be decommissioned as state roads. The other thing people want in this area is primary job growth. Belfair has always said that they don't want to be just a bedroom community, we don't want to be just residential, and we don't want to be just an extension of the summertime community that we currently have. It was looking for something different. The hurdles that I think were common to all of these plans in 1996 and 1999 and the current one are big infrastructure problems. You've heard about them recently and you'll always hear about them. The other one is the traffic issue there. Traffic is just this predominant infrastructure problem that you have to look at almost being a social problem that we're trying to fix because you have a town that's split in many different ways. You'll hear testimony over and over again about people who live on one side of the road that get in a car to make a trip to another side of the road that's well within that quarter of a mile walking distance that any pedestrian can do as long as those hurdles are there. There's the methodology that Mason County has always adopted in choosing to rezone a piece of property and there's a methodology that I think should be used. What I see is the current county process is you look at overall zoning. You have the citizens come in a group and say what

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

they want. Then we figure out how we're going to zone it. Then we're going to check it against the OFM numbers and then we're going to refine it to fit some nebulous numbers that are out there to make sure we're compliant. Part of this is the county saying we need to make sure we limit our liability and go through the approval process. I think that is a very limited process that won't really define the unique nature of Belfair as a community that's very different than the large majority of Mason County. The process I think you should use instead is you should determine the intensity of use and we've done this up in Belfair. We've looked at visual surveys that show different types of communities and what is visually appealing. Did you have a good experience when you had a personal experience being in a community like this at this intensity of use? There's some great numbers there. You should determine that. That should be your end goal in answering the question of what do you want to create. Determining intensity of use goes exactly to those numbers. Residential - 10 units to the acre. Then you should zone to that intensity of use. You should make sure that zoning is in place if it's a compatible use. Then instead of switching the uses, switching the overall zoning densities to fit that number, you should cap the permits that you issue in the area without doing a Comp Plan revisit. So instead of saying let's adjust the zoning or intensity of use to fit the numbers why not instead allow the market to set the precedent; cap the overall permits that would be issued and that way you don't have to worry if a property is developable or are we providing affordable housing or are we providing a mix of uses? You're saying we will let the market determine that based on competition. That's how the system really should work rather than going the other route.

I talked about the history of Belfair in its planning process. Specifically for my interests I should also discuss with you a development contract that my family has with Mason County. That's a contract that's intent was very basic. It's intent was we were willing to partner with the county in a road project where we knew funding was going to be scarce at the state level so instead of being paid for the roadway for the Belfair Bypass we said we would partner with the county as long as they would assure that we could be paid for the road by having the right to develop our property at urban intensity. That was the nature of the deal and it was supposed to be a five year contract but the BOCC at the time said we know this can take a long time so let's extend it out to twenty. You hear people talk about the Overton contract and the legal issues. We've had an ongoing dialog with the county and the Prosecutor's Office and Darren who represents you here and there's always been an open and honest invitation to the county saying any differences you have we will sit down and we will work through those in an honest way. Over the last two years the county has not extended an honest effort to sit down and resolve those so when you hear someone talking about the legal issues with the contract it's an unwillingness on the county's part to sit down and resolve those in accordance to, not someone's personal philosophy, but the law of the land. The law of the state and specifically the RCW that allows development contracts and allows this to be a legal venue to go through. We've never reached that level of arbitration to get through these clauses. So I don't want you to have the mistaken idea that I've got another card in my back pocket; that I'm just not showing it. That's the honest intent that we have and we feel we can have an honest partnership with the county if they'll step up to really solve the issues.

I talked a little bit about planning logic and goals that I think you should address and look at as well. Now I'm going to talk about the county's proposal which is different from the Belfair community plan that was developed by a group of citizens up there. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about the infrastructure problems that I see with both of these planning methodologies. The first one being that when you look at the differences, and I think largely you'll understand the differences with plans, what made those decisions, by looking at the areas that are affected. In both of these plans you'll see a transportation plan that's eluded to and I think it's been passed out to you. It has the assumption that the Belfair Bypass is in there in 10 to 15 years or when warranted. That project alone sits within the planning time frame for both of these so when you look at the reduction of overall densities it concerns me that they were taken from the area that's to be served by the bypass and while the bypass is not immediate, this area certainly falls within the vicinity of the project and would be serviced in that time horizon. When you look at greenfield development, which is development on an area that doesn't currently have a project versus different sorts of remodeling and redevelopment projects, the cost associated with greenfield development are much cheaper. So you're eliminating some of these densities that can be applied towards affordable housing and some of those other things that you're not going to see with some of the infrastructure projects you have associated in downtown Belfair. Additionally, some of the concerns I have are with the county looking at transportation through foot so when you're looking at getting from the south end of the UGA up to the north end of the UGA or passing to any other point and going through the center of town versus the pedestrian friendly goal, you're looking at two things that do not blend well together. I believe they're somewhat mutually exclusive goals. If you are designing a road to get

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

people through town you are not designing a road to keep people in a shopping district. It's a different sort of goal. You're not designing a road that's pedestrian friendly. You can't do them at the same time and one of the methodologies that we came up with the county when we were looking at it is before you improve the only road that you have through town you need to reduce capacity on that so that you limit the impact of the community and provide an alternative route and that's why the timing originally was you need to look at the bypass first and then you can reconstruct the infrastructure in downtown Belfair.

One of the other issues I tell you to look at is your capital facilities planning. You're looking at authorizing a huge amount of density in a corridor that's already congested. So you're looking at first changing the zoning before you've done your capital facilities plan and then choosing to reconstruct it. So you're first authorizing building permits at a higher and more intense use before you know the cost, before you have the money in place, and before you have any relief valve. Those things don't line up when you look at a time line for good zoning. I would think first you would figure out before you zone these new and intense uses what do they cost and what are we getting ourselves into because as soon as a projects start popping up here you're going to have uses that are there that are depending on these checks that the county hasn't even figured out what they're going to cost. You look at some of this R-10 zoning that's around a commercial core I don't know anywhere on the Olympic Peninsula, the Kitsap Peninsula, or any community that's under 10,000 people that's building multi-story condo development above retail next to an urban core like Belfair. Where you're seeing that development is in master planned communities like Dupont that was on a large piece of acreage because they could mix it in with other uses. Another inconsistency I see is that in the current market out here where you look at high capacity zoning, that's not 2 ½ people per unit. That's normally about 1 ½ because you're looking at people who are retiring, people who want to live next to each other and if you think about some of these common sense pieces of logic and where they fit into zoning you get some inconsistencies. Are people with families going to want to go into a tight, expensive apartment and live next to other people when they're going to be noisy or are they going to go into the rural areas where they have more room and it's cheaper to go? So you're zoning a lot of high density housing and assuming a high capacity for that unit when in reality you might see 2 ½ people per unit in R-3 or R-5 but you certainly won't see it in R-10 so when you're looking at adjusting those zoning units and you're removing R-10 property you're not removing an equivalent amount of population if you remove twice as much land in R-5. It's just not that simple. You're just kind of half getting there and I really think it's really done out of order.

The other thing that you're not seeing is you have a huge area up here that my family and my company are looking at and we're actively platting at this point. What you don't have here, along with some of the capital facilities plans, are implementing ordinances. You don't have a planned unit development ordinance, you don't have a master planned community development ordinance, you don't even have a fully contained community ordinance which has been on the books for years. So some of these big tools that you would encourage large scale developers to come in and utilize you don't have those in place so no one is going to come in and make a large investment in here without having some of those ordinances in place. So my point is some of the basic steps of zoning aren't in place. You haven't checked the numbers on capital facilities plans, you haven't looked specifically at the transportation infrastructure that's going to have to be put in to accommodate the zoning that you're about to approve and you don't have the implementing ordinances for large scale development. If you don't have those things the first thing you will sacrifice is affordable housing because those are the last people that can afford to write the check. They're the last people that can afford to pay the new sewer hookup fee or the proposed or the proposed \$50,000 per resident that it would take to provide the infrastructure here in Belfair. That's a huge amount of money no matter how long we finance it over. The taxpayers in Mason County, I don't think, can afford to pay \$50,000 a head to fix some of the problems in Belfair. You've got to look for partners; you've got to look for public funding and private resources that will come in and build a product that they'll make money off of to help pay for some of that infrastructure.

I would encourage you to look to some neighboring markets. Look at Port Orchard, look at Gig Harbor. Don't necessarily look at Shelton. North Mason and the Belfair community specifically is poised right on the county line and has more in common with those areas but you're not going to see this kind of development until you have public infrastructure there that makes it affordable and encourages development inside the urban area. Until that you'll pull a lot of population here in your zoning codes and they will go everywhere else around here and so you really won't direct it unless you have appropriate zoning that you can afford based on your economic model for the area that hasn't even been developed. So look at your neighboring communities for relevant examples and they'll have most of those things that we talked about. They'll encourage public /

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

private partnerships so that both the community and the private sector can work together towards common goals. So I would encourage the county to create a new alternative that reflects some of the issues that I've talked about. I would also urge you as a commission to look at your planning schedule. Are we looking at this too early? What are the critical questions to ensure success of this? I really do think they are knowing what the transportation requirements are for all the zoning you're about to approve and finding out the true cost of it. I encourage you to ask any questions and I'm open to any sort of dialog that you have. I thank you for your time.

(#1230) Steve Clayton: Any questions for Dave?

(#1232) Terri Jeffreys: You made an assumption that these apartments would be expensive. Why is that?

(#1232) David Overton: Why is that? Because you don't have the infrastructure in place currently so when you're putting together that if you're doing it on a small lot in an area that doesn't have infrastructure you're going to look at septic. You also have an ordinance currently that says you have to plumb for septic or a community drainfield and also put in a sewer system so you're putting in almost two different systems. That starts eating up development costs. You're also looking at some of the issues of if you don't have a master planned community ordinance and if you look at some of Bob's numbers where it shows 5,600 population you look at the zones of Festival Retail, General Commercial, Mixed Use, some of those and the percent unsuitable comes out at 56 so you're saying that over half of that property is probably encumbered by something. So you've got a lot of development issues that go along with that. If you look at some of the other areas like the R-5 and the R-10 you're looking at 24 to 32%. If you go back to the other one presented by the community of Belfair and the only change being this R-10 density was dropped it changes that 34% back down to 25%.

(#1330) Jack Nicklaus: My name is Jack Nicklaus and I have a couple of questions. First of all, I'd like to state that Dave was, Brian was, Steve, Ken and myself were all on the UGA committee that created this. We spent 30 months working on it. I'm really surprised that some of these problems that Dave brought up weren't addressed at that time. I don't know where ... the old saying is if you're going to quote a price on something to do something you have to back it up with a quote; where did you get the figures? So I'm going to recommend that the cost of a hookup is going to be \$10,000 instead of \$50,000. We're going to have costs to hook up but the reality is no matter what's built there's going to be costs. I think when Allyn put in their sewer system the hookup cost was about \$1,800. That's a far cry from \$50,000. If we have a sewer system it makes logic that we're not going to have a septic system. The bypass is really what I want to talk about tonight. We need a bypass held back until we get Belfair done. The reality of the thing is if you don't fix Belfair now it isn't going to get fixed. Bob, you're right; there are a lot of problems on that highway but the problems are from people trying to turn. This plan was well thought out. It's a good program. If we do not do this there will be other things happening. This is a corridor now and it's already a business corridor. It will languish if it's not improved upon; it's going to deteriorate. Infrastructure; if we have to do the infrastructure; if it's not done here it's going to be somewhere else. Mr. Overton said that he was going to have some zoning and some of the other uses there and my question to you is 'what other uses are there outside of commercial and commercial and commercial'? There's a possibility for creating another area up there. Bypasses are bypasses. A bypass means exactly that. That you want to get around a town. Sequim has a real nice bypass; the speed limit is probably 60 mph on that. We're not talking about a place with 11 intersections in a 3 or 4 mile area. That's not a bypass; that's another road. There's another question about moving state roads. How many of you have lived in Shelton? Do you know what 1st Street used to be? Highway 101. It's been moved; I rest my case. I want Belfair to be a nice town. I have a vested interest in this, don't get me wrong. We have a chance to make that downtown corridor something nice. By making it advantageous for people to build there and to create new businesses there. You're going to have a chance to do something. If you build it somewhere else it's going to be a slum. There's houses build on hills right now where they've excavated all the way around. I don't want that. I don't like it. My store isn't the prettiest store in town; I don't have the money to fix it up. But if I did it would look a lot nicer than it is. Time will take care of that. Infrastructure will come in and people will spend more money in Belfair and things will improve and the value of land will go up. As far as costs go I understand this county is limited in growth by the state. Is that correct? They say we will intensely become a rural community. Any time you put that moniker on a town you know that the value of the outlying lands is going to increase in value. That means these 2 or 4 acre tracts are going to become more and more popular and the price is going to go up. Lands that are not attractive will

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

be the ones that are filled in. We have a lot of the land in town and we have a lot of it that's going to be available to build on. I'd like to see that taken care of. You can't help the increase in costs of doing business.

Public safety; Makers, the people who created this plan and helped us work on it, did a study on the roads and they figured that the best thing to do was to rebuild Highway 3. We want to make Belfair a nice place. We want to make it a nice town. We're going to need to get through that area and I invite you folks to do something really cool and make this happen for us. Highway 3 should be improved. I have no arguments with the Overtons building up on there; I have no arguments with them creating whatever they want to create. If we build something up here is the infrastructure going to change? The money is just going to be redirected somewhere else. The dollars are going to be spent. Let's spend it where we need to spend it; where the people are now.

(#1575) Wendy Ervin: What store do you have?

(#1577) Jack Nicklaus: I own Hood Canal Auto Sales. I own the land. I bought it in 1990.

(#1600) Ken VanBuskirk: My name is Ken VanBuskirk, Davis Farm Road, in the heart of the Belfair UGA. It's kind of an oxymoron a farm in a UGA but I understand that one of the alternatives that is before you is taking it out and that would be great. One thing that I found kind of odd is that this stuff wasn't available to our sub-area planning group when we did the plan.

(#1650) Darren Nienaber: We didn't have the technology at the time.

(#1652) Bob Fink: The county has been working on developing the parcel layer for several years and that program ended at the beginning of this year. That then made them available to us.

(#1662) Ken VanBuskirk: Regardless, when I looked at them at the break I noticed on one of these maps where they've got wetlands and critical areas and they've also got an R-10 laid over the top of it and what we heard Mr. Overton speak to is they took R-10 from another spot and moved it down here. It's something to think about. I think you folks have all been reading the papers and you know what's going on. Our BOCC have already made up their mind and whatever you folks recommend but the BOCC put out a request last week for folks to implement their plan to improve Highway 3 already and the sewer and the stormwater. I would ask you to make whatever decision you're going to make but before you do that please read this book 'Hood Canal Splendor at Risk', page 204 and 205. This was written thirteen years ago and it recommended a bypass at that time. Also take a look at this book, 'The History of Belfair', pages 102, 152 and 153. Does history repeat itself? Take a look at it and see what you think. I thank you for your time. Any questions?

(#1740) Brian Petersen: I'm Dr. Brian Petersen from Belfair. I've got several comments. I've got a letter to leave with you tonight. And I've also got a study to leave with you tonight. As Jack mentioned some of the prior dialog has got me a little off course and I'm hoping you will allow me some leniency on time. I've got a lot of things I'd like to say. I don't want you to be mislead. We had maps during our process and we continually referred to maps in terms of zoning. We went back to them, talked to landowners, tweaked the zoning based on the landowners needs, came back and reviewed more maps. Did every map have every wetland area or every river overlapped? No, but we had a map of the UGA. We had parcels on there and we had the zoning and we were considering what zones were where amongst all the other things. We considered where the R-3 would go because this is in the Union River Basin. We made that conscientious decision. We considered these maps and the critical areas when we picked the zoning. There's also some other reasons we picked some of this zoning and it's for community building. I do support the LTA. I hope that Ken and his wife get that; I don't have a problem with an ag being in the UGA. I think it's in an appropriate spot and in fact the parcel next door is just now starting a business. They're looking at building a large barn that will be a feed store and a retail center for that type of use. It's really applicable and they're going to make it a commercial building that will be designed to fit the character of the area. I guess my personal opinion is that it's not really necessary to pull it completely out of the UGA; I think it's find how it is and it's protected from the other uses. It will particularly be protected if he takes advantage of selling the transfer of density rights. I do support the county's alternative of swapping the R-5 and R-10; I think it makes a lot of sense. I know it was important for the Overtons to have one area that is a commercial core area for larger footprint possibilities. That's what we looked at because larger area footprint possibilities can't exist in downtown nor do we want them to. So this would be perfect for a Target or something like that to come in

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

and the high density to be surrounding those types of uses. One of the main things I wanted to touch on and go through is last month I left a little bit disturbed at the Mason County Association of Realtors letter and a lot of erroneous comments in there and erroneous intent; questionable intent. Essentially it made a lot of comments in terms of infill development and basically the underlying theme was that Belfair shouldn't have anymore infill development, all future development should go up on top of the hill to the plateau, we need to make sure we extend infrastructure to the top of the hill to the plateau, or we need to build a bypass to access all the land up there to the top of the hill to the plateau. In my opinion, the quality of life sub-committee was basically used as a lobbyist group for one landowner and that's disturbing. I think they had an opportunity to be very objective about the plan and they weren't. That's my personal opinion on that. The infill development will not necessarily be more expensive downtown. What's going to be more expensive to run a half mile of sewer lines, water lines, power lines out here or a lot of these lots will have sewer, phone, power, water right in front of them. I just built an 8,600 sq ft building in Belfair. I did okay and the only reason it penciled out that I could build 8,600 sq ft is because my infrastructure was right there. I had storm, I had power, I had water; everything was there. I hooked up in a matter of 200 feet. I hooked up to an off-site septic system that had plenty of capacity. It worked because the infill infrastructure was right there and it was less expensive. So I don't buy, and I'm asking you not to buy, into the \$50,000 hookup or it's going to be much more expensive. It's actually quite the contrary. Remember a lot of this zoning was based on getting sewer and a stormwater system in place.

What do we want our vision to be? Not 3 years from now but 10 or 15 years from now. We want a walkable community with that type of feel. We want it where there's people living in and around downtown that can walk out on their sidewalks and walk over to the store or restaurant and we want that density. This was a conscientious decision by the community, the committee and the urban planners to put the density downtown to support a walkable community with sewers and stormwater. It makes sense.

With regards to the wetlands issues, we were conscientious of that and there's a number of different things that we did to address that. We kept all the high density out of the Union River Basin. We went ahead and accepted the ordinance of a transfer of density rights therefore ... let's say you have a 5 acre parcel that's R-10. Let's say that 2 acres has some wetlands issues. That's okay, you still have rights to 50 units. A lot of times based on the heights that we've allowed you'll be able to fit your 50 units on that remaining 3 acres and still have plenty of room while still hooking up to your storm system and your sewer system and causing zero negative impact to the environment. It's a beautiful thing and that's why we came up with it. I would sell my house and live in a community like this once it happens. It's not going to happen right away but it's going to happen in 3 to 4 years we're going to see sewer here. We're getting support from everything from Lower Hood Canal Watershed Implementation Committee to Puget South Action Team and Hood Canal Salmon Center and Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group; they're all saying we need the SR3 project first. If not for the road for the sewer and stormwater issue because we need to clean up our number one resource and that's the Hood Canal. Unfortunately, here we are with the Governor of the State and a Congressman back in DC talking about our Hood Canal and talking about the pollution problem. I grew up here; I grew up in Belfair. I went away to college and came back to work in Belfair. I love Belfair. I grew up here on the South Shore on the canal and I can't believe we're discussing pollution problems in the Hood Canal. This is the number one recommendation from the Puget Sound Action Team is to do the Belfair sewer. Why would you tear up the road, put in sewers and then fix it all back up, go build a bypass, and then come back down and tear up all the roadway again to expand it? These densities were based on the stormwater and sewers coming in. That's why we planned it that way. We have height restrictions that are based on preserving some of the view easements. It's all thought out. Every detail has been thought out, hashed and rehashed through the community and committee. So these aren't arbitrary things we threw out without thinking.

There are a lot of people who talked about the environmental concerns with high density downtown and again with that infrastructure you're not going to see that. A good example of that is what's happened in Allyn and along Highway 302. In Victor there's houses popping up everywhere. Those were all previously unbuildable lots. Now because of sewer they're being built on and that's great for the county tax rolls, it's great for the individual landowner, it's great for the real estate agents. Even amongst the increased property development we're seeing environmental protection, environmental improvements in North Bay. It's cleaned up significantly. We've got closed beaches that are now opened up. It makes sense.

The MCAR also made their recommendations on the Belfair Bypass. I will tell you that this isn't a bypass.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

For years it's been erroneously compared to the Sequim Bypass or the North Bend Bypass and it didn't hurt those towns but it's significantly different. Those are 60 mph roads around the town. What we're talking about here is 6 intersections just on the north section of their property. We're talking about 5 mile corridor that is not designed as a 60 mph road with no development along it. It's designed as 45 mph with 9 intersections plus ingress and egress back to Highway 3. That's not a bypass. It's amazing how many people I talk to in the community that say, 'are you serious; that's not a bypass'.

Let's talk about traffic counts. The count for the new Salmon Center was for 200,000 to 250,000 people; not cars coming per year. They're a huge advocate of a third turn lane because they're going to need it. Most of those accidents that take place, including right in front of Bob's store and Hanks, ... I believe that's the number one high accident location not only on the corridor but perhaps in the county. It's all rear ends. The thing about a third turn lane is not only will you eliminate the rear end collisions but you're going to allow traffic to keep flowing. They've shown that that is going to significantly improve our traffic flow through town. They predicted we wouldn't even need a bypass through 2020 or beyond. The latest numbers I've seen from WSDOT from 2002 were 15,800 on the north end of town. A lot of those dump down into SR300 down North Shore and a lot of them dump into the commercial area and I think it's around 11,000 on the south end of town. I do have a Transpo Engineering traffic study for you. It's an origin and destination study. It was done in 1998. What happened was they were subbed to Skillings - Connolly and they did a report called the T-3 Report. On page 4 you'll find that they estimated an average north and southbound is only 14.1% of traffic are actual commuter traffic. A lot of the commuters are going through town and choosing to go down 106 to 101. That's how they're choosing to commute. What they came up with is actually 14.6 isn't the number that's going to decrease off the corridor as the result of a bypass. It's actually a 5% traffic reduction. I've got the study here for you to read. A lot of the people are going to still come through town because they wouldn't take the bypass and then backtrack and come down 106. They'll go through town and still go down 106 to 101.

Recently I'm told that at the Democratic Convention or a large Democratic Party meeting the bypass was brought up for consideration. It went 80 to 20; 80% voted down a bypass. What I'm telling you here is that's pretty significant when you hear those type of numbers. Makers pulled a survey from a large public forum and there were 33 questions asked. The number one point score was the SR3 project. Number 33 was the bypass. That's telling you don't ignore the community input that's gone into this. Speaking of community input I know that Mr. Overton stated some things about the 1996 - 1999 planning efforts. We considered that; we looked into that. There was only a couple of meeting on the 1996 plan. The 1999 plan consisted of only a handful of people. Not a whole lot of community input went into those things. We went on for 30 months with a professional on a \$120,000 contract and produced a magnificent plan with a lot of support. So I ask you to adopt that and recommend adopting that in it's entirely to the BOCC including the transportation plan. Any questions? One of you asked

(#2455) Bob Sund: What is the timeline for the construction of the third lane and the sewer and everything else? How long do they figure it will take?

(#2470) Brian Petersen: That varies depending on who you ask. Perteet really has to answer that question. There's a lot to it with the three phases.

(#2490) Wendy Ervin: The PUD has shown some reluctance to put the money up for putting the wires in underground. Do you have any power in affecting their decision?

(#2500) Brian Petersen: I'm the last guy PUD wants to hear from. I do have an opinion in that I don't think we're going to vote on this project or the sewer. My personal opinion is we voted. We voted to elect the BOCC to lead us and they're doing a great job leading.

(#2520) Wendy Ervin: But you also voted for the PUD.

(#2522) Brian Petersen: Good point. That's an interesting issue and I have some personal opinions that are probably more than I need to say here but I will tell you this whether it's the PUD's reluctance or whatever it is what you're hearing is it's all about competition. It's about what if Belfair really gets it's act together. What if Belfair really starts cleaning up. What if Belfair becomes really something and pretty soon investors will be coming to town and consider where they want to go. They'll say Belfair is beautiful and here's an opportunity

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

to build multi-family housing in this area and this is already where city center is and it's a walkable community and they'll want to go there and there's people that don't want that because of competition. Any other questions? I appreciate the opportunity to speak. My last comment is I know you recently talked about the zero lot lines in Festival Retail and we made a conscientious decision to do that and I really hope you don't nix the zero lot lines in that Festival Retail.

(#2595) Wendy Ervin: Can you explain what the Festival Retail is?

(#2600) Brian Petersen: Festival Retail uses would be those type of feel good, walk around, let's go to the Starbucks, let's walk over to this cute little boutique, let's go into the deli for lunch and that kind of feel. Any other questions? Oh, let me talk about signs. Signs are a real issue and I addressed that in my last letter to you but I've got to tell you there's two things I'm begging of you. One is to adopt our sign ordinance and the second is to adopt an amortization to make sure noncompliant signs come into compliance. Without a sign ordinance and without noncompliant signs to come into compliance we're never going to clean ourselves up. If we want to be competing, if we want to be growing, if we want to become or develop a sense of place to our community we need that sign ordinance in place and we need to address the noncompliant signs. A five-year amortization is what I'm told is typical and acceptable for other communities. I think that's reasonable.

(#2770) Ken VanBuskirk: I had to bite my tongue a couple of time when Brian was talking. That critical aquifer recharge area didn't come into play until quite a bit into our planning process and some of the folks are very reluctant to consider it and even if we put a sewer in downtown Belfair and pave the whole thing over it still has a dramatic environmental affect on the critical aquifer recharge area and I would like you folks to keep that in mind.

(#2810) Wendy Ervin: Are you still wanting to move your property outside of the UGA?

(#2812) Ken VanBuskirk: Yes, I'd like to be out of the UGA. I don't want to have anything to do with it.

(#2818) Darren Nienaber: Ken, I have a question. If they did move to take you out do you mind if on your lot line right in front of the road if utilities cross over there?

(#2832) Ken VanBuskirk: I don't mind at all. They can put whatever they want there.

(#2850) David Overton: I'm David Overton and I have a business in Belfair. The only thing I would say, and it's certainly not in rebuttal, it's just that a lot of people will elude to knowing my dad or knowing what we're up to or they'll elude to a large landowner and their real plans. You can take me on my word, or you can take me on the word that's in the newspaper, in a letter to the editor, but I think it would be a hard thing for me to do to stand here and lie to your face in a community that I've been in my whole life and that we've raised our families in and that we'll continue to be here. So when I come and testify this really is what we're doing, this really is what we believe and we don't take it lightly. I don't spread half truths about things that I haven't studied. These are ideas that I've come up with in my head. They're things that I've always said and I will always continue to say them. People may choose and the community may choose to go a different way and we'll see how things play and that's fine. That's a choice that doesn't upset me because as long as it really is a community based choice with a lot of input you have to respect it because it's people getting active in their communities. That's why I think it's so important that you serve, that's why I served on that committee, that's why I also was a minority vote ... I'm not voting for that plan so I'm just here to say that if you have a question and you have a question about our intent where things don't match up just give me a call or give my dad a call. Most of you know him or will get to know him or know me or get to know me because I'll be here for a long time. I'm here to testify in a very open way and I'm happy to answer any of your questions but please direct them directly to me rather to someone else who knows Pete or talked to Dave or knows what they're up to. Thank you.

(#2955) Steve Clayton: Before we close the public part of this I've got some technical data to pass out to the committee that is WSDOT traffic counts for Highway 3, 300, and 106. There's some information out of the Skillings - Connolly bypass study. I had sent a letter out regarding high accident locations not being recorded in the plan that the Belfair group did and this is the documentation I got. Brian already gave you a copy of the actual traffic survey. I also have some Belfair sub-area planning committee minutes and a report by WSDOT

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

on the 106 to Gorst design study. That will give you some reading material. Do we want to continue this until the June meeting or do we want to close the hearing?

(#3028) David Overton: I'd encourage you to keep it open for written testimony.

(#3035) Terri Jeffreys: I move we continue the hearing until the next meeting.

(#3037) Mark Drain: This is our second public hearing on Belfair itself.

(#3045) Diane Edgin: We've gone on a lot longer than that in the past with other issues.

(#3050) Wendy Ervin: It seems to me this is an awfully big issue with an awful lot of details and I would like not to have it said that we didn't give an adequate hearing.

(#3062) Steve Clayton: So that's a second to Terri's motion?

(#3064) Wendy Ervin: Yes.

(#3066) Steve Clayton: So we'll take a short break before we continue on with the agenda.

(#3098) Darren Nienaber: Before everyone leaves as far as sign regulations go it's extremely important that there be a record about why you're developing those sign regulations. So if you haven't testified about the sign regulations please testify or submit a letter. It's extremely important that that record is there. The Supreme Court has said that when you're developing regulations on free speech you have to have some sort of record and explain the rationale about the harms you're trying to address.

(#3138) Wendy Ervin: I have a personal comment about the sign regulation and the form letter that was copied and copied and copied. Frankly, I personally count that as one opinion. Twenty people signing a form letter ... I think it's the opinion of the writer.

(#3166) Steve Clayton: We did have a motion and a second on the floor and we didn't vote to actually continue it. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes to continue hearing.

Break in meeting.

(#3185) Steve Clayton: Okay, Mr. Sund had to leave us for the remainder of the evening. We're looking at a consensus of it being time to go home. Mark brought up an idea to give us an idea of where we're going from here. We've got these three different items still left on the agenda. Are there more Comp Plan amendments to do?

(#3210) Bob Fink: Yes. The Overton request for the open space amendment still hasn't been brought forward.

(#3232) Allan Borden: Have we completely tabled the septic/sewer connection review?

(#3242) Bob Fink: Yes.

(#3245) Terri Jeffreys: So you're withdrawing it?

(#3247) Bob Fink: Yes, I believe so.

(#3252) Darren Nienaber: We'll bring it back to you at some point.

(#3260) Mark Drain: If at the next meeting we anticipate less public hearing and then address these three items and then hopefully we'll have some time we can discuss Belfair.

(#3275) Terri Jeffreys: Should we put a time limit on the hearing? On the testimony?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

- (#3300) Bob Fink: We could start with the end of our agenda at 6:00 pm and continue the hearing.
- (#3310) Steve Clayton: It would be tough to take public comment after we do the Comp Plan and DR issues.
- (#3350) Allan Borden: We could announce that we'll be continuing the hearing on Belfair at 7:00 pm.
- (#3360) Steve Clayton: Next time when we close it, maybe we'll close oral public input but we would take written.
- (#3375) Bob Fink: Well, one of the things we haven't really done is we haven't updated the draft and laid out some proposal that we'll probably do for amendments to what you're looking at now so you're going to have to allow public comment after that draft is in circulation. I don't know that that draft is going to be in circulation very long before your next hearing.
- (#3452) Steve Clayton: So it will be staff recommended revisions to the plan?
- (#3455) Bob Fink: Right. Did you have any particular comments on the alternatives I drafted out for you? If not, I'm going to move forward with SEPA. If you have any comments on the alternatives I laid out I'll be glad to hear what they are.
- (#3535) Mark Drain: You're not looking for us to accept one over the other, are you?
- (#3538) Bob Fink: No, not accept, I'm just asking if maybe you wanted another alternative.
- (#3560) Steve Clayton: You're looking at trying to reduce the population projection to something more realistic, right?
- (#3565) Bob Fink: Right.
- (#3567) Steve Clayton: The Belfair Water District's 40-acre parcel that they do not intend to develop and if we could get confirmation from them on that, they're in R-5 and that's 200 households. I know it depends on the critical areas around it. There's a long term ag that the county has zoned that's not on the map.
- (#3600) Bob Fink: It's ag resource lands.
- (#3602) Steve Clayton: It's either R-3 or R-5 and if we bump that down and put it in the same
- (#3612) Bob Fink: That's something that hasn't been discussed. It was mentioned in the sub-area committee but never really addressed. There is currently a parcel zoned ag resource lands. One of the implications of this draft is it won't be zoned ag resource lands.
- (#3660) Darren Nienaber: It can change your population numbers some amount.
- (#3665) Mark Drain: I don't think the difference in the population numbers are a big deal anyway.
- (#3670) Darren Nienaber: If you can get them closer it's better.
- (#3720) Diane Edgin: Dave Overton was talking about us not having ordinances in place to accommodate large scale development. I do know that is an issue not just in our county but in other counties, too. Can we or can't we? How much money are we going to spend before we find out we're really not viable? So I think that is an issue.
- (#3780) Darren Nienaber: You've got to move forward at some point. You've got to take a couple of steps here. If somebody says you don't have this or that you're never going to get anywhere.
- (#3800) Allan Borden: It's possible to develop a tool that is used generally across the county in fully contained

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

areas.

(#3818) Steve Clayton: The only other big chunk I saw that we could down zone is the critical aquifer recharge area up Old Belfair Highway. Our critical ordinance right now says that the maximum density you put on it is 1 unit per acre until it's hooked up to sewer. It's not proposed to be in the initial sewer district ...

(#3845) Bob Fink: There is an assumption that everything is going to be served by sewer in 20 years so you can't really eliminate it from consideration.

(#0095) Steve Clayton: You could put it in as urban reserve.

(#0098) Miscellaneous discussion.

(#0145) Steve Clayton: If you're on a critical area that's not going to be sewerred in the foreseeable future and you're limited to 1 unit per acre why should we have it in the plan at 3 to 5 units per acre?

(#0148) Wendy Ervin: But isn't it going to be sewerred in the foreseeable future?

(#0152) Bob Fink: If it's in the urban area you've got to allow for urban densities and the 3 units per acre is marginal as urban densities. You can only go that low because of the sensitivity of the site. If it wasn't in the aquifer recharge area it would be 5 units per acre. You're right, as a timing aspect, as long as it's aquifer recharge area it's not going to have more than 1 unit per acre developed on septic.

(#0185) Allan Borden: I would anticipate that if you had development in an area that was an aquifer recharge area that ... there's no sewer there right now and they're going to have to meet the current standards for septic.

(#0192) Wendy Ervin: And there are a lot of people who live in that area, right?

(#0195) Bob Fink: Right.

(#0198) Terri Jeffreys: Why was it put in the UGA? Was it just because of the development that's already there?

(#0200) Bob Fink: Yes, because there's development already there is one reason. It's more intensive than the rural area because rural is 5 acres and so it's committed to more than rural development. A lot more than the current UGA was originally designated. In 1996 the UGA was much larger than this UGA. So you have interested property owners who have aspirations for their property. They're one of the influences on what shape you take. You have existing development ... where are existing development? Where are platted lands that are already committed to more than rural development? Where are the property owners pushing to be allowed to develop or you can expect them to develop? Those are all factors. There's no one reason why anything is the way it is.

(#0240) Terri Jeffreys: So if sewer goes out to Belair State Park, GMA laws say you cannot let anybody hook up along the way, can you?

(#0245) Bob Fink: You can as far as existing development where there are health issues. There are individual single family septic that have major concerns with their functionality because of the soils there and the pattern of filling. You can't allow increases in rural development based on the sewer. So there's going to be a question how you deal with infill.

(#0265) Wendy Ervin: But hooking up somebody that is currently there on a septic and the sewer passes by there's no question of allowing them to hook in.

(#0270) Bob Fink: If there's a health issue related to the sewer they can hook in.

(#0275) Darren Nienaber: This area is declared a severe public health hazard for that reason. That's how you

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 17, 2004

get around it otherwise it would probably be a problem.

(#0280) Bob Fink: It's going to take additional review and analysis to know exactly how they're going to service that area. We do know that it's a critical issue under GMA. There are failing systems there that nobody is fixing because there's basically no place to put them. They're going to have to have some kind of sewer whether it be a community sewer or an extension of the Belfair sewer.

Meeting adjourned.