

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes August 29, 2005

(Note audio tape (#2) dated August 29, 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, Tim Wing, Diane Edgin, Terri Jeffreys, Wendy Ervin, and Jay Hupp.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the July 18, 2005 and August 15, 2005 were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

July 18, 2005:

On page 19 under (#1362) it should read ... 'There were two dissenting votes' ...

August 15, 2005 :

On page 9 under (#2200) it should read ... ' The bizarre thing' ...

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0125) Bill Dewey: Tonight is a workshop to discuss a number of different Group 1 amendments to the county's Comprehensive Plan. So the first one is Integration of the Shoreline Master Program in the Plans and Regulations

(#0150) Bob Fink: My name is Bob Fink and I'm the Planning Manager with the Department of Community Development. Tonight we wanted to hold a workshop on what's called Group 1, which is the first of several issues that we want to address in the Comp Plan and Regulation update that we're currently engaged in. We're in preparation for a public hearing on this group, which is currently scheduled for September 12th. We'll just go through the order on the agenda. The first item is the Integration of the Shoreline Master Program in

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

the Plans and Regulations. At this point, we don't have a finished draft to share with you. The purpose of these amendments is not to amend the SMP but to adopt a structural amendment so that there's a recognition in the matter of format that the Comp Plan includes the policies of the SMP and that the regulations of the SMP are Development Regulations of the county Comp Plan. A few years ago, GMA integrated, in a sense, the Shoreline Management Act and the Growth Management Act and said that the SMA was a part of the Comp Plan. The actual review and update of the SMP isn't scheduled for Mason County until the year 2012. At this particular time all we're proposing to do is basically change the format of the regulations to start building ... one of our goals is to have an integrated set of regulations in the sense that everything is in one body and one text that reads in sequence and that there's appropriate cross referencing so that it's more organized. We would take it further when we start looking at definitions and try to make sure all the codes use similar definitions unless there's a particular reason why you didn't use it. We've already taken efforts on this with regard to variances. We redefined variances so that, under any of our codes if you wanted to seek a variance, the same criteria are applied and not very similar criteria. This is simply a format change and pretty soon we'll have a draft and people can look to see where it is, but it's not intended to change the substance of either the Comp Plan or the SMA.

(#0288) Bill Dewey: Bob, is there guidance from CTED on how to go about integrating this?

(#0295) Bob Fink: I've never seen any guidance on how to integrate the Comp Plan and the SMP. There is extensive guidance on how to update the SMP language and what needs to go into it and how you go through the update. That was adopted a few years ago and it provides fairly detailed information about the process. There's no specific guidance about how to integrate it. What we're doing is trying to use the format for the Mason County Code, and so it provides a structure and how to organize the information into chapters. We're moving most of our regulations into Title 17, which is a zoning title. Certain other regulations will be maintained in Title 8, which is our environmental regulations. Eventually we'll have everything with a standard format. We already standardize processes in Title 15, which sets procedural guidelines for all the permitting. Because of state law, the processes for the SMP permitting is a little bit different than the processes for similar quasi-judicial permits under Title 15. There are different legal processes for each one. The state hasn't integrated fully those two statutes together yet, and one of the reasons for that is because the SMP requires a certain level of state review. For a shoreline permit, the permits themselves go to the state for review. and depending on the type of permit they are, the state simply has to appeal the approval by the county in one class of permits, and for conditional uses and variances, the state actually has to approve the action of the county and it doesn't become official until the state approves it. It's a difficult process, but we're trying to make these changes and go along.

(#0400) Jay Hupp: As I recall, the two statutes that cover the two different programs, are still in effect. In order to technically marry the two, it would take legislative action.

(#0425) Bob Fink: That's right.

(#0430) Jay Hupp: I certainly agree with making it as simple as possible and bringing together as much as you can, but I think we need to be careful not to put ourselves in a position where we get tangled up between the two ACTs legally.

(#0435) Bill Dewey: Bob, you said you hope to have a draft for us soon on this. If we're having a public hearing on September 12th, will we have it in time to at least read it and consider it?

(#0445) Bob Fink: I'm not sure. I was just looking at the schedule earlier. We lost one of our staff who is the proud parent of a baby daughter and she'll be gone for two months. We are intending to hire a temporary person to fill in, but it has put a little bit of confusion in our process. We're going to reevaluate the schedule and we'll see whether we're going to be able to proceed with exactly the same grouping material for the first hearing. We will have a hearing on September 12th, but we may make some adjustments to exactly which issues get addressed. Because we want to have the drafts available with ample time for people to look at before the hearing, we'll only bring forward those issues that we can actually have the draft available. This issue, since we've never sat down and actually finished what that reformatting is going to look like, this may be one that gets deferred to a later date to be heard. Any other questions on this issue? Okay, then we'll move onto the Economic Development Element.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

(#0525) Steve Goins: I'm Steve Goins and I'm also with the Planning Department. I want to pass out some comments that were received by the Planning Department since we had our workshop on this. As we discussed in the workshop, our objective was to bring back to you a revised draft that would address all the comments that have been received. I didn't want to try to generate a draft in the period of time, but to try to get that together prior to the next hearing. I did hope that we could use this opportunity to discuss some particular items that were brought up and that would hopefully help staff with generating our response to comments and get some better direction. Commissioner Hupp's comments included some discussion about rural character and promoting economic development in the rural areas. I thought it might be an opportunity to allow a discussion among the Commissioners to occur and help staff to take a pulse of where your direction is and how you'd like to see us respond to that. I'll summarize what I thought his comments were. The need for insuring that development business expansion can occur in the rural areas was deemed as something very important that the document didn't seem to address strong enough, and that there needed to be some revision to the language to try to support and promote development in those areas in different capacities. If that's something you'd like for staff to include in the document, we sure will do that. It would also be helpful to find out some specific ways you'd like to point us to as far as how to achieve that.

(#0645) Terri Jeffreys: I appreciate that and I appreciate Jay's comments, and at the very least, I believe that the study that was developed should be definitely referenced. I would like to see an acknowledgment of the rural businesses in the county and the employment and how it affects the economy; like a definition of how our economy has developed over the years and this is the historic nature of our economy. How to do that; I think just a whole new section that talks about the importance of small businesses, in particular, and how they start as garage type industries and the success of those businesses. Acknowledging Matt's letter, it did seem as I was reading through the Economic Development Element that we did focus on three different industries at the cost of other industries that might already exist or could be encouraged to come here. Perhaps done in more of a SWOT analysis type format; we could better understand what our strengths, weaknesses are, and then under that we will pick up those industries that perhaps got dropped. Also, the table listing the larger employers is very important but I think we also need to acknowledge the importance of small businesses in this county, and some how or another, get some statistical data regarding how many employees. I think this 2000 report that Jay referenced might be able to give us that information. How many folks are employed by small businesses; under 50, under 2; what the payroll is; what the impact of not being able to expand where they are and maybe a discussion of that.

(#0755) Wendy Ervin: In reading Jay's comments one thought was that I would like a copy of the business demographics and the impact of land use restrictions on the Mason County economy.

(#0768) Jay Hupp: I have the original here. Maybe we can get some copies made.

(#0770) Wendy Ervin: Your paragraph starting with 'Granted, what I am suggesting' ... my response is that you have stated what I have had in the back of my mind as a gnawing worry and you have enunciated that. My worry being that in trying to make sure we get everybody into a UGA and we meet these goals, that all we're accomplishing for the Mason County resident is that we're converting the work force into a bunch of gardeners for the people who can afford to live in the rural area. That is not where we should be going. We should be looking at the needs of all the people of Mason County and not just those who have the money to afford the \$70,000 or \$80,000 lot out in the country. There's the guy who's been living in the country, in the rural area, for generations and that persons needs must be met also.

(#0840) Jay Hupp: The situation, as it has developed under the dictates of the manner in which GMA is implemented in rural counties and particularly in this county, has been particularly frustrating when looked at from an economic development prospective because from Day 1, there was a total disregard of the actual character of rural. There's a huge misunderstanding on the part of folks that have brought the GMA together and moved its implementation in the direction of reality. Huge misunderstanding of what rural really is. None of us really have to go any further than about ½ mile outside the city limits in any direction to spot a business that is more than a cottage industry. The glaring example of that is Taylor Shellfish sitting down there on 101, which is a natural resource based business, as is Skookum Lumber, as a number of other resource based businesses, but when you look at the totality of the aggregate of businesses that, in fact, exist in Mason County, both large and small outside the UGA's, you have to realize that that is, in fact, a large part of the definition of rural. That is, you have businesses that exist in areas that are outside the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

population centers. That's not peculiar to Mason County; that's characteristic of rural across the country. The nature of businesses in rural counties is different than it is in urban counties. That's misunderstood grossly on the part of those folks that think about these things from urban areas. Their minds are wrapped around the thought that businesses should be congregated in a given place, and isolated away from everything else, and that you have to provide extensive infrastructure and services to them in order for them to work. Well, that's kind of the way businesses look in urban population centers, but that's not the way businesses look in rural areas. In rural areas, for the most part, the majority of businesses are scattered across the land in rural areas, and they don't require extensive infrastructure or support from water and sewer. If they did, they wouldn't be there because there's no infrastructure out there. The argument that businesses, as they exist in rural areas, cause infrastructure to have to be built in order to support them that's a bogus concept. That's another huge flaw in the assumption about the economic character of rural. What has been so frustrating is to watch the development of the Comp Plan and the DR's that have come on as a result of the Comp Plan, totally ignore the nature of the economic engine that drives this county. I think, in one way or another, if we don't begin to get a handle on that, we're going to continue to drive in the direction that has moved us from about 30% of our working population commuting, as of about 10 or 15 years ago, up to 43%, and we're going to continue to drive in that direction of a bedroom community. If that's the choice, then that's the choice, but I think it ought to be done consciously and I don't think it's being done consciously now, or really even exercise through that discussion as to what the true economic character of this rural county is. If you're going to create an economic development element, you've got to address what the true character is. This study that was done in 2000, was done in order to illuminate that character. We went to the Department of Employment Security and then went to the Department of Revenue and asked them how many businesses legitimately generated income back into the Department of Revenue in the year 1998. It came back with almost 4,000 businesses. We went through that and plotted the location of those businesses and got a relative size on each of the businesses, and then went through it and eliminated those businesses that were probably not legitimate. Then we went to the Department of Employment Security, and they had a GIS system that could plot on maps the location of businesses within Mason County or those businesses who had employees. What we found was that there was a very close correlation between the percentage of businesses that were located in the rural areas and those that were located in the urban and more population areas. So between the information that came from the Department of Revenue and the information that came from the Employment Security Department, we had a very statically valid picture of what the economic engine is that drives this county. That needs to be addressed; what the real nature is. The ACT calls for the county to define what its rural character is. The ACT does not call for the GMHB to come stomping in some place and say that this is you and this is rural. What the ACT calls for is for the county to define its rural character. Now whether we get away with doing that or not, I don't know. It might come flying back in our face and that needs to be weighed; weighed more by the BOCC than anybody else.

(#1095) Bill Dewey: In reading through your comments, Jay, I'm trying to understand exactly what you're proposing as far as a change to the economic element. Is it essentially the middle of your page here that you'd like inserted into the element?

(#1105) Jay Hupp: I would start out with the introduction of the Economic Development Element in describing the economic nature of this county. Then from there you can begin to address what it is that you want to change, how you want to change it. I'm sorry I missed this August 15th meeting but when Jeff Carey started talking about how do you quantify or measure the achievement of those things that you identify as goals and objectives? That already is being done; it's been done for about the last 10 years in a report that comes out of the Economic Development Council in the spring, that looks at the top 50 employers in the county and it analyses what's happened with those top 50 employers during the course of the year and compares it to the previous year. It's a really good comparison or view of where we're at in comparison to the years past. From that you ask the question of are your goals being achieved and what's the measurement of it.

(#1180) Tim Wing: If you define the economic character of the county as you're describing it, would the goals be to increase economic activity in rural areas, or to preserve it, or to make it easier for existing businesses to grow and thrive, or to encourage additional ones?

(#1195) Jay Hupp: I think you have to encourage additional ones because it's not necessarily that we're losing

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

businesses in the rural area, although we are, but that's not really what causes the shift in commuting population outside the county. What increases that figure is the total number of new folks that comes into the county, and if the business doesn't grow commensurate with that, then that portion that is not offset by growing business finds jobs elsewhere. So that's really what's happening. The growth of business, and that's 62% that lies outside the UGA's, has been severely constrained over the last 7 or 8 years with the development regulations. There's no more graphic example of that than what happened with the Bronze Works. That, in my opinion, did not meet its demise as a result of Norma Taylor running out of gas. She just ran out of gas because she was up against the regulations that just caused it to collapse and stay in the red for way too long. Many, many other businesses, in the last 7 or 8 years, have run up against development regulations that caused them ... in fact, the regulations are designed to frustrate business development outside the UGA's. That's what it's all about. If that's not turned around in some way then, if you apply a low estimate of an annual attrition rate on the small businesses in the United States, some figures are as low as 7% a year and some are as high as 13% a year. If you use just the figure of 7% attrition rate every year, and those 62% of the businesses that outside the UGA's, in a 10 year period, you will eliminate 70% of that 62% that sits out there in the rural area. If you don't begin to do something to turn that around then the character of this county is going to change drastically.

(#1295) Diane Edgin: What I've seen since the time that I've lived in this county is that there's a definite element that their vision of rural is for their enjoyment not for economic growth. Yet, on one side, they're saying the taxes are so horrible, but yet, they fail to recognize the revenue that businesses generate.

(#1315) Steve Clayton: I didn't understand what you were saying regarding the Bronze Works. Could you explain to me how we failed in that? Would it fail with our current regulations? With the rezones that are available?

(#1322) Jay Hupp: It was 80 acres that sits just south of town here on Highway 101. The property is up for sale. The vision was that that facility would start out as a bronze works casting very high end bronze art works and that once that was on its feet, the rest of the property would have been developed into an attraction that would have brought artists ... in other words, there would have been a building that accommodated bronze works. There would have been a building that accommodated painted art works. There would have been sculpturing. An artist colony. She started into it and she no more than got the first building built and then next objective was to bring together a building in the back and that went through frustration that went for about 18 months and finally we figured out a way to get that second building built. The only way it could be built was to connect the first building with the second building with a breezeway. Finally by the time she got to the third building, we were about 4 years into this. It was running in the red all the time and finally she just threw her hands in the air and said it can't work.

(#1388) Wendy Ervin: She moved the operation out of Mason County. I think she's in Pierce County, but she has not quit. She intended to have that as a destination tourist and art colony. She wasn't just looking at the hard arts ...

(#1402) Steve Clayton: So the contention was this was a rural residential area and she was attempting to expand ...

(#1405) Terri Jeffreys: Taylor Towne wanted to be a UGA; have it's borders incorporate so that this type of development could happen.

(#1410) Steve Clayton: If it was intended to be a rural tourist sort of thing and currently if you came in and asked for a zoning change on 80 acres to rural tourist ... I'm just wondering, trying to figure out ... we've been, in my opinion, more lenient and we've done a lot of zoning changes here and very few have failed when people came in and asked for changes.

(#1432) Wendy Ervin: It wasn't just rural tourist, though, they were producing products and displaying ... it was a well rounded operation, and it could have had conferences, educational facilities ... that was the whole thing. When I went to a Mother's Day there, and I talked to people from Colorado, Montana; this was attracting people from the whole west coast. We could have put Mason County on the map as an intellectual center with that Bronze Works, and through short sightedness ... I talked to one of the county employees who was

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

instrumental in squashing it, and he laughed about it and made a comment about what they charged for those bronze works. People pay that money so the fact that they charge \$5,000 for a bronze statue is not too shocking.

(#1490) Bill Dewey: Let's get off of the specifics of the Bronze Works.

(#1492) Jay Hupp: Beyond the specifics, I think the point to be made here is that if you take that as part of the naturally developing character of rural, the questions becomes why should it have ever even run into a problem? It runs into a problem because the assumption is made ... there's a word that's used in these minutes that just rankles me as it speaks to the nature of business. It's a very derogatory comment. The attitude that business can't exist in the rural area without walking all over the people that live there is bunk. All you have to do is travel around this county and you see business after business after business that is totally compatible with residential areas. Taylor is a perfect example of that. Taylor never gets any comments from the surrounding neighborhood about how they operate because they're sensitive to the people that live around them. Rose Nye, when she was running that business out on Cole Road, she never got any complaints out there. There are occasions where people will fire up a diesel engine at 6:00 in the morning and irritate people. The regulations can be written in such a way that we can take care of those individuals walking all over each other, but we don't have to write the regulations in such a manner that we eliminate business simply because people occasionally get walked on by their neighbors. The regulations have been written in a manner that so over protects the neighbors that it's almost impossible to create a business or expand a business in the rural area of Mason County. I'm not suggesting that we could get away with completely turning this thing over in one step, but I would like to see us move in a direction that intends to address reality and deals with the economy in this rural county in a much more realistic manner than what has been forced on us in the past.

(#1595) Wendy Ervin: I think an essential step would be having a discussion and pinning down a definition of the rural character of Mason County. You've suggested that here; the law says that.

(#1610) Terri Jeffreys: There is a definition in here.

(#1612) Wendy Ervin: Is it a specific Mason County definition, because if it's not specific to Mason County ...

(#1618) Terri Jeffreys: It is but it's pretty generic.

(#1625) Bill Dewey: Maybe that's good council from the PAC that we need to be more specific with that definition. I hear what you're saying, Jay, and I'm not sure I that support totally. There are natural resource industries that the county relies on that need to operate in the rural areas, and as I've said in previous meetings, we need to have certain protections as we start to increase our rural densities that the activities associated with those natural resource industries, people understand that they need to anticipate them if they're going to move in next to them. With that said, there are a lot of other businesses that are not natural resource businesses that can locate in the rural areas that don't demand additional services or put an additional demand on the need for infrastructure. However, there are businesses that do. You would need heavier roads for trucks or additional three phased power in areas where you might not have it, whereas a UGA might. So there are examples where not every business is going to fit out in the rural area and you want to direct those to the UGA's accordingly, especially for rail, power, fiber optics, etc. So I think there's a balance; we just can't open the doors and say it's all okay everywhere out there in the rural area.

(#1700) Jay Hupp: But where we find there is a need for infrastructure, if it's not there, the business won't locate there.

(#1706) Bill Dewey: That's true, assuming the business knows what its vision is going to be 20 years out.

(#1710) Jay Hupp: But you're absolutely right that businesses grow to a level that they have to move, and that's the characteristic of a business that outgrows the infrastructure that supports it.

(#1730) Bill Dewey: With that said, it's responsible on our part to try to encourage them in the first place, if it's the type of business that may eventually need that to grow, to areas where those services are so we don't

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

lose them as a business later because the county is unwilling to bring that power out to that remote location. (#1744) Wendy Ervin: I think what he's saying is that if they've grown to the point they can no longer operate, now they're big enough they're probably going to move into an industrial area where those services exist, but their initial infancy has been in an affordable location in a building behind their house. Then they grow to the point where they need to expand so they go.

(#1765) Tim Wing: I think it's a fairly complicated question and it's one that people are going to have different viewpoints on because there's a lot of people who like the rural character and they like it quiet. There's a guy who repairs outboard motors on the South Shore and the only way he can tune some of those up is to run a two cycle motor at 7,000 rpm's for 35 seconds while you adjust the machine. It drives the neighbors crazy. He's not too big; he doesn't need any infrastructure but he does have a parking problem. I appreciate you addressing this issue because I think it has gone too far the other way and I think we should encourage, perhaps, an element in the plan that we would establish a dialog about this question and try to come up, probably not before December, the proper definition of what the economic nature is of the rural areas and try to address the issues that you're bringing out and get a bigger audience to participate to try to come together with a decision about how we want to proceed. There's a lot of people that have a lot of different opinions about it and I don't think we have time to address them by December, but I do think we could address it by saying we want this addressed in the future; the next 24 months or the next 10 months, as a way of recognizing that it's a problem and that there may be a need to adjust what is written so far about the economic nature of the rural areas, and establish a plan to address that in a time frame that would give more people an opportunity to participate.

(#1845) Jay Hupp: I appreciate that. I think it is a question as to whether you could bring something together for December that would be realistic and accepted. On the other hand, you're creating an Economic Development Element and it's taken years to get the GMA to recognize that economic development was an important aspect of planning. For the first time, we're going to create an Economic Development Element in our Comp Plan. We have an opportunity to start off on the right foot. If we start off with an Economic Development Element that doesn't even recognize the provable true nature of the economy in this county, then I don't think you're ever going to get it turned around. I think you need to start off with an element that is based on scientifically known fact about what the nature of this economy in this county is. It's right there in that report. It could be updated but it would take about 3 weeks to get the information out of Employment Security but I don't know that it's necessary to even update it. We know the basic character as a result of the study that was done in 1999 and updated in 2000. The character of that economic engine that drives this county is known and if we start off with less than that, I don't think you're ever going to recover from it.

(#1930) Bill Dewey: Tim, just to be clear, I think one of your concerns is trying to update or change the definition of rural character. Are you necessarily objecting to including the information that Jay has provided from the study that more accurately defines what our current economic engine is?

(#1950) Tim Wing: I really don't have any problem with putting anything he has said into some form into this. I have two issues. One is, if you try to redefine what the economic development should be in the rural areas of the county, it's a topic that there's going to be a lot of people that have a lot of interest in it and I don't know if we can accomplish a full discussion by December. The second issue is, if we decide we're going to put something in here just based on what we think, I think we have the potential of causing the difficulty of getting our plan renewed and perhaps we can make a very strong statement that this needs to be addressed because we think there are serious issues, and put our foot in the door, but yet get the plan renewed and then have the time to have the discussion.

(#2100) Allan Borden: I have a comment about the report. First of all, I think it would be very important to, if you had 1200 businesses, have a tally of 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, employees in the business. You can easily operate a business out of a decent size garage with 5 employees and it doesn't even impact the neighbors. It's not fair that if there are 250 - 5 employee businesses in this tally, they may disappear in the landscape as you drive by. This was worked on in 1999 and 2000. There are new goals and policies in the GMA that came into effect in the year 2002 that encourage rural economic development, whether it's industrial or commercial. So the county has tried to do that as best as we can but one of the things I'd like to see is some supportive criticism on how the county can change regulations, if that's necessary. Especially on what we call nonconforming development. That's development that existed in the county since July 1990 and may have

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

not been zoned for that land use because they came into effect in 1992 and 1993, and especially in the first 8 months of 1995. If we had a more effective way to treat nonconforming development, maybe the property owners would understand that they indeed could expand within the framework. Whether it's a standard, or a public process

(#2200) Terri Jeffreys: Allan, if I recall, the matrix of permitted uses in the rural areas was, I think, an attempt by the county to try to address the reality of what's going on commercially in the county. Was that officially killed by the GMHB or what?

(#2250) Allan Borden: There were additional columns in the matrix that applied to rural lands and when we developed the zoning regulations for different zones, like the rural residential or rural commercial, that column disappeared from the matrix.

(#2275) Bob Fink: Essentially we're touching on 8 years of litigation here. The study that Jay presented is not new. It was actually presented back when it was written and made part of the record and argued before the GMHB when the county was trying to preserve as much flexibility for commercial and industrial development in the rural areas as it could. You mentioned that the Taylors had to attach the new expansion to the old expansion and that's because the GMHB had invalidated the county's regulations and we couldn't permit any new building. Since we couldn't permit a new building, we could only permit an expansion of the existing building, which was still allowed under the invalidity. So when you get into these issues, you have to realize that there's a lot of discussion that preceded this. A lot of back and forth with the GMHB to bring us to the point where we're at. The current regulations actually allow new commercial and industrial development in the rural areas. It requires that it be small scale, but it does allow it. It allows for the continuation of businesses and their expansion up to a 10,000 sf expansion for a non resource based. There are limits of various types on these activities but the county has always been working to make them as reasonable and flexible as possible under the guidance of the GMA. To the extent these things could be improved, I'm sure there are ways they could be improved. It seems to me that it's appropriate through the mechanism of the Economic Development Element we identify some of the ways this might happen. I would also add that a lot of the small businesses can start up ... garage start up businesses, cottage industry, home occupations, are permitted throughout the rural area and the residential areas as well as throughout the urban areas. Those can have up to 5 employees before they fall out of the definition of home occupation, in which case they may have to move, or they may have to apply for a rezone. They would have their options ahead of them. This is not a new discussion; It's an old discussion, and because this is a new PAC, many of the members weren't here over the years. I just wanted to be sure you understood that this information is not new and the study is not new.

(#2435) Bill Dewey: Thanks, Bob. That's good background. We've had some good discussion here on the Economic Development Element. Steve, I'm not sure you've gotten the direction you were hoping for tonight but we've had some good discussion on it just the same. I don't know that we're going to get further with it with additional discussion.

(#2455) Steve Goins: I think you've provided me a lot of foundation that I can come back to you with something on it that will get a lot closer to achieving what you're trying to achieve here. It's been very helpful to me.

(#2465) Tim Wing: I wanted to say that I tend to agree with a lot of the positions here. I just don't know if we should be getting real specific about it, but I would like to see a statement in the plan that recognizes that the rural areas of the county are important economic areas and that the county needs plans and goals to continue to offer flexibility and to deal with that issue.

(#2490) Bill Dewey: I think Jay's comments bring that out as well as Matt's. We talked about that there was adequate analysis on healthcare and tourism but concerned that other sectors such as forest products, aquaculture, manufacturing, forest resource, and service were not adequately addressed.

(#2520) Steve Goins: I should let you know, in a response to Matt's letter, I shipped out a copy of the draft to a couple of the larger resource based industries to get their comments so I could more directly respond to what I believe would be industry needs and they both indicated they would be happy to do that. I think

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

something else that you have sort of been talking about is we don't really have the time to necessarily create all the policies and specifics that we need to really take this forward, but what we can do is establish a plan to do that, and that's part of what the strategies try to achieve. We don't necessarily have all the right answers today but we are going to set up programs and procedures so we're starting down that path.

(#2564) Terri Jeffreys: I'd also like to say that I am really impressed at the specificness of your strategies. It's refreshing after reading extremely vague county type documents.

(#2580) Diane Edgin: Now that we've had Olympic College facilities now for some years, has there been any business that used them to train their work force?

(#2590) Bill Dewey: It talks about that in here.

(#2615) Steve Goins: That is an area, for example, where the county isn't necessarily in the lead on making that happen, but we can provide mechanisms to support that. But at the end of the day, we're relying on others to make that happen.

(#2640) Wendy Ervin: Would it be appropriate that just the statistics portion of this report be upgraded so that we could have a view of the direction that things are moving as far as the business demographics?

(#2665) Jay Hupp: I don't know whether the county staff wants to take that on, or if Matt wants to take that on. I'm not really sure, that given the time frame that we're talking about, would add that much.

(#2680) Wendy Ervin: Allan had said there was some changes that were put into effect in 2002, and those have now had 3 years to percolate through the system.

(#2695) Bill Dewey: I think all of us would see that as a valuable goal, but as Steve has said, we don't have all the information we need right now and it may not achieve everything we want to right now, but that may be a good goal in light of the fact that in 2002 things did change. I want to clarify that this is a workshop essentially for the benefit of the PAC tonight to deliberate these things that we're going to have public hearings on, but obviously as in previous evenings, there has been a lot of interest from the public here and so I don't want to eliminate you from our discussions tonight. If you feel like you have input that would be beneficial to the PAC on any of these topics, please feel free to raise your hand and be recognized for you to comment.

(#2750) Bob Fink: What I said about a lot of these issues being addressed before, I don't think that changes the suggestion that within this element that the distribution of employment and historical patterns be addressed. I also think that what Tim said is a good idea that part of the work program for the future include examining the zones to see what improvements and adjustments should be made in the future. I think those are very good ideas.

(#2800) Terri Jeffreys: About the work force program, do you see it, and does the EDC board, see the ... one of the functions of the EDC is helping to facilitate work force training needs of current and new companies with the programs at the college.

(#2812) Matt Matayoshi: We're working with Olympic College here in Shelton in solving some of the work force development problems, particularly the forest product industry. Part of the challenge is getting companies to open their doors to the idea of working with the educational institution in that in the past, maybe their expectations were not met and that isn't specifically with the relationship with Olympic College, it may have been with a different institution or a different program. So we're overcoming a history, in one aspect. The second challenge is developing curriculum or finding curriculum off the shelf that will meet the needs of employers. The third part of it is the education of employers and letting them know that there are tools out there to solve their challenges. Lastly, in our facilities, we can teach management, soft skills in a classroom setting, but as far as having a facility where we can do welding and put out 20 welders a year, that's more challenging. There are prospects that Olympic College can take their training programs on site to these industrial companies and teach the skills that they need. This is a problem that's been identified not only in this community, but also across the nation. We're working in a regional effort with work force development board in looking at this issue from a regional perspective. The larger the group you go to to resolve an issue,

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

the greater the process and bureaucracy is to work through.

(#2950) Bonnie Knight: I'm Bonnie Knight with the Port of Allyn and President of the EDC. The last few years, I was involved with a regional group and it covered 7 counties, and one of the issues we looked at was that very thing. Last year we did have a conference in Bremerton and did bring together the colleges. Olympic College Bremerton and Shelton campus, as well as work force, and there were a number of EDC's involved. The report was the end of about a 6 month study by a group from the University of Washington looking at exactly that question. They were looking a telecommunications capability and doing an inventory on that, but one of the major things that came out, they interviewed a very large number of employers and they came up with the report, and I can get that to you, on the gap that employers feel.

(#3040) Jeff Carey: I'm Jeff Carey of Allyn. On this 21 page Economic Development Element, on page 3, I think you also need to see what the earning capacity is of the commerce in this county so you know which areas are driving this county in addition to jobs. For example, if you had 440 permits last year, and the average house is \$150,000, that's 66 million in new construction. Those kinds of pieces need to be in the big picture of this. I'm not saying you can get it done by December, but it's a section that needs to be in there. The assets of a company; when Simpson made their upgrade to the mill, that has a way of cutting down jobs but that earning capacity of that corporation in this area goes up. So that has a play on what's going on here. These goals bother me, not in a sense of what they're saying, but I'm a person who likes to see things quantified. I just don't feel good with a goal that doesn't have a form of measurement.

(#3150) Matt Matayoshi: In looking at the challenges of putting this Economic Development Element together, the best way to clearly work through something is to go back and look at the regional task at hand. It's laid out in the original law which says 'An Economic Development Element establishing local goals, policy objectives, and provisions for economic growth and vitality and the high quality of life. The element shall include a summary of local economy, such as population, employment payroll sectors, businesses, sales, and other information as appropriate. A summary of strengths and weaknesses of the local economy defined as the commercial and industrial sectors and supporting factors such as land use, transportation, utilities, etc.' I did not see a lot about the strengths and weaknesses of our various sectors and economy in here. As far as our demographic information that could be included, some of the data goes as far back as 2000 and I know there's adequate data more recent that can be used in the element. I'd be happy to share that with staff. The two charts I passed out, the first one shows unemployment trends across ... for the state, it goes back to 1970, but for Mason County, it goes back to 1980. What you see is a trend that our unemployment, on average, is about 1% or 2% higher than the state average. The more concerning graph is the second graph, which shows Mason County and Washington State's average wage. When you start out in 1980, you'll see that they're very close together, and as we go on and progress, there's an increasing gap between the average state wage and the average Mason County wage. Here in 2004, there's a gap of almost \$14,000 between the state wage and our local wage.

(#2450) Bob Fink: Matt, is this place of employment in Mason County or is this place of residence in Mason County?

(#3460) Matt Matayoshi: This is place of residence. So I offer that information and there's other information as well on demographics available.

(#3490) Bonnie Knight: From the Port of Allyn's prospective, and from the EDC, although I'm not speaking for the EDC, from the economic development prospective, you talked about growth of the business in the rural areas. The balance that they've achieved is probably rational, but part of the issue is, if you slow it down in the rural areas, you've got to have some place for it to go. I think it's important, that when we talked about this at the Future Search Conference, we talked about an inventory of buildable lands, and that definitely includes developable light industrial lands for each one of the UGA's. If you're expecting the growth to go there, that's part of that whole equation, that as you're saying we really don't want solid business from here to Belfair, ... the other side of that is you do have to have an inventory of buildable lands and that's a really important element. Also, make sure all 3 of the UGA's have a good balance of the difference uses. That's my primary concern as far as economic development. I think the rest of it is coming along really well.

(#3590) Bill Dewey: The county is going toward GIS tools, and I think that will be a valuable way to show that

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

assessment for businesses who are interested in locating or expanding here, if you understand what types of services are available where and on what zoned land, that will be a very valuable tool and encourage economic development in the county.

(#3640) Bonnie Knight: And as a port district, to be able to market your port. The predictability element becomes much more straight forward when you don't have to question each piece of land. That came out from the Future Search conference, and it came from an environmental person.

(#3695) Bill Dewey: So let's move on to tackle a few more items on our agenda. The next item is Population, Housing and Other informational Updates.

(#3740) Bob Fink: The Population, Housing and Other Updates are the draft chapters that you already have in hand that were distributed some time ago. Chapter 4 on Land Use, and Chapter 5 on Housing. They did update, for instance, the information to the 2000 census and update information regarding building permits that have been issued. But what's really still pending, is the decision on how population is allocated. We talked about population last time, and we're not going to be able to finalize that particular discussion until we finalize what the population allocation is that the county is going to use. In a similar way, the UGA Boundary Updates, there's one proposal to change the UGA boundary, which is in Belfair. It was from previous years, which was a change that was requested, and has already been reviewed by the PAC, who recommended the change. It's approximately a 10 acre area, and not a significant change in the sense that we're talking about changes. However, no decision was made by the BOCC on whether to approve or not that particular change. Any other changes to the UGA boundaries are going to be a result of how population is allocated, and what the land analysis is going to tell us about the different populations allocated.

The Parks and Recreation Element, the proposal there is to incorporate the policies that were proposed for the Trails. When the county did the Trails Plan, that wasn't sent through the PAC; there was a committee set up to do that. They developed a number of policies to lay the groundwork and guide future parks development, and particularly trails development. What we would like to do is incorporate those policies, the way they're written, into the county Comp Plan. There's also an outstanding issue on open space; an open space request from the Overton Family. That's also an issue that the PAC has already considered and made a recommendation to the BOCC. However, the BOCC has not acted on that yet.

Manufactured housing. Manufactured housing refers to a change in statute which doesn't allow the county to discriminate against manufactured in single family residential areas. The county doesn't have any regulation that does that. So I don't know that there's actually going to be any amendment that we'll bring forward to address that.

The Harstine Island Policy Review. I want to distribute copies to you. It's a document in 2 parts. One part is a brief review of the Harstine Island policies. The other part is the policies themselves as abstracted from the plan. I put them in different documents so that they're easier to compare one against the other. Just to give you a little bit of background, in the early 90's, a committee formed to look at a possible sub-area plan for Harstine Island. There was a draft plan prepared; the draft plan was never approved by the county. It preceded me a little bit, so I don't know exactly when the draft plan was available. The draft of the county Comp Plan was developed in 1995 and eventually adopted in 1996. Rather than address the entirety of the sub-area plan, a number of the policies were taken out of the sub-area plan and incorporated into the Comp Plan. Those are the policies I have here that I'll pass out. These policies address a lot of the same rural issues that were addressed later on a countywide basis. They also address a lot of the environmental protections that were addressed countywide. There's different classes of them, but a number of them have been incorporated into overall regulations, or they've been addressed through other mechanisms. There's a few that are probably outdated that really don't meet the nature and the direction that was taken by the county subsequent to when these policies were first directed. One of the things I'd like you to do when you look at them, these policies have been, to some extent, incorporated into existing regulations and those regulations are identified in the document I'll give you. You may want to decide if any further action on them is appropriate, or whether it's appropriate to remove the policy because it's no longer necessary. There is an example of a policy, at least as currently written, that the county couldn't implement because it suggested that we should control the way forest practices are done. Forest practices on forest land is not subject to county regulation. One of the things the county will be addressing this year is forest conversions. If the county

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

wanted to implement these policies when we permit conversions, and the policies mainly have to do with things like setting up a buffer of trees ... as a forest practice we wouldn't be able to regulate that, but as a land conversion we could.

(#0400) Terri Jeffreys: So a sub-area plan was developed because that citizenry stepped forward and said they wanted one, or what?

(#0430) Bob Fink: I couldn't tell you exactly why.

(#0440) Diane Edgin: It was an attempt to put a sub-area plan together but there became too much opposition.

(#0450) Terri Jeffreys: So there is a sub-area plan ...

(#0455) Bob Fink: There is no sub-area plan.

(#0465) Jay Hupp: To answer your question on what happened with the sub-area plan. There was also a sub-area for the southeastern section of Mason County.

(#0468) Bob Fink: There was North Mason sub-area plan, and a southeast Mason sub-area plan.

(#0470) Jay Hupp: And all of those kind of got folded into the Comp Plan as it came together for the first time.

(#0485) Bill Dewey: Now that we have these in our hands, Bob, could you explain them to us again?

(#0490) Bob Fink: The document titled 'Harstine Island Policies' is a review of how these policies have either been implemented or not implemented. Your Development Regulations need to be consistent with your Comprehensive Plan. Not all policies necessarily result in a DR. Some policies might result in changes to your capital budget. The policy says we're going to provide sewer for Belfair so we better put some money in our capital plan to provide sewer for Belfair. Some of these policies say that you enforce your regulations. Some policies simply guide other decisions. They don't necessarily result in directly applicable DR's. They may guide the result of DR's so that we have ... one of the things that implement a lot of the policies in the Harstine Island plan are clustering provisions. A lot of the clustering provisions affect the aesthetics, address adding additional protections for critical areas, etc. A lot of the policies in Harstine Island are expressed in the clustering provisions. When you create a performance subdivision, you set aside open space, you cluster the development away from the county road, you have a curvilinear road so that the development can be further screened, and you have all these provisions that address what these policies are getting at.

(#0630) Terri Jeffreys: I keep coming across recommendations in various documents about limiting impervious surfaces. I see there's a policy here limiting the amount of impervious surface. Can you talk about how implementation would be achieved? Are you looking at a larger area, or lot by lot with the percentage? How would one limit impervious surfaces if you... let's say Harstine Island should have no more than 30% impervious surface. How would you implement such a thing?

(#0670) Bob Fink: The way that impervious surface is restricted now is through an incentive to cluster. You have an incentive to develop land and subdivisions that are clustered and that typically reduces the amount of road area that you need to serve those lots. The county has restricted building sites in the rural area; the size of the square footage of the built area with regard to the size of the lot. It did that mostly to protect the rural character of the area rather than specifically to reduce impervious surface. Impervious surfaces are also reduced by lower densities. If you have 1 house per 5 acres, you have more impervious surface than if you have 1 house per 20 acres. You also limit impervious surfaces by having stormwater regulations that require people to deal with the stormwater that impervious surfaces cause. Communities have put caps on the amount of impervious surface that's allowed on a given type of development or within a given zoning district. Essentially, they've said that in these areas you're allowed 20%, 30%, 50% impervious surface, whatever it might be, depending on the circumstances of the community. What you need is to develop a specific rationale for why that regulation exists. I think there are certainly water quality reasons for wanting to limit or encourage as little impervious as possible. It's also easier to deal with the stormwater if there's less

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

impervious surface. Most communities that regulate impervious surface directly have a numeric limit that they set with a percentage coverage of a lot. In Mason County, what would be the specific rationale for any specific limit? At this point, we don't really have any numbers worked out.

(#0800) Bill Dewey: I think, Terri, in general under the principles of low impact development, you're better off to do it by lot if you can.

(#0808) Bob Fink: Right. When you get into the details of it, the low impact development; one of the chief ways you deal with that is you allow places for the water to run off to, which could be even grassy lawns where they've been dug up and composted and they're basically designed lawns that have a high rate of absorption. There's stormwater management which simply has an unpaved area around your lot so your stormwater hits the unpaved area and native vegetation and that acts as a filtering system.

(#0850) Tim Wing: I have a question about what exactly this is. This is a recommendation from people who live on the island?

(#0855) Bob Fink: There was a comment raised in our review process that one of the things that we need to look at in our update is the Harstine Island policies, and whether they've been implemented or not in its Comp Plan. That was sent in as a comment and it was added to our list to look at during the update.

(#0875) Tim Wing: Are these policies?

(#0877) Bob Fink: Yes, these are all policies.

(#0880) Tim Wing: Have they been implemented?

(#0882) Bill Dewey: To clarify, are these Harstine Island policies or the county's?

(#0884) Bob Fink: They are the policies that were taken from the draft Harstine Island plan and incorporated into the county Comp Plan. They are adopted policies in the Comp Plan.

(#0892) Tim Wing: And they were recommended by a group of people from Harstine Island? Were those people elected by any method?

(#0900) Diane Edgin: I'm the only one around here that was on that thing and it was a different group of people who threw their name in the hat and said they wanted to be on the committee.

(#0905) Jay Hupp: They weren't even appointed by the BOCC.

(#0910) Tim Wing: That's what I mean. How did this become county policy if there was no appointed group appointed to develop it, except the self appointed people, and now it's county policy and it affects everybody on the island?

(#0915) Steve Clayton: You could say the same thing about the Allyn planning committee. The Allyn group was self appointed and not appointed by the BOCC.

(#0920) Tim Wing: So I could say that about the Allyn plan, too.

(#0925) Diane Edgin: This was prior to us ... we were all working towards the GMA and this started out to be a sub-area plan but it was absolutely too much between members.

(#0940) Tim Wing: Was this ever sent out to everyone on Harstine Island? Does everybody on the island know that these are the policies?

(#0945) Diane Edgin: Yes, back then it was.

(#0950) Allan Borden: I'd like to reiterate what Bob said a while ago. There's a North Mason sub-area plan, there's a southeast Mason sub-area plan. As far as I know, neither one of those committees was appointed

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

by the BOCC.

(#0955) Tim Wing: North Mason was. I'm not being critical; I just wanted to know.

(#0966) Wendy Ervin: So what we are being asked to do is look at this and if some of these things don't seem to be appropriate, then we can suggest that they be removed.

(#0978) Bob Fink: Exactly. My take on these policies, not just Harstine Island but the other 2 plans which also had policies incorporated into the Comp Plan, is that at the time, the county didn't have a Comp Plan. A lot of these policies, if you look at them, are precursors to what the county eventually ended up with, but it's regulations are generally countywide rather than Harstine Island specific. I don't know that you'll find a specific Harstine Island regulation of any kind. I don't think the people's concerns on Harstine Island were necessarily unique to Harstine Island.

(#1020) Tim Wing: Which ones apply to Harstine Island? If I'm on Harstine Island, and I say I want to do something, do the county regulations apply or do these policies apply?

(#1035) Bob Fink: County policies do not generally apply to permits. There are certain permit reviews, like in a subdivision review, where an adopted policy of the Comp Plan is considered. When applying for a building permit, the adopted policies are not applicable; they're not part of the regulatory review. There's only certain permits where the policies are. Some of the special use permits require review for consistency and the subdivisions require review for consistency with the policies that are in the Comp Plan, but a building permit does not.

(#1060) Tim Wing: I'm pretty confused about this. If we've got a county policy that's countywide, and when you go in for a permit, they do know how much concrete you're going to do, how you're going to deal with the stormwater, and if it says here that 'care should be taken to limit the amount of impervious surface'; you said this was a policy. Well, is the policy to take care or ...

(#1080) Bob Fink: The policy is implemented through regulations, or through programs, or through funding, so there's different ways a policy can be implemented. A policy on impervious surface can be implemented any of those ways. It can be implemented through education. The county works with WSU to have people teach about water quality and other issues for small landholders. Policies are intended to guide the development of DR's. The concerns that are expressed in these policies pretty much have been implemented through various regulations. That doesn't mean you couldn't have done something more or something different.

(#1120) Tim Wing: Here's one of the places I'm going with this. If Harstine Island people want this for Harstine Island, I don't have any problem with that. But if county DR's become developed based on what everyone on Harstine Island said, and not based on other rural areas that might have wanted to have some input, I do have a problem with that. So is it coming from just Harstine Island for the whole county, or isn't it? I know that people in Union and Matlock didn't have a group that got together and came up with this.

(#1150) Bob Fink: I heard from many people from Matlock. What we're dealing with now is an adopted policy, and really the questions is, do you want to keep the policy, amend it, or get rid of it?

(#1185) Tim Wing: If we're dealing with this adopted policy, is this a policy for Harstine Island only?

(#1200) Bob Fink: Yes, it's written for Harstine Island only.

(#1202) Tim Wing: If I say I want to keep this policy, am I saying I want to keep a policy that's going to have an impact on the rest of the county?

(#1205) Bob Fink: I would say that if you want to keep the policy, the next question is, is it a policy that should apply only to Harstine Island or should it apply throughout the rural area or throughout the county?

(#1215) Tim Wing: The first question is, is it a good idea?

(#1220) Bob Fink: Right.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

(#1222) Tim Wing: Do we have a set of things like this from those other areas that developed position on this?

(#1225) Bob Fink: Yes.

(#1230) Steve Clayton: When the initial Belfair plan was adopted in 1990 or whatever, then we readopted last year. We went in and amended the Comp Plan. There's an Allyn plan and there's also a Shelton specific plan.

(#1250) Tim Wing: What do you do when you get to the question about the impervious surfaces. If the county decides they want to have a position on that, and there's mentioned in 1 or 2 or all of these plans, but they aren't necessarily the same, what do you do? What's your practice in terms of coming to a decision about what you want to propose for a DR for the whole county?

(#1270) Bob Fink: The practice is to give things full consideration. If something is a good idea, it doesn't really matter what the source is. That's not to say that different areas shouldn't have different regulations because there may be special considerations that are applicable to a particular area. We have a number of sub-areas that have special regulations, but most of these regulations are subdivision regulations, critical area regulations, water quality regulations, septic regulations that they have addressed in these Harstine Island policies. For the most part, those are applied generally and should be applied generally. I don't know what any rationale would be to treat Harstine Island differently from any other area of the county. Now, there may be some rationale for some policies that should be different, but those haven't been articulated as to how to distinguish them. As I said, my understanding of it is most of these sub-area policies came because the county didn't have the current Comp Plan. It hadn't addressed the rural area issues. It hadn't addressed some of the water quality goals. So instead of dealing with it as a whole in the county, certain communities stepped forward and wanted to address some of these issues. There's physical reasons too, because the southeast Mason County, and there's a lot of water quality policies in there, and that's where a lot of the shellfish industry is located. It was certainly a lot more important there than in the Matlock area that they address some of those issues.

(#1340) Wendy Ervin: In light of our earlier discussion about the economic development, it's interesting to note on page 4 under B-3-a it says, 'Discourage or prohibit industrial development in the subarea'.

(#1352) Diane Edgin: What I remember from that conversation was is the fact that we were looking at the bridge and the fact that the two roads as you come onto the island aren't designed for semi's and that was one of the issues that unless the roads were upgraded on those two roads, then semi traffic would be a problem.

(#1368) Bob Fink: This is where our policy like that would come into play. If someone had requested a rezone on Harstine Island to a commercial use or industrial use, then you'd look at that policy and you may be inclined not to grant that rezone because of a policy like that. There's not a lot of rural commercial or rural industrial zone land on Harstine Island, but there is some. If someone on one of those sites that applied for a permit that met the DR's, you'd issue that permit.

(#1395) Tim Wing: Thank you, Bob.

(#1400) Wendy Ervin: Is it appropriate for me to ask a question about the manufactured housing subject?

(#1402) Bill Dewey: Sure, go ahead.

(#1404) Wendy Ervin: It's my understanding that a modular home that is built to stick built specifications, if you go to modify that, that you cannot get a building permit to do that, that you have to go through L&I.

(#1428) Allan Borden: That's correct.

(#1430) Wendy Ervin: It would seem to me that under here where it says 'The county needs to revisit its housing policies to ensure that manufactured housing is not regulated differently than site built housing', can

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

that be changed so that you get the building permit from the same place that your next door neighbor with the stick built house would get a building permit?

(#1444) Allan Borden: You're talking about consistency of state regulation versus local regulation.

(#1448) Bob Fink: So the answer is 'no'.

(#1452) Terri Jeffreys: And this is talking about the siting of them, not any kind of development.

(#1454) Bob Fink: There are certain distinctions you can make and certain requirements you can put on manufactured housing, which we would have the option of doing; like, require them to be on a foundation, or have at least a certain degree of slope, or prohibit units prior to a certain year. The state law specifically allows certain restrictions that the county could put on, but the county doesn't have restrictions now and doesn't have conflicting ordinances on them. That's the main point for the moment, that we don't have anything in conflict with the siting of manufacturing housing.

(#1500) Bill Dewey: So let's move on to our final item.

(#1525) Bob Fink: You already have a copy of the staff report regarding UGA sizing. We have a Countywide Planning Policy that calls for 50% market factor in sizing of UGA's. That's not allowed by the GMA. The amendment we're proposing is to go to 25%, which is recommended by CTED and it's been approved for Mason County by the GMHB. That's the totality of the change.

(#1550) Jay Hupp: Is it not allowed by the ACT, or not allowed by the boards?

(#1570) Bob Fink: By the boards and the courts. I couldn't give you a complete case history of it, but for Mason County, that was a decision specifically in Mason County as well as other locations.

(#1578) Tim Wing: How often can that be reviewed? So if you say Belfair can have 20,000 people in it in the next 20 years, and we get there in 2 years, can you review it then, or do you have to wait 20 years and not let anybody else in?

(#1592) Bob Fink: Urban areas have to be reviewed every 10 years. The county has to update its plan every 7 years. The county can review this every year, or any given year.

(#1600) Jay Hupp: So this will have a direct impact on the sizing of the UGA's?

(#1604) Bob Fink: The sizing that's proposed would have a 25% market factor.

(#1610) Tim Wing: So if we reduce this from 50% to 25% we're not going to have to reduce the size of the UGA boundaries?

(#1614) Bob Fink: No, the current boundaries are all based on 25%. They were either remanded or reviewed on that basis.

(#1620) Wendy Ervin: So you're saying there's no change?

(#1622) Bob Fink: Right.

(#1625) Steve Goins: We're essentially putting our policy in step with what we're actually doing.

(#1628) Bob Fink: And with the GMA said we could do.

(#1632) Bill Dewey: So, anything else, Bob?

(#1634) Bob Fink: No, that covers the items on the agenda.

(#1636) Bill Dewey: So our next meeting is on Tuesday the 6th of September. Last week when we talked about the 'Big Allyn' option, I mentioned a study that had been done on impacts on shellfish growing areas. I

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 29, 2005

brought copies of that study that I'll pass those out.

(#1650) Jay Hupp: Would it be appropriate at this time to mention that I'm not going to be able to be here on the 26th of September and the 3rd of October?

(#1675) Bill Dewey: Motion made, seconded, and passed to excuse Jay Hupp for the meetings on the 26th of September and the 3rd of October.

Meeting adjourned.