

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

## Minutes August 22, 2005

(Note audio tape (#2) dated August 22, 2005  
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 Chair Bill Dewey at 6:00 p.m.

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Members Present:** Bill Dewey, Steve Clayton, Diane Edgin, Terri Jeffreys, Wendy Ervin, Jay Hupp. Tim Wing was excused.

**Staff Present:** Bob Fink, Steve Goins, Allan Borden, TJ Martin and Susie Ellingson.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the June 20, 2005 and June 27, 2005 were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

June 27, 2005:

On page 3 under (#0605) it should read ... 'Is there anyone' ...

On page 5 under (#0935) it should read ... 'and I'm not aware' ...

### 4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0010) Bill Dewey: On our agenda tonight will be a workshop to discuss the draft of the proposed population allocations for the 2005 Comp Plan update process. First, I'd like to introduce and welcome Jay Hupp our newest member of the PAC. Jay with his involvement with the Economic Development Council has a lot of great background we'll look forward to hearing that. Welcome, Jay.

(#0044) Jay Hupp: I might add that I sat on this body for five years in the late 80's and also on the Shoreline Advisory Board at the same time.

(#0055) Bill Dewey: I'd also like to introduce our new county land use attorney, TJ Martin. It's nice to have that expertise back. So let's go ahead with our workshop.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

(#0200) Steve Goins: What staff wanted to do is introduce you to what is being considered and give you an overview of what we're bringing forward and allow you some time to contemplate your allocation alternatives prior to the hearings and prior to having to making a recommendation. We've provided you with a staff report and I'm going to give you an overview of what staff has prepared and why. The workshop objective is to review GMA allocation requirements. We will consider and evaluate 24 alternatives which were a part of the matrix that is included in your packet. At the hearing on September 12<sup>th</sup>, we'll be asking for public testimony at that time and a recommendation on a number of alternatives that we should move forward on for further consideration. We don't have a set number in mind. This graph described the OFM numbers and how the allocation numbers are derived. The OFM assigns a range of population projections that they should try to accommodate within their plan for a 20 year planning period. This graph shows the high number as being 95,000 plus and the lower projection would get the county to a population of a little over 61,000 by the year 2025 and then there's an intermediate number shown at a little over 75,000. The county has the ability of choosing any number in between the high range and the low range.

The plan is to evaluate 24 alternatives and a way to look at that is there's sort of two decisions that are in this process. The county is considering just how much growth we are trying to anticipate, and that's the allocation side of this, and the matrix provides 4 alternatives for that allocation of growth. One, is the OFM intermediate growth number which would be an increase of about 21,299 over this 20 year period. Over the last 30 years, Mason County's growth has almost mirrored this intermediate growth number as far as the percentage of growth. We've also added 3 other allocation alternatives to the matrix. One where this growth projection of 21,000 plus an additional 10,000 would be accommodated. A third one where we would meet the intermediate growth with an additional 15,000. The fourth alternative is to use the high growth number that was provided by OFM. These were based on the estimated population of 53,789 as the target that we're moving forward from for 2005. The reason that's important is that the OFM projection of 95,000 is a high growth number and was based on a growth rate starting in 2000. These numbers are assuming that in 2005 we are at an intermediate population projection of 53,789 so to meet this high growth number we would have to increase the growth that OFM was projecting over that period because we're sort of off to a negative start.

In addition to the allocation alternatives, there's a distribution alternative, and that's what the county is considering as far as what we want to try to plan for in terms of where this population growth will occur. We arrived at 6 different alternatives to do that. Alternative #1 is an extension of the current growth trends and the staff report speaks to this. We used building permit information over the past 10 years and looked at what that trend was telling us. Alternative #1 basically takes that and extends it for the 20 year planning period. Alternative #2 projects a moderate amount of growth would occur in the designated UGA's past the year 2010. Staff used that number because we felt it was a logical argument that once a number of important infrastructure projects are completed, that would be a good justification to having a change in the growth patterns within the county. We analyze that and the numbers reflect a sort of change occurring in a tiered process; this period from 2005 to 2010 would be the status quo. Then after 2010, those rates would change and the number that is projected is an averaging of how that change would occur over a 20 year period.

(#0410) Terri Jeffreys: The status quo of the current growth trends?

(#0415) Steve Goins: That's correct. Alternative #3 is a similar analysis but with a more significant amount of growth occurring in the UGA's after 2010. Alternative #4 is an alternative where a larger portion of the growth that would occur within the UGA's, and not in the rural areas, would occur in the Allyn UGA. Alternative #5 is a similar distribution as you see in Alternative #3 with significant growth occurring within the UGA's after 2010, but accommodating that by, instead of potentially increasing the size of the UGA's, it's increasing the density within those UGA's and having a more urban type setting within those areas. Alternative #6 is taking what is currently adopted in the Comp Plan and just continuing that over the next 20 year period.

(#0450) Wendy Ervin: Why in Alternate #4 was 'Big Allyn' used as opposed to 'Big Shelton' ... why was Allyn selected as the only one to look at as an alternative?

(#0458) Steve Goins: One reason for that was the Allyn Community Association was interested in studying that as an alternative. They were interested in seeing if the county could accommodate, in their planning process, an expanded UGA as part of this update process.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

(#0470) Wendy Ervin: So that would be actually adding acres to the UGA.

(#0472) Steve Goins: That's correct. That would be the anticipated result. This matrix is included in your packet and it provides a summary of all these different allocations and distributions that I just described. Across the top of the graph is the various population numbers and the last numbers show the percentage of where the population would be distributed within the county and the alternatives as far as how the distribution is placed in the county is the column on the left side. So these correspond to the different growth projections to expect under each alternative and so you come up with 24 different scenarios for potential development.

This illustrates, in a different fashion, the distribution allocation as a percentage. This Alternative #1 describes the current development patterns that have occurred over the last 10 years. As you can see, 81% of the growth that's occurred in Mason County over the last 10 years has been in the rural areas. Just a fairly small percentage in the urban areas. Alternative #2 is the alternative with a moderate amount of growth occurring in the UGA's after 2010. As you can see, over that 20 year period, the amount of growth that would occur in the rural areas is 70%. I should point out that by the year 2025 that percentage would be much lower, but over the period of the 20 years it would average 70%. Alternative #3 is a more significant growth pattern occurring in the UGA's and now you can see the rural areas are only accounting for 48% of the overall growth under this distribution allocation. Alternative #4 is the large Allyn alternative. Similar resulting growth in the rural areas but a redistribution of what would occur in the UGA's, putting more of the emphasis on growth in the Allyn area. Alternative #5 is identical in terms of distribution as in Alternative #3. The idea would be in lieu of expanding or considering expansion of UGA's is to consider more densification in the UGA's. Alternative #6 is the currently adopted Comp Plan growth pattern. There's 38% in the rural areas.

This is an opportunity for the county to be proactive in determining how growth will occur over a 20 year period and that's part of what the GMA is trying to achieve. As we decide where we want growth to occur, how much growth we want to anticipate, we can be proactive in making policies and making decisions that help that occur. That's a summary of the allocation you're considering. The idea now is to have an open dialog.

(#0628) Terri Jeffreys: In Alternative #5, you talk about increasing densities to, I assume, accommodate the projected population growth. Does that assume that the UGA's are not sized large enough as they are with the current densities?

(#0642) Steve Goins: Maybe Bob can answer that, but we aren't really prepared at this point to determine how appropriately sized the UGA's are, particularly the Allyn UGA. We still doing the analysis to figure out, under the current zoning and under the current UGA boundary, how much population we can anticipate in that area. We have some pretty good numbers for Belfair because of the work that was done on that when it was adopted. Shelton is in the process of doing a very similar effort and they have a consultant that is working with them. They are in the process of doing that analysis but they haven't landed on something that we can bring forward at this point.

(#0675) Diane Edgin: I find this a little difficult to even kind of wrap around because we have proposed sewers and not a spade of dirt has been turned yet so we don't know when the time line is on these things. From what I see, we've been working on this for ten years and we're not there yet.

(#0685) Terri Jeffreys: The assumption of the 2010 being that the growth will really start here, I'm wondering about the relationship between assumptions of where the sewer will be in Belfair and how much growth can be accommodated as a result of that. Without a real general sewer plan of knowing where sewer will go ... is the whole UGA going to be sewerred? Or is it going to be phased in? The assumption would be that once sewer is in the growth would grow pretty quickly because of the ease of development. I didn't see significant changes in the percentages going to Belfair in any of these alternatives. It seems to me that's kind of underestimating what might happen in Belfair as a result of sewer.

(#0740) Bob Fink: I'm Bob Fink, Planning Manger with the Department of Community Development. What Steve touched upon earlier is the point of when you look at projections ... the projections are estimates and we took the current distribution of population, or the most recent trend towards population, which is 80%

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

going to the rural area, less than 1% going to Belfair of residential growth; not commercial. Using that as a starting point, we looked at every 5 year segment and increased the growth in each of those areas and Belfair ramps up so it approaches capturing a third of the growth going to urban areas by the end of the period. Allyn and Shelton both have sewer now, although there's some issues with the water system in Allyn, a large part of the residential property is already served with water. Shelton has public water and sewer service but haven't extended the lines and can't provide service today to many parts of the urban area. They are growing at a much higher rate. Currently, Allyn is absorbing about 7% of the population growth as compared to Belfair's 1%. There's a big difference between the 10 year growth for Allyn and the most recent growth pattern for Allyn. It illustrates what can happen when sewer and water is available. I think there's a certain demand for it. This chart shows the permit history in Allyn with the period of 2001 when the sewer first became available. You can make all kinds of assumptions. A big affect in this is the ramping up and when you come from this, which is today, and to go to any of these alternatives is going to take time. It depends on the services but you also have to plat the land in a way that's conducive to growth. He also mentioned that this alternative over the 20 years is 70% rural but by the time you get to the last 5 year segment, you're probably about half and half rural and urban. In Alternative #3, where you're assuming there's a big shift to urban and rural, you're probably about 35% or less of the people going to the rural area. If you look at Thurston County, they have about 40% of the construction going into the rural area.

There was a question about the sewer planning in Belfair. Most of the sewer planning to date has been for the initial construction of the sewer system and defining the whole service area for future expansion. The first phase is under the process of revision right now. They are looking at the possibility of extending sewer service outside the Belfair UGA to serve existing development, where there are environmental health concerns. We've asked them to define the future phases, but how much do you have to define those future phases? The real question of where they focus most of the effort is in the next 6 years or so with capital planning, which is consistent with the requirements of the GMA. Then you have your longer term plans. You have to realize there's a 25% market factor when you're sizing the UGA's. So presumably you wouldn't have to serve the entire area to serve the entire population because the 25% market factor says that you've got 25% of land you don't have to develop within the 20 years to meet the expected demand for land at that time.

(#1000) Terri Jeffreys: So you're saying that the rate of growth for Belfair increases and the percentage increase is a function of the fact that we're only at 1% right now.

(#1015) Bob Fink: Right. Especially the first 5 years we looked at where sewer presumably won't be available. If you have a major concern with that, these numbers are prepared as alternatives, and that doesn't mean you have to lock in every alternative in exactly this form. I also wanted to point out that the only alternative shown with a Fully Contained Community is actually the existing allocation of population. The current plan has a population reserve for a new Fully Contained Community. I think it's around 1,000 or 1,200 people; about 4% of the population growth. We didn't put that in any of these alternatives, and that's not to say that we shouldn't continue to reserve some population for possible allocation to a new town. A Fully Contained Community is a new urban area. In order to approve it, it takes a Comp Plan amendment and then you designate that area as a new urban area and you also have to provide for sewer and water and other facilities.

(#1170) Bill Dewey: I'm confused. When the county did its original Comp Plan, its strategy was to achieve Alternative #6 ... I thought one of the foundations of growth management is that you set these goals and you work towards directing your population to those areas, and if you're not achieving that, that you go and change your programs and development regulations and infrastructure to try to achieve consistency with what you plan for. Since it's not happening there, you don't go change your plan to reflect where it is happening. The idea is here you have a master plan to try to accommodate this growth so I don't understand why we're talking about different allocations.

(#1200) Bob Fink: There's nothing to say you can't keep Alternative #6. There's really three different functions that the allocation of population plays. One way is that you're trying to set a target. What is the goal of the county? What would the county like to see happen? That's kind of what you are talking about. GMA requires the encouragement of urban growth and if growth shifted from #1 to #6 that's certainly a major shift in the decisions of where people are moving. Having set that target you can ask if we're meeting it? The

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

answer is 'no'. We're not there yet. The plan was invalidated by the GMHB, not because it wasn't ambitious in allocating growth to the urban areas, but for other reasons, although the UGA sizing in Belfair was an issue. It was over the size of the UGA, not the population allocation. Alternative #6 was approved by the GMHB.

(#1290) Wendy Ervin: Every one of these is basically saying what percentage of the, for instance, 31,299 people in the intermediate plus 10,000. So each one of these is showing how those 31,000 people break down in terms of where they settle.

(#1300) Bob Fink: Right.

(#1304) Wendy Ervin: Okay. Alternative #1, which we are currently experiencing, what is the rationalization given for why, for instance, only 1% of the growth is happening in Belfair, which has been said to be a real tight market and good projections for growth, and yet what we're seeing is that only 1% of people, according to you, are currently building there?

(#1325) Bob Fink: These numbers are based on building permit activity.

(#1328) Wendy Ervin: Is it a lack of services? What is the reason why?

(#1335) Allan Borden: Wendy, you can't confuse the construction building activity in Belfair with the residential construction.

(#1340) Wendy Ervin: Well, he said building permits ...

(#1342) Bob Fink: Residential building permits only. This doesn't address where commercial or industrial growth is going.

(#1350) Wendy Ervin: So 81% of the growth is making a choice to situate themselves in a rural area. That's a pretty clear indication of where people emotionally are making their choices. That looks like people want to live in the country.

(#1368) Steve Clayton: We have a lot of developed areas in the county that aren't in the urban areas. In Belfair, we have multiple times the residential population in Belfair that are not in the UGA, and not depicted here.

(#1385) Bob Fink: In the rural area, there are a lot of pre-existing plats (pre 1995) that are not of a rural character. Mason Lake area, Lake Limerick; there's probably a hundred of them of some size. It's not that everyone who moves to Mason County is looking for a 5 or 10 acre rural plot, but that's not necessarily what's going on. There hasn't been a survey done on this kind of issue since the planning started. In the early 90's, there was a survey done of why people moved to Mason County. As I remember it, the main reasons people moved here was cost, the rural character, and it hasn't been conducted since then. The example in Allyn shows you in the fact that many people are moving into places like Lake Limerick, and they aren't necessarily looking for large acreage tracts. Not all urban area has to be ten story high rises. What you can't have is 1-acre residential lots. You either need to have small lots so they can meet the urban area densities or they have to be very large or a mix of larger and smaller lots so you can preserve the rural character in the rural area.

What I was leading into, besides the function of the allocation as a target, this is your goal and you can track how well you're getting there. Since we first adopted the plan, we really haven't gotten there yet. The current plan was a 1994 to 2014 plan. So it was adopted almost two years into its planning horizon. There's a number of reasons why that's happened. I think the county was expecting to provide services that haven't yet developed. It might have been a pretty ambitious target. One of the concerns when this was adopted in 2000, was that because of the requirement in the GMA that you encourage growth to go to urban areas, that meant over 50% of the growth had to go to urban areas. I think there was some concern that was what the GMA required in 2000. After this action was taken, there was at least one GMHB case with Jefferson County. Jefferson County adopted a 75% rural, 25% urban split. Jefferson County had, like here, only one city. They looked at where they're at and the hopes for what they could get and do to realistically attract people to the

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

urban areas. They said it's realistic for 75% rural. That was found compliant with GMA. So you don't have to go to this where you're 48% rural and 52% urban to comply with GMA.

(#1600) Wendy Ervin: The 75% that you're talking about that Jefferson County had settled on. Was that 75% distribution of growth, or 75% of ...

(#1610) Bob Fink: It's 75% of the new growth. So the county hasn't revisited this since that time. So this is really our first chance to look at it and ask if we still want to set this target? This is certainly a good target in the sense of allocating population to urban areas, but is it too ambitious? There's consequences with setting allocations.

(#1635) Wendy Ervin: I had a question about the Fully Contained Community. Last meeting was the first time I had heard that in reference to Mason County. Is this a shopping and industrial and residential community? Is that the definition for Mason County?

(#1652) Bob Fink: It's discussed in the Comp Plan. Steve, could you look that up? It is supposed to be a mixed use area and be more than residential; it's simply a new town. Something like DuPont where you have a commercial area and an industrial area or job center, or maybe offices, and shopping. It would be a new urban area that would be fully contained. Fully contained implies that you can shop there, live there, work there.

(#1682) Steve Clayton: Would an example be such as Hoodsport? To convert over to a Fully Contained Community?

(#1686) Bob Fink: That would be one mechanism of designating Hoodsport. You could designate it as an urban area using the allocation from the FCC portion, rather than taking it from one of the other urban areas, or from what you think is going to happen between the urban and rural split. I think the concept of the FCC is that they're primarily focused to allow you to create new urban areas, rather than recognizing an urban area. In either case you need to make a Comp Plan change and you need to allocate that population to the FCC.

(#1740) Diane Edgin: What would be the advantage for Hoodsport to do something like that?

(#1745) Bob Fink: Hoodsport is currently a Rural Activity Center, which means that development is not typical rural development but it's accepted and allowed to develop in certain ways that are consistent with a specific character, which is not quite urban but is more intensive. They call them Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development. Sewer can't be provided into these areas, except for a health or environmental crisis and you can only provide it to address existing development. You can't provide it in order to provide for future growth. You're not supposed to provide it outside the urban area. To provide for future growth, you're supposed to provide for existing health problems. Hoodsport has water; water can be provided either in rural or urban areas. Sewer is really the defining difference between ... it's really the only service that's defined uniquely as an urban service. When the Comp Plan was first adopted, Allyn was actually a RAC. After the actions were appealed, the decision was made, with support of the community, to go to an urban area. When the plan was first adopted, they thought they could have enough flexibility as a rural area to do what they envisioned for their community. They found out they couldn't; they found out they didn't have the flexibility to do what they wanted to do so they had to become an urban area. The same thing could be true for Hoodsport.

(#1880) Jay Hupp: It seems to me that's the ultimate crux of any decision that's going to be made on population allocation is what the impact is going to be on the ground in various communities pertaining to the size of the UGA's. It would seem to me that before you start playing with the current population allocations, you get a good feel from the various communities as to how they're satisfied with the current sizing of the UGA and where the community would like to see the changes in the UGA occur. Then if you manipulate the population allocation in order to make that happen, then you've satisfied the needs of the citizenry. What washes out in the long run doesn't make any difference because the people are going to go where they want to go anyway.

(#1918) Bob Fink: Well, it does make a big difference how you allocate population because you have to

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

provide services for it. You have to do capital planning to support it and that's why it's important. You can have a target but you also have to be realistic. If you pretend that you're going to have so many people ... 100% of the people are going to move to Belfair, Shelton, and Allyn, then you've got to start designing your sewer and water systems to handle that. It's not just a question of what area do you designate, it's what are the consequences. If you tell the school systems that you're going to have 10,000 new kids, then the schools should be using that information to start building schools. What about the fire services? If we say we're going to have 10,000 people moving into this area, and we're only getting 2,000, we're telling the fire districts to ramp up all their services and start building stations to start providing the necessary services for those people. It makes a big difference where you send those people ...

(#1965) Jay Hupp: I didn't mean to say that it didn't make any difference how you allocate the population, but it seems to me the ultimate impact is going to be on the size of the UGA's so if you examine the suitability of the size of the UGA's currently, then you'll have a much more realistic handle on what people are going to accept as far as population allocation is concerned. I remember the last time we went through this, it got into a very, very emotional argument throughout the community on sizing the UGA's as a result of the population allocation and one of the things that folks were really upset with is this phantom community set up there with 4% allocated to it, and that allocation could not go to Shelton or Belfair, which were the only two UGA's at the time. So it seems to me that if we examine the suitability of the current UGA's and how the population within those UGA's want those UGA's maintained or changed, then we'll have a better handle on what would be more realistic as far as the population allocation is concerned.

(#2025) Bob Fink: Having gone through this process, I think people are generally satisfied with where the UGA's are now. The exception is that Allyn wants us to look at a different configuration. If there are other people that really have a different opinion on this, then they need to come forward in this process. We have a status quo target, and we have a status quo reality. In the same way in sizing the UGA's we'll look at the status quo and look at the size of the UGA's now and our capability of providing services to that area. And realistically, do we need more urban area or not to deal with the allocations that we have?

(#2100) Bill Dewey: I'm missing our realtor tonight. Tim brings an interesting perspective to this and a question that's been lingering in the back of my mind is in talking about all these different alternatives, I feel like we're trying to think about alternatives without a critical piece of information and that is, under our current zoning, do we have sufficient suitable land to accommodate any of these alternatives?

(#2125) Bob Fink: That's why we're not asking you to make a decision tonight because we don't have that information.

(#2128) Bill Dewey: Will we have that information before the county moves down the path of any of these alternatives?

(#2130) Bob Fink: Yes.

(#2132) Terri Jeffreys: I would love to have the assumptions that you used as you developed each of these alternatives. For instances, if you put numbers to rate of growth in Belfair due to the second Narrows Bridge. Just to see how you came up with these numbers.

(#2152) Wendy Ervin: I would like to see how geographically it plays out. We've got 'X' number of acres of rural land, 'X' number of acres of Belfair, Shelton, and Allyn UGA's, and how much of these, when you distribute this population according to these, what actually is the net change in the number of acres of rural that wind up being developed and the number of acres of Shelton, Belfair, and Allyn. Rather than just a pie chart, I'd like to see both, but I'd like to see it played against the actual acres. Alternative #2 through #6, are those made with an assumption of sewers? We don't have sewers in Belfair.

(#2200) Bob Fink: The assumption is yes. If you don't have sewers you're not going to have an urban area.

(#2205) Wendy Ervin: In Alternative #1, there's no sewers, and there's 1% growth in Belfair. Alternatives #2 through #6, there's anywhere from 7% to 17% growth.

(#2218) Bill Dewey: We talked about transportation element and we got some input that indicated the state

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

highway system was looking beyond the county boundaries of things that are happening as far as the Hood Canal Bridge and the Tacoma Narrows. We're looking at the population allocation, and Terri asked the question that I think is very important. With any of these alternatives, are we factoring in things like the second Narrows Bridge?

(#2230) Bob Fink: The answer is yes but how do you factor it in? You make some kind of assumption of how much it might affect it. The most probably outcome for growth in the county, according to OFM, is the interim projection. All these apply to any projection, but the interim projection is most likely. If all those other good things happen and they spur additional growth in Mason County, it may get closer to the high projection. It's always possible that we would exceed the high projection, but there are issues with adopting an estimate that exceeds the OFM projection.

(#2270) Terri Jeffreys: If you look at the geographic location of these, we've got the majority of the growth, besides rural areas, going to Shelton, so there's got to be an assumption that the population goes to Shelton because ... I'm assuming there's more jobs here, it's closer to Thurston County ... but what is happening in Kitsap County? How we're assuming it will grow up there has a tremendous impact. There's a lot going on up there and it would be nice to know that we're incorporating everything.

(#2305) Bob Fink: Even with a lot going on in Kitsap, they're only expected to grow so much. There's a lot going on with the state, but the state's only supposed to grow so much.

(#2312) Wendy Ervin: But you're looking at the balance between Kitsap and Belfair growth. Are you looking at those as things that play off against each other?

(#2324) Bob Fink: You can get to the same point making different sets of assumptions. I guess you could make an assumption that everyone who came to the State of Washington would want to move to Mason County. Why not? It's a good assumption to me, but it's unlikely to happen. I would consider that most of those pros and cons are probably addressed well within the range that OFM provides. There's a range from 60,000 to 95,000 people. That's a lot of people for the county to absorb, and if things change that dramatically 5 or 10 years from now, if we track what's happening, we'll have lots of warning. If we monitor the building permit activity, then we'll know 2 years from now that we were expecting 1,000 houses built in those 2 years and there's 1500 houses, we'll know something is going on. This is a 20 year plan.

(#2390) Wendy Ervin: So it can be adjusted along the way.

(#2394) Bob Fink: Right.

(#2396) Wendy Ervin: So if we pick an alternative that winds up not being appropriate, then we can adjust to accommodate that.

(#2408) Bob Fink: The county can revisit this every year. According to the GMA, we have to revisit the plan as a whole every 7 years. We have to revisit the UGA boundaries every 10 years. That doesn't mean you don't watch it.

(#2432) Diane Edgin: This was under the handout from the last meeting that we didn't actually hold on the Economic Development Element ...

(#2440) Susie Ellingson: Actually, Diane, I'd like to clarify something. We did have the meeting but because there was no quorum, we didn't take any action.

(#2445) Diane Edgin: Okay. I was looking at the housing on this thing, and the latest numbers on it was 2002. I'm looking at the breakdown in the number of housing units sold by price between \$70,000 and over \$120,000. Do we have anything newer than this?

(#2478) Steve Goins: It certainly may exist but I couldn't find it. It's not a matter of just counting the houses; they also have to allocate how much they sold for and we just don't have that information.



## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

(#2500) Diane Edgin: Where I'm going with this is one of the elements you mentioned is about capital services and fire, etc., and usually the higher dollar value of the home the larger the square footage is. I think it's one of those little things that needs to be fit into the picture. Whether you're talking about rural or urban. It seems like the trend is going to pretty big houses.

(#2530) Allan Borden: That's happening everywhere; not in the UGA's but also in the rural areas.

(#2545) Steve Goins: If I could add something to the discussion about the changes over time. Something we will be considering as part of the overall update is a policy change about how much area you're allowed to have in the UGA's that exceeds accommodating the population allocated to that area. Forty five percent is the number that the GMHB has previously determined is appropriate. CTED has also determined it's appropriate and part of the reason is that they encourage you to accommodate for more than your allocation so that if market changes occur overtime, your plan isn't immediately obsolete but you'll have time to evaluate it and that 25% cushion allows you to be able to absorb changes that might be occurring in the market place while you do this 7 or 10 year update.

(#2600) Diane Edgin: We had this discussion at an earlier meeting about looking at some property just to the north here about how much we were going to allow this ground to be subdivided. One of the things that Tim was talking about was that the inventory that the realtors use for available 5-acre plots was greatly diminished. What you're saying is that we're also having to plan for growth and now on the other side of the coin we're actually in the process of trying to accommodate that growth.

(#2640) Steve Goins: I think that might be a factor in the question of why Belfair is growing at 1%. How many available lots are there? How many people who own those lots are waiting to see how long it's going to be before sewer comes along and then there's more of an opportunity there for those lots.

(#2660) Bill Dewey: If we decided we were wrong when we did our original projections and we decide now that we want to allocate more to the rural and less to the UGA's, does that mean we're going to need to resize because of that? They can't be more than 25% larger than what we're projecting for them? Does that mean that if we shift to rural we're going to have to resize our UGA's down?

(#2685) Bob Fink: That 25% really isn't a change from the existing conditions. We are proposing to change the countywide planning policy because when the areas were first adopted using 50%, the GMHB invalidated it and they were all readjusted.

(#2705) Steve Goins: I think part of the question you're asking is are we going to be faced with reevaluating those boundaries based on the allocation, and we don't know right now. We hope to have that information for you before the hearing.

(#2720) Jay Hupp: You just asked the question in a different way that I did just a few minutes ago as to what's going to be the impact on the boundaries of the UGA's as a result of a decision on population allocation. I think that's a critical question to answer.

(#2735) Bob Fink: As I said, we're not asking you to decide this tonight, and one of the reasons we're not is because we don't have that information. We're about a year and a half from having a GIS system that can address the whole county. With that, we could answer these questions a lot better. Not having that, we're going through a very labor intensive process of trying to evaluate those measures; what is the capacity of the rural area as well as the capacity of the UGA's. We'll have them in a few more weeks.

(#2778) Steve Clayton: When we did the Belfair plan, which was pretty recent, we did have a projected capacity of the UGA and we actually had to downsize it to meet that.

(#2785) Bob Fink: With Belfair, we know what the current boundary and zoning is sized for.

(#2792) Steve Clayton: How does that density, population wise, fit in here?

(#2798) Bob Fink: You have to look at what alternative you want. There is a number, which I don't have,

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

which probably fits into 1 or more of these alternatives for Belfair. That number is how, given the current zoning in Belfair and size, it will tell you how many people. It was more than the 4,000 or so people allocated to the urban area, but the time horizon was allowed to shift.

(#2834) Steve Clayton: So to answer your question, Jay, it was done for Belfair. We know how big the UGA is, we know what each parcel is zoned, and it was done recently. Now your question is, it appears we need to do it for the other UGA's in order to have an answer, but at least we have one piece of the puzzle.

(#2850) Bob Fink: Right. The City of Shelton is actually doing that analysis for the Shelton UGA. We're doing that analysis for Allyn, but we just don't have the final results at this point.

(#2865) Wendy Ervin: What is the current planning for extension of sewers in Shelton?

(#2870) Bob Fink: There's a regional water and wastewater system that's planned that's been sent to the state a couple of months ago.

(#2878) Wendy Ervin: Which includes extension?

(#2880) Bob Fink: Right. There's a number of issues that the city hasn't solved yet.

(#2915) Bill Dewey: I'd like to open it up to the public for comments but just remember that it's not a public hearing so your comments aren't a part of the public record, but you're welcome to participate in the discussion.

(#2930) Jeff Carey: My name is Jeff Carey, with the Allyn Community Association as President, and also as Secretary to the planning committee. I've been on that committee since 1997 so I have a track record of what's going on. I'm fascinated how many ways you can look at a number and come up with so many possibilities. When I look at the numbers, using some of the stuff that's been put into it like the Shelton Journal that had the profile of Mason County; you look at different things; one thing that jumps out at me is the last four years, looks to me, if the Shelton Journal's profile is correct, Allyn has been picking up about 15% of the permits for residential, stick built homes. Everybody will say sewer and different things, but there was also a big lag there towards 2000 - 2001 because nobody wanted to put money into a septic that they were going to have to put in and so there was a burst of permits that went through as far as the sewer system connections and they're still up and running at a good clip but a lot less. It's partly marketing, it's partly the community; it's a number of things that influences what happens as to whether a community grows or doesn't grow. Right now, it appears that since 2001, we're going at about 50 to 60 homes a year in that community. That's doesn't fit into any of these alternatives. It's more than #1 or #2 but not quite as much as #3. If you go back ten years, 1994 as far as permits of residential, stick built, Allyn appears to be growing still faster than Shelton. I don't know that the permit count is accurate, but I'll assume for the sake of argument that it is. What I'm concerned about is I see different scenarios here, but forgetting boundaries and other factors, you've got this many permits here and here and it looks like there are more people going to Allyn at a higher clip than Shelton. Half the homes built in the Shelton UGA are modular, whereas most of the ones in Allyn are stick. You start looking at this and you wonder what's going on. I understand trying to pick a number and which one will fit, but I don't think you're quite there yet. As an example, there was 1298 permits for stick built houses in the last four years in this county, if the profile is correct. Two hundred of those are Allyn. There's a lot of different things in play here. Our school district hasn't increased, even though we've had phenomenal growth in the Allyn area. You need to be thinking what that all means. Obviously, my intention is to address the boundaries of the Allyn UGA and to increase it, as we've submitted to the county. But whatever is the sizing, I'm trying to look at the big picture and say that whatever we do, I want it fair between all four communities, meaning rural Mason County, Shelton, Allyn, Belfair. Yes, this could all be curtailed because of lack of infrastructure and other things.

(#3210) Steve Clayton: Jeff, you being a numbers guy, have you done a build out of what population at current densities the current Allyn UGA would handle?

(#3234) Jeff Carey: I don't know the unbuildable land. If everything was buildable and you were to push it, you could probably get a total of 2200 to 2400 dwelling units.

(#3250) Diane Edgin: You don't have any condos out there, do you?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

(#3265) Bob Fink: Yes. They're building condos at Lakeland Village.

(#3290) Jeff Carey: Whatever we do with the population, look at the big picture about what's going on with permits. Generally, one thing that's different about permits in our part, people tend to live there. Houses are usually more substantive; full-time residency is higher than a lot of other areas in the county.

(#3330) Terri Jeffreys: Do you have a guess why Allyn ...

(#3335) Jeff Carey: We did the first check in 2001 and it was around 11% of structures weren't occupied full time. The rest of the county has a much higher number. We would guess it's a little bit larger just because of the number of new homes coming in but we haven't taken the time to do a new check.

(#3350) Steve Goins: That's not an inconsistent number with a community like Lakeland Village. About a third of the residents are retired and they have second homes.

(#3380) Bill Dewey: Shellfishly speaking, I'm concerned about Alternative #4 and the increase in Allyn. North Bay / Case Inlet has a long history of shellfish production and it's interesting and potentially ironic that the reason there's sewer out there is because of the shellfish industry and that may, in the end, spell our demise.

(#3425) Terri Jeffreys: So sewer is not enough to protect water quality?

(#3434) Bill Dewey: No. I meant to bring out a copy of a study recently out by the Puget Sound Action Team on the affects of urbanization on shellfish growing areas. It's pretty dramatic.

(#3460) Terri Jeffreys: Given that all of our UGA's are on shorelines ...

(#3466) Bill Dewey: There are lots of things the county could do, but the reason I'm speaking up is that we need to do them.

(#3472) Terri Jeffreys: If urbanization is a tremendous pressure on that industry, and all of our urban areas are on shorelines, it seem like there's a conflict.

(#3488) Bill Dewey: There's potentially a conflict and that's why I'm speaking up is that we have to recognize that. We have a draft economic element that's trying to encourage protection of our existing natural resource industries as one part of it, which I'm grateful for, but if we're going to do that and encourage our urban growth on shoreline areas adjacent to shellfish growing areas, which we have Oakland Bay and it's one of most productive shellfish bays in the country. North Bay isn't probably far behind and those areas support a lot of jobs and the rural economy. It doesn't mean we can't have that urban growth, but with it needs to come a lot of other things besides sewers. You need to have good stormwater infrastructure, you need to think about your pet waste and pet waste ordinances, and low impact development. We've talked about that before; if you're going to have urban growth in these areas you need to start incorporating that now and if you don't, the shellfish industry won't be able to be in those areas. I just raise that as a concern that I have. We've had problems in North Bay and Oakland Bay. A lot of them are due to urban growth in those areas and the pressures that that brings.

(#3575) Wendy Ervin: So if we as a body decide that the needs of the shellfish industry are not well met by Alternative #4, Big Allyn, how does that translate? Are we discouraging growth in Allyn? By picking another alternative, do we consciously refuse building permits? How does that play out?

(#3620) Bob Fink: The immediate affect would be that you wouldn't recommend Alternative #4.

(#3632) Wendy Ervin: I'm saying if we decide against Alternative #4 and say we go to Alternative #2 or stick with Alternative #5, in which the Allyn segment of the growth is considerably smaller then Alternative #4.

(#3650) Bob Fink: That affects the sizing of the urban areas.

(#3660) Wendy Ervin: Just the sizing of the urban areas?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

(#3662) Bob Fink: It affects all the other things that we talked about earlier. These are projections that should be used by other entities that do planning in the county. Fire Districts, School Districts, The Sheriffs Office ...

(#3680) Wendy Ervin: So a business that was thinking about going into Allyn, would then look at going into Belfair instead.

(#3690) Allan Borden: Not necessarily.

(#3692) Bob Fink: There's a lot of things that go into business locations.

(#3694) Allan Borden: Remember, this is residential; not commercial.

(#3696) Wendy Ervin: Oh, that's right.

(#3698) Bob Fink: The sizing of the urban areas also isn't driven only by population. It's also driven by what you estimate are the needs for commercial and industrial space. Also, any other open space or any other land needs beyond residential. Those other demands can also be recognized and built into the sizing of the urban areas. There's a lot of things that could be done and analyzed and some of this won't be done until next year. For instance, one of the things that's in the Economic Development Element, is they'll take a closer look at industrial lands and whether there's adequate and suitable lands for the targets that the county might want to establish for industrial land use. Some of that isn't going to be resolved this year. What the county adopts this year, at a minimum, we have to meet the update requirements of the GMA. Anything else that we achieve beyond that is a plus, but there will be a lot of issues that the county will still be addressing after December 1<sup>st</sup> of this year. These issues can also be revisited as new information is developed. Also, when does the sewer get built in Belfair? That's going to be a critical time as far as estimating how much growth is going to happen over 20 years. If it's built 3 years from now, that probably means a lot more growth than if it's built 9 years from now. There's a number of unknowns. If they actually build the race track in Kitsap County, that might have some impact.

I talked about two reasons and there's a third one that you need to keep in mind when you look at these population allocations. I talked about a target; goals, and I talked about realism. There are implications for picking an allocation and where you're going to put these people. Because of those implications, you want to be fairly realistic. There's also the matter of risk analysis. If you grow a lot more than you expect or grow a lot less than you expect, what will be the consequences? Will your sewer system go bankrupt? Do you need to start road planning because you're going to have a major point of congestion? When will you reach those points of congestion as your growth happens? That's one of the reason why in the analysis that you try to look at a range rather than a number. Planning really has more to do with ranges because the future is in its essence only learned as you get there. We will look at a range of implications. For instance, the transportation analysis, we're trying to generate a high and low range. Then they can run their test model and figure out if it's a low range, then it probably won't be an issue for transportation, but if we did grow up to the level that the OFM said is the high range, and we got all these jobs here, then what would that do to the road system? There might be pressure points in the road system and the transportation analysis can say that this intersection and segment of highway is going to be a major issue with the high growth scenario. Ultimately, the county has to adopt a number and you pick a number that you can live with and you track it and find out what goes on over time and then you start making adjustments.

(#0215) Wendy Ervin: A while ago, you said something about that we had originally had 50% as a projection, and I think you meant we were expecting 50% of all growth to be in rural areas. The GMHB screamed about that. Do we risk losing our compliance if we choose the wrong alternative? That would mean we couldn't look at Alternative #1.

(#0250) Bob Fink: I think you misunderstood what I said. At the time that the current allocation was adopted in about 2000, then the consultants and other people that were involved were concerned that the GMA would require that 51% of the population had to go to urban areas to meet the goal of the GMA of encouraging growth in urban areas. I followed up that with a case for Jefferson County, and it's probably for other counties as well, where that is then shown not to be true. The county doesn't have to allocate a majority of the growth to urban areas in order to comply with the GMA.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

(#0288) Constance Ibsen: My name is Constance Ibsen and I live in Union, which is an RAC. I want to ask a clarification. Is the buildable lands survey that I read about in the work plan for next year, does that include all lands or is it just going to be industrial?

(#0300) Steve Goins: The buildable lands survey is for industrial, commercial, and residential.

(#0305) Constance Ibsen: That's what I was hoping for. This is my understanding. You're just going to try to pick something now so that you just have it so that you need to do by December 1<sup>st</sup>. So I would just pick something and say that you're probably going to come back real soon, but if you're going to be putting this out and because I was involved in that 2000 stuff, like if you get to Union; the RAC isn't in here. We have a bunch of lots. Even a scrap piece of land that's been platted in Union is now worth money and they're going to put a home on it. Also, Alderbrook has really grown. It's outside the RAC. They now have enough water so they are really growing and that's really built out. So it's very hard for me without seeing also the RAC's, and also like a Lake Limerick, and Mason Lake, and to see those kinds of densities around here for what's really going on. So I don't want to crowd my mind up with a lot of stuff when hopefully you're going to get the buildable lands out in 2006 or 2007. I think those are properties that are vested and you'll then have the critical areas, and we'll know more of what's really on the ground and what we're doing. I would hope that we could show the GMHB that that's the work that we're planning to do so we will probably be revising this number and this allocation. Right now I can just tell you that I can't explain this to anybody or any of my neighbors. It starts making the whole process not have any credibility.

(#0378) Steve Goins: Part of what we began with tonight in the discussion was, hopefully as we make a decision in a few weeks, is to pick out from these 24 or however myriad of alternatives we could have considered, down to a few reasonable considerations that we'll study further. That will be part of the charge when you make a decision that of these alternatives that we've been talking about and considering, which of them make sense? That will also help clarify things for you.

(#0405) Steve Clayton: Steve, between Alternatives #3 and #5, increasing densities. We've gone through a public process in each of the UGA's where the community has established the densities they want. Would we arbitrarily up those densities in each UGA, or would it be a matter of throwing it back to each UGA to decide? That would seem to me to be a rather time involved process.

(#0418) Steve Goins: The consideration there would be would the community support expanding the UGA, and essentially taking what is currently in a rural area, and putting it into a UGA, or would they prefer to densify the current area and leave these rural areas alone. That would be something that the communities would have to provide input on.

(#0430) Steve Clayton: And that's not going to happen in the near future for this round.

(#0435) Bob Fink: We would have a better idea of we had our analysis done on the urban areas. There may be a question in what's a reasonable allocation, there may not be enough capacity in the urban areas now under the current zoning. So the obvious question is if there's not enough capacity in the proposed zoning, and the proposed zoning changes affects the capacity just as much as the size. Increasing the density doesn't necessary require you to expand your sewer system, put in more roads, or water. You can often do that on the same area so it's much more cost effective to use a higher density. That's not to say that the local communities haven't given some thought for what densities they want, but I think it's still a fair question to ask.

(#0465) Steve Goins: It may be more likely, say in Alternative #5, for example, depending on the allocation number that the county chooses, would determine whether the UGA is adequately sized or not. In other words, if you choose the high growth number, it's more likely that an expansion would be more necessary as opposed to choosing the intermediate number.

(#0488) Wendy Ervin: Steve, you said an analysis has been made of all the UGA's. Has that also been done in Shelton?

(#0495) Steve Goins: Shelton is in the process of doing that right now.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

(#0505) Ken VanBuskirk: I'm Ken VanBuskirk. I like what I heard about Jefferson County and I think that could be applied to Mason County. I think that, and I've maintained for quite some time, the buildable lands survey is very important to what we're doing. I appreciated Mr. Hupp's comments about community wants. Allyn Community Association is talking to the county. When the Belfair Sub-Area Plan was done, and I think you folks know how I feel about that, there was 27 members of that group and only 3 or 4 of them actually lived in the UGA. I believe the zoning in the Belfair Sub-Area Plan equated to 15,000 in population. Bob has said 4,000, but when I asked one of the consultants at one of the meetings I think he told me it equated to 15,000. I'm concerned about all the shorelines. It's not just Allyn. I drove down the North Shore today to Tahuya and it is wall to wall houses down the whole North Shore, and also down the whole South Shore. That's where our urban densities are already at. I really like the idea that maybe we don't have to put all of it into the UGA's, but we have to make sure what we have is not too much. I think it's a lot more important to put the sewer down the North Shore and the South Shore of the canal than it is in downtown Belfair.

(#0585) Matt Matayoshi: I'm Matt Matayoshi with the Economic Development Council of Mason County. In considering the size of the UGA's, I think one thing important to consider is what is truly a buildable lot. You may have an acre of land and one could say it could be built at a urban density but with elements such as steep slopes, wetlands, and setbacks from roads, and streams, you may not have, what looks like on paper or theory, a buildable lot. Another consideration, is that my experience with counties and looking at planning, very rarely is it looked at from a regional prospective. There's often times little consideration given to things going on outside the county, which is understandable, because it is very difficult to consider those factors, like how Thurston County's order of invalidity and the thought that they're going to be building at a lower density there, and with a potential racetrack and bridge expansion on the horizon. As you were talking about commercial and industrial development in the UGA's, and that was considered as one of the factors of the size of the UGA's, the question the county needs to ask is how many jobs do you want to create here in the next 5, 10, or 20 years? The formula that's accepted throughout economic development seems to be 1 truly developable acre equals 4 jobs. That's for industrial. I can't help but touch on the Allyn UGA as well, and when high density development occurs, there's usually 3 things present. One, there's a developer with the will and the capital to do the development, two, there's the zoning, and three, there's the infrastructure. If the developer has the will and the capital to bring the infrastructure to those areas and to build it out, there's been a high demand.

(#0700) Terri Jeffreys: Matt brought up a point that should also be part of the consideration and that is we need to think about if there are any targets for job growth.

(#0722) Wendy Ervin: Mr. VanBuskirk said something that sparked a thought for me. He's talking about the North Shore and South Shore of Hood Canal. I know there's a lot of 50' wide lots with old houses on them because they were platted and built on years and years ago. If a tax incentive were given to a combination of a couple of lots into a single, and if a tax incentive were allowed so that the purchaser ... you'd be putting up one big house instead of 3 houses, but your services are not going to be growing. It would be cost effective to give a tax incentive and then you could just allow the market to lower the density on Hood Canal.

(#0760) Diane Edgin: You'd have to do it for the whole county, not just on Hood Canal.

(#0762) Wendy Ervin: That would be fine but I know on Hood Canal there are a lot of 50' wide lots.

(#0780) Bill Dewey: I think we've had some good discussion tonight. Terri asked this question early on, Bob, and I think it would be helpful to try to understand a little more about your thinking that went into producing the alternatives. To give us an idea that these numbers weren't just drawn out of the air and there was some logical thinking that went into producing them. If there's not a whole lot more to offer, then that's fine.

(#0825) Bob Fink: There's really not a whole lot more to offer. Essentially the alternatives range from the intermediate to the high. We could have gone from the low to the high but we thought that it was very likely that there was probably no interest in going to the low projection. Our current growth rates are about the interim projection. So that gives you a range and then we pick 2 intermediate numbers fairly equally spaced between the intermediate and the high so those are just spaced in between there to give you an idea. Alternative #1 is the status quo alternative. Alternative #6 is the status quo alternative. With these ones, I

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

broke them down into 5 year segments starting with this proportion allocation and then adding several percentage points each 5 years to create a trend line.

(#0900) Bill Dewey: My question is why did you distribute some of those to the urban areas as opposed to pulling from the rural.

(#0935) Bob Fink: I considered that there was only a certain number of people who want to live in urban areas or would be attracted to urban areas that were nice. Nice is a matter of cost, services, amenities, design. In the Belfair plan, they had a number of guidelines to try to come up with good designs. There's capital planning, they want to improve services, they want to improve streets, beautify the area; a lot of it is still in formative stages but that's the kind of thing that you need to do to attract the people to live in the urban areas. People come where there are jobs, and not a lot of people come to Mason County because of jobs. There are some, but in the long term, or for the last several decades, the trend in Mason County is for there being a greater number of commuters where people come to Mason County to live but they actually work outside the county. It's over 40% now and it's gone up every decade for the last several decades. I'm sure it's not a trend that can continue forever. It's a self limiting trend. That would be one of the goals of the Economic Development Element that you want to try to reverse that trend. You want to target the people that are living here and get them to start their business up here instead of Tacoma.

In this scenario, Allyn starts at a faster point because it's growing faster. But it has limitations to its growth, as well. So every 5 years we added additional percentage in growth going to each urban area. So you end up with a curve. The second assumption is that you've got a few more percent that you did in the previous one and the curve gets steeper.

(#1000) Terri Jeffreys: Were you trying to keep your trend line fairly even?

(#1020) Bob Fink: I only broke it into 5 year segments. The OFM does have a lot of background material on their projections. These trend lines go like this but the actual growth development will jump up and down around it. You'll know from one year to the next if you're going to be a little bit above trend or a little bit below trend that year. The assumption is that on average that's the way the growth is.

(#1040) Allan Borden: The difference between Alternative #3 and #5 is that #5 is increasing the development densities within the boundaries where the boundaries won't move. With Alternative #3, you might be able to accommodate growth in the population or associated industrial / commercial by expanding the boundaries of the UGA's.

(#1060) Bob Fink: Right. Alternative #5 is an alternative that could have been left out of here but we wanted to make it explicit as something you could consider is increasing the densities or changing the zoning within the urban areas. You could do that by expanding the area of higher density residential, or you could do it by raising the density of that residential so instead of having just 10 units an acre, you could allow 15 units an acre. That allows you to have more capacity. You could do the same thing with Alternative #2 rather than Alternative #3. When you're looking at it and you say we really like this growth scenario where we're 10,000 above the intermediate range and we think that's a real reasonable number and we're maybe being a little bit optimistic that some of these things are going to happen and we know that they're going to finish the bridge across the Narrows and when they do that we think a lot more commuters are going to move here and work in Pierce County. So you have a slightly different set of assumptions of expectations of what difference that's going to make. I'm not saying you have to stick to one of these alternatives. As I said, you may want to consider picking one of these and adding a Fully Contained Community element. So it doesn't have to be identical to any of these. We should also have a lot of the analysis that we are just short of now and it's been very labor intensive to do because there was no complete data base to work from. When we tried to use the Assessors data, the zoning hadn't been applied to parcels and we needed to identify the zoning by parcel, we needed to identify if it was in a RAC or an urban area, or was it 5, 10, or 20; all of that had to be done on 50,000 to 60,000 parcels in the county. It was my hope that more of that information would have been available when we discussed this but it's simply not done yet.

(#1200) Wendy Ervin: As you're talking about population allocation, you're talking about total numbers of population, not total households, right?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 22, 2005

(#1210) Bob Fink: Right. Households are different numbers, although we use an assumption of 2.5 people in an occupied household.

(#1220) Wendy Ervin: Is there any adjustment for thinking that perhaps there are smaller households in urban areas on average than there are in rural areas?

(#1225) Bob Fink: I don't know that we have any analysis to support that. There is a major factor in this county and that's the number of seasonal housing. Over 20% of the housing in Mason County is seasonal. It's been higher in the past and what I'm expecting to do is make the assumption that it stays about where it is. There's contrary trends happening in the county. We'll assume that, for the most part, the seasonal housing is outside the UGA's. There's a lot of detail here to deal with.

(#1300) Bill Dewey: That was a very helpful explanation. Let's go ahead and wrap up our workshop.

Meeting adjourned.