

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes
September 12, 2005**

(Note audio tape (#3) dated September 12, 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, and Jay Hupp. Wendy Ervin was excused.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0040) Bill Dewey: We have two purposes in our meeting tonight. The first is a public hearing on several items related to the Mason County Comp Plan update. Then we'll move onto a workshop on several other Group 3 items. We'll begin the public hearing portion of our meeting.

(#0075) Allan Borden: I'm Allan Borden with the Department of Community Development. Last week I handed out a draft version of the Height Limits on Development on Industrial Zoned Lands. This is a slightly updated final version. I did add a public comment section on page 2. This topic is one of the items on the list of the work program for the Comp Plan update. This topic was included in the work program in response to a comment letter submitted by Mason County Forest Products, an industrial enterprise in Mason County, and that letter is attached to the staff report. It was also emphasized by the Economic Development Council of Mason County. Their support was noted that there was some constraints to expanding existing businesses and attracting new businesses and industries to Mason County without a zoning change and allowing above 35-foot height structures. The current regulations in the development standards in the DR's deal with heights with structures that are generally in Mason County and those also noted in the DR's Section 1.04.400 on Rural Industrial Lands. On page 3 of the staff report, you'll see that there's a change of Section 1.03.032, Development Densities and Dimensional Requirements, in the addition of text that's underlined. So now the second paragraph reads that maximum height restrictions shall not apply to storage silos, antennas, transmission towers, water tanks on lands in all zones and on resource lands and shall not apply to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

incineration facilities, boilers, electrical or generating plants, or industrial facilities on lands zoned as industrial areas. That actually provides for current flexibility but it also will come into play when the urban areas actually come up with zoning. So those lands that are industrial lands will benefit from this loosening of the standards.

In the rural area, lands zoned rural industrial in Section 1.04.400, I proposed to change the height standard to read that no maximum height for incineration facilities, boilers, electrical or generating plants, or industrial facilities on lands zoned as industrial areas. This also provides relevant standards of review for a proposed structure used in an industrial activity, based upon where the planned activity is located. The revision of standards permits the development review without the use of a special use permit to evaluate the proposed industrial activity structure. Currently, that special use permit review would need to be completed prior to the approval of the building permit. The only public comment I've received is the correspondence and no comments were made at the workshop last week on September 6th. The Department of Community Development would conclude that by adopting the proposed text revisions to the Mason County Development Regulations, standards regarding height restrictions would be provided that address the review of development associated with industrial facilities and other tall structures on industrial lands in Mason County. Any questions?

(#0270) Jay Hupp: First of all, I have to say that I won't be voting on anything that pertains to this question because I'm a party to the origination of this letter.

(#0275) Allan Borden: Do you want to recuse yourself from the discussion of this topic?

(#0278) Jay Hupp: Not from the discussion, but I will from the vote. Is that appropriate?

(#0280) Bob Fink: You don't have an interest; you just had some prior involvement.

(#0282) Jay Hupp: Yes.

(#0285) Bob Fink: Our attorney isn't here now. I don't think it's a problem with your involvement in the discussion as long as you don't have a property type interest.

(#0292) Jay Hupp: No, I don't. The way the change comes about in the proposed changes from the staff, is different than the request. The request was simply to add electrical generating facilities to those exemptions that already exist in the regulations that pertain to the 35-foot height. I'm curious as to why those two items were simply not added to the list of exemptions, rather than shove them over into the industrial lands area and only allow them in industrial lands or industrial areas, as opposed to the blanket exemption that exists for towers, tanks, etc?

(#0332) Allan Borden: I thought that was the appropriate way to address the request.

(#0335) Jay Hupp: The way the request reads is 'Maximum height restrictions shall not apply to storage silos, antennas, transmission towers, water tanks, incineration facilities, and boilers, electrical or generating plants'. Prior to the time that this request came in, there was a blanket exemption for storage silos, etc., and the intent was to just add electrical generating facilities to that list of exemptions. That would have allowed them countywide, as these other exemptions allow the other things that are specifically stated countywide.

(#0360) Bill Dewey: If I'm understanding this, would the other exemptions that apply previously countywide now be limited?

(#0368) Jay Hupp: The way I read this, the exemption to electrical generating plants only applies if they're intended to be built in industrial lands or industrial zoned areas. Whereas, the other exemptions allow those types of structures anywhere in the county.

(#0380) Steve Clayton: In 1.03.032, that, as I understand it, is applied to the entire county. The 1.04.400 is just the rural industrial. What they've done is made this more broad than what was asked. Not only is it good throughout the entire county, but they've eliminated height restrictions for any industrial facility.

(#0400) Terri Jeffreys: As long as it's zoned industrial area.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

(#0402) Jay Hupp: Right. It only applies if it's zoned industrial. The other exemptions apply to the entire county.

(#0408) Steve Clayton: Above under C it applies to the entire county. It says in all zones.

(#0415) Jay Hupp: But in C above, it says 'plan for density and dimensional requirements for the applicable zone designation'. Then it gets into the details in the next paragraph. Was this the intent? That the addition of exemption for incineration and electrical plants only apply to industrial zoned zones, or was it intended to apply across the county as the other exemptions apply?

(#0432) Allan Borden: It's really those kinds of activities if they occur in the industrial areas would be exempt.

(#0436) Jay Hupp: Right, and the other types of activities, no matter where they occur, they're exempt. Towers, silos, water tanks, antennas, etc. Those types of things are exempt anywhere in the county. Why wouldn't the electrical generation and incineration be exempt anywhere in the county, given that all we're talking about is not a permit to place it there, but eliminating the height restriction. That's all we're talking about.

(#0465) Allan Borden: The way it's framed, these kinds of activities, incineration facilities, boilers, electrical or generating plants, are the types of activities you would expect to find on an industrial facility.

(#0470) Jay Hupp: True, but what if you don't? What if there's an intent to put one someplace other than in a designated industrial facility? The reason I ask this question is because it was generated by the question of a cogeneration plant that would be coincidental with a lumber mill. Lumber mills don't necessarily have to be located at industrially zoned places. They're a natural resource industry and they can occur anyplace. So the way this is worded, the only place you can have an electrical generating facility would be in an industrially designated zoned area. Example, if Skookum Lumber wanted to create a cogeneration facility out there, this would not allow it. If Mason County Forest Products wanted to create a cogeneration plant at Johns Prairie, this would allow it. So the reason why it was worded in such a way that it was blanket, as are the rest of the exemptions, was to make sure it was allowable for everybody no matter where it was located. That was the reasoning behind it. Why did the philosophy change and it reads the way it does?

(#0520) Allan Borden: If the wording in 1.03.032 - if we added 'lands zoned rural natural resources and industrial areas' would that add some flexibility to allow it?

(#0532) Jay Hupp: In my mind, that makes it very cumbersome. If you simply add incineration and electrical generation facilities to the list of exemptions as they are in the DR's currently, then that covers the whole subject. The thing that brought it up was the question of whether or not a cogeneration facility would fall under the current exemptions as they're listed in the DR's. The answer was that it did not specifically say that an electrical generating facility is exempt. So that's what generated the request for the change. It was simply an intent to add those two things to the exemption so they could be located any place. It has nothing to do with permitting. It simply has to do with the height restriction.

(#0565) Allan Borden: I understand what you're saying. I'm just trying to see where in the DR's we talk about electrical generating facilities and incineration facilities.

(#0575) Jay Hupp: That's the point; you don't, and that's what the change was about.

(#0577) Allan Borden: If you change a regulation on that kind of structure, then you haven't changed any kind of flexibility on where those actual land uses can take place. If it's not listed in the DR's you would then have to search for where that kind of facility would take place, and you would wind up on rural industrial lands or lands in the UGA that are zoned industrial.

(#0595) Jay Hupp: So what you're saying is that you can't have a cogeneration facility at a lumber mill in this county unless it's in an industrial zoned area?

(#0600) Allan Borden: Not necessarily. That's why I'm suggesting that we could add the words 'rural natural

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

resource' to this proposed regulation so that we can help potential development sites in the compatible location.

(#0610) Jay Hupp: I think not only natural resource lands, but you'd also have to add rural. If you put industrial, natural resource, and rural, ... there's still a 35-foot restriction inside the UGA, isn't there?

(#0628) Allan Borden: That's right.

(#0630) Jay Hupp: So you would have to list each one of those areas, that, in fact, the 35-foot restriction is eliminated, wherein, if you just add those types of facilities to the blanket exception that you already have in the DR's, that would cover it.

(#0655) Allan Borden: As it's worded right now, in the rural area, rural industrial, there is a 35-foot height limit for structures. One of my concerns was by not specifying about the incineration facilities, boilers, and generating plants, that you're not helping people by directing their attention to where those kinds of facilities would be allowed.

(#0700) Jay Hupp: The way it reads right now, if you wanted to put a cogeneration plant out at Skookum Lumber you couldn't do it, and I know that was not the intent of this proposed change.

(#0720) Diane Edgin: Isn't it the intent of the 35-foot limit to not exceed the capacity of our fire fighting equipment?

(#0724) Bob Fink: I think it's related to that.

(#0732) Jay Hupp: Well, if you have no height restrictions on storage silos for a fire consideration, the most likely situation for a serious fire is in a storage silo. We have no height restriction on those; you can put them anywhere you want and as tall as you want.

(#0750) Steve Clayton: Is Skookum on rural natural resources?

(#0755) Allan Borden: I think that it is.

(#0760) Steve Clayton: In the DR's, there is no height limit in rural natural resource. It says it's exempt from the 35-foot height limit.

(#0775) Jay Hupp: That 35-foot height limitation applies to the entire county with the exception of the exemptions that are listed here.

(#0778) Steve Clayton: Not according to the May 17, 2005 DR's.

(#0785) Bob Fink: That's correct.

(#0788) Steve Clayton: What would take precedence? A UGA on height limits, or the rural industrial in this regulations?

(#0792) Allan Borden: The UGA. That's what I'm saying. Once the UGA has identified industrial zoned lands, then this would apply. Right now there are no industrial zoned lands in the UGA's.

(#0805) Bob Fink: There are in Allyn and Belfair, but not in the Shelton UGA.

(#0810) Tim Wing: Isn't the only reason there isn't is because they haven't adopted formal zoning there?

(#0815) Bob Fink: We've begun a process working with the City of Shelton to try to develop zoning, which would presumably include industrial areas inside the UGA outside the city limits. That process is started, but we haven't adopted anything yet.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

(#0828) Allan Borden: And even the regulations for Belfair and Allyn are interim.

(#0830) Bob Fink: Belfair's regulations are not interim; they were adopted in December of last year. The Allyn regulations are interim, but they are in effect.

(#0835) Tim Wing: It seems like there's two questions. One is, how high can you build these facilities, and secondly, where can you build these facilities? Is that correct?

(#0844) Jay Hupp: Correct.

(#0846) Tim Wing: You seem to be wanting to make sure you can build the facilities in places where perhaps you can't. But that's a different question of how high can you go if you get permission to build them. I'm having trouble separating the two because the discussion ...

(#0852) Jay Hupp: It's both. But if you're correct, and I didn't realize there's no height restriction in rural resource lands ... is that true?

(#0862) Bob Fink: It's the rural natural resource designation, so it's a zone. Most of the rural area that we have used to be all one rural area. Most of that is now rural residential with 5, 10, or 20 acres per residential unit density. In those areas, there are limits to what commercial or industrial activity can happen, because they're primarily residential. The process, and there are designated rural industrial lands, and designated rural natural resource lands, and the large mills would normally be designated as rural natural resource, although, depending on circumstances, they might be rural industrial. Right now, what it would take to locate one of these facilities anywhere in the rural area, would be to rezone the land as rural natural resource, or rural industrial. That would be the mechanism by which you could do this outside the urban areas, potentially just about anywhere in the rural area, but the county would still have some control of whether the siting of these facilities was in an appropriate location for that kind of activity.

(#0925) Jay Hupp: So you're saying that there are circumstances under which the land would have to be rezoned if you wanted to build an electrical generating facility as opposed to a silo over 35 feet?

(#0940) Bob Fink: Even building a silo, for some activities, would require a rezone to ag use or industrial use.

(#0950) Jay Hupp: So all we're talking about is the height? We're not talking about the permitting?

(#0954) Bob Fink: As I understand the request, they only wanted to address the height limit, and not necessarily allow these permitted uses anywhere in the county, but they were concerned that where these facilities were allowed, that they'd be allowed to be tall enough to meet their needs. That's what Allan attempted to do. He might have perhaps missed a district, but the rural natural resource isn't one of those because they don't have a height limit, but rural industrial does so that should be changed. The urban areas have a height limit and that would need to be changed.

(#0975) Jay Hupp: I don't want to pursue this any farther; I think we've talked about it enough, but the intent was to put it in the same category as a silo.

(#0990) Bill Dewey: So is there any more discussion from the PAC or questions for Allan? Okay, we'll open up the public hearing portion of it. Any public comments? It appears there is no one here this evening to provide public comments on this issue. We'll close the public comment portion. What direction would the PAC like to go? Bob, under your last comment, did you say that we need to add something in here for the UGA's?

(#1035) Bob Fink: They're included under the development densities and dimensional requirements.

(#1095) Jay Hupp: So this would remove the height restrictions inside the UGA's?

(#1098) Bob Fink: Right. Anywhere where these facilities are allowed, they would be allowed to be as tall as they need to be.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

(#1100) Bill Dewey: So, Jay, are you satisfied with this now?

(#1102) Jay Hupp: Yes.

(#1105) Bill Dewey: So can we have a motion?

(#1107) Tim Wing: I make a motion that we accept staff's recommendations on these changes for the Height Limits on Development on Industrial Zoned Lands.

(#1110) Diane Edgin: I second the motion.

(#1112) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. On to the Economic Development Element.

(#1125) Steve Goins: Steve Goins with the Department of Community Development. What we have prepared in the staff report is some analysis on comments that were generated during the public review period up to the workshop session we held last week. I have included some discussion and dialog summarizing those comments into eleven groups and attempted to not only address the comment in the discussion, but also address the comments and changes that were made in text to the draft that was in public review. There were additional comments received, which I'll discuss momentarily, but I'll summarize first these eleven comments.

The first one is dealing with characterization of Mason County as a 'bedroom community'. Mainly staff just wanted to bring this to your attention for further consideration. This may have touched the wrong nerve and might be something you might consider wordsmithing.

The second discussion point was dealing with the rural based businesses and promoting business development outside the UGA's. This was an item that there was considerable discussion on in our last workshop. Summarizing the concerns that were included in the business report that was entered into the record, one was that most businesses currently operating in the rural areas would not be authorized, under the newly adopted zoning regulations, and secondly, annually a percentage of these businesses will close down or relocate, which will result in a declining inventory of rural based industries that cannot be easily replaced. In the discussion, I pointed out that since that report was issued, there have been some revisions to not only the policies, but our DR's to try to address some of those concerns, but in the discussion that was held last week, there seemed to be some further concern over whether those changes went far enough. So staff included, in this revised version, a strategy and objective where we would facilitate a process where we would revisit those policies and DR's and the key part of that would be to develop a community driven definition of rural character. That has been included in this draft.

Discussion #3 was expand the discussion of capital facilities to include Allyn and Belfair. In response to that, staff included a number of other capital facility projects that have occurred over the recent past or are in the planning stages that directly affect those UGA areas.

Item #4 was provide additional assessment and analysis on the forest products, aquaculture, manufacturing, forest resource, and service sectors. In response to that, staff did attempt to add some discussion that included some basic information about those sectors and their contribution to the overall economy. I should add that staff felt that the real impetus in improving conditions in those sectors isn't in discussing it but in providing goals and strategies. To somewhat be brief about what those sectors bring to the economy, there wasn't a lengthy discussion provided. A lot of information regarding various sectors is available in other means and can be obtained. In fact, it would be more current in subsequent years to find that information through other resources than our Economic Development Element, but the goals, strategies, and policies that support those are really what's important.

The fifth discussion was to improve provisions that protect local contractors. I did provide some discussion about this item. We have not, in summary, completed an analysis of all the legal parameters of doing this. We were not able to determine whether another jurisdiction in Washington State has attempted to do something like this. We don't think that there's a legal problem with it, but we're just researching to find out what we can and cannot do. Example of where you see something similar to this is where you have public

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

sector projects, such as roads, or other projects that cities and counties develop, where you have stipulations on small businesses, women owned businesses, minority owned businesses, types of materials used, who's hired. There's a number of restrictions that jurisdictions use to encourage local builders and service providers to be used in contracts. To turn this into something for the private sector is a little unique and different and we just haven't been able to do that to this point.

The 6th discussion item was to further support the shellfish industry by further enhancing provisions that improve water quality. Essentially we did include the comments that were provided in the last discussion.

Item #7 was to include support of tourism. In the discussion what we attempted to point out was there is some goals and strategies that do support tourism. In the public workshops there was a lot of debate and there wasn't a lot of unity into what really was the best approach the county could take to do this. So staff didn't try to make a decision here. We just wanted to move forward with something that provided some support without going into a lot of detail.

Item #8 was to reconsider implementation of special assessment districts and local improvement districts. Again, we provided some discussion on this matter. There seemed to be some subsequent discussion in which it appeared that including the language as it was initially provided in the first draft seemed to be sufficient.

Item #9 was to include more implementation and less fluff in the document. To summarize staff's comments, we were sort of walking a tightrope on this one. On one hand, we were trying to provide goals and policies that generally provided community support on a basic level, and on the other hand, providing implementations and strategies that really give these goals and policies some teeth to make these things happen. We feel that we did strike that balance pretty well. There was a lot of discussion in the workshops that we held about these items, and we tried to be responsive to that public process and respect the comments that came out of that as well.

Item #10 is adding performance measures. This was discussed at length in the workshops. Staff doesn't necessarily feel this would be a bad idea. There's a lot of sound reason to add some type of performance measures or indicators in a document like this. The caution I would have is the process of arriving at what would be proper indicators and what those indicators mean can be very lengthy. Typically communities that do that have a process in itself where they gather various stakeholders and try to agree on what could be hundreds of different indicators, which ones really make sense and which ones are we going to monitor. It can be a very long and costly process from the county's standpoint so we were reluctant to include it.

The last discussion item was include various sector revenues. This is sort of a related issue. The document could include a number of different indicators of the local economy. Again, those would be stagnant unless we update the document on an annual basis, which in itself would be something that would incur some staff time. Gathering this type of data can be laborious and it can be costly and there are other avenues available to track various economic indicators in Mason County outside this Economic Development Element.

That summarizes the changes that were made since your last workshop. There were some additional comments that came in between the workshop and tonight. Green Diamond Resource provided some comments about the natural resource forest timber sector and basically had five items that they wanted to include as means to help support their industry. In addition, Commissioner Clayton included some comments in an email, most of which staff didn't have any issue with. You may want to discuss that in relation to using some of statistics that were related to the Phase 2 report. One regarding the amount of payroll that's generated through rural based businesses and the number of businesses with employees outside the UGA's. Staff tried to provide a sort of a range of numbers here instead of giving something with certain and reliable data.

We included some recommendations at the end of the report. A recommendation could be to consider recommending this version of the element to the BOCC subject to the changes that we would bring back before you, but close the public hearing. The public hearing has been open for over 30 days. We feel like we've really made an attempt to reach out to the public and get a lot of comment, and we have received a lot of comment. The concern would be that unless there's something new and unique that comes through the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

process tonight, we would like to close the public hearing and allow this item to move forward because there are a number of other elements you need to be considering in the Comp Plan update.

(#1588) Bill Dewey: Thank you, Steve. My compliments to you for doing a great job. You've taken a lot of different input from different processes here and incorporated them. You've done a great job in being responsive to the public comment, and I wanted to compliment you on that. Did the Green Diamond comments get handed out?

(#1602) Steve Goins: They're not in a format where I could hand them out to you, but I can provide those if you like. I can read the five comments, if you like.

(#1608) Bill Dewey: Were they incorporated in here?

(#1610) Steve Goins: They were not. I just received them late last week. They have not been addressed.

(#1615) Bill Dewey: Steve's comments?

(#1618) Steve Goins: Those have not been addressed in this version. I can make those available.

(#1625) Bill Dewey: I guess I'm concerned on the Green Diamond comments, considering where those comments are coming from being a significant part of our Economic Element. I'd like to make sure we're addressing their concerns.

(#1635) Steve Goins: I'll read the summary of what those five points are. These are in order of priority. 'Protect long term forestry designation in the county'. They added that they participated in the process in which the designations were established and they're satisfied with these initial designations. 'Ensure compatible uses on adjacent lands'. 'Recognize forestry role in protecting fish and wildlife as well as clean water'. They indicate that transportation infrastructure improvements are more important to Simpson than to Green Diamond, but they realize their importance, not only to them, but also they noted in the comments about protecting our current rail service to note that rail service is not just limited to the county, but it reaches out to the region. 'Support for conservation and restoration projects to protect or enhance watershed health, upstream and downstream, of private forest lands'.

(#1685) Bill Dewey: Do you feel their comments are pointing out edits that need to be made, or omissions that need to be added, or are they saying that what we've done is adequate?

(#1695) Steve Goins: I think they'd like to see comments that basically state these elements in some fashion included.

(#1700) Bill Dewey: They didn't provide any specific amendments or language?

(#1705) Steve Goins: No. They had some edits, but they were just simply wordsmithing edits.

(#1710) Bill Dewey: Do we have any other questions for Steve? Hearing none, we'll go ahead and open up the public hearing portion on the Economic Development Element.

(#1730) Jeff Carey: My name is Jeff Carey. You have my letter on file so you know what I'm after. Nothing changes; I understand what the county is saying. The other thing is on page X.21 near the top. Maybe it is a good thing to adopt the provisions of the State Department of Ecology 2005 Stormwater Manual. It happens to be a 972 page document, and it seems a little like you're just tagging it and not saying what they've got in there is right or wrong. I'm concerned when you start adopting without the process, because maybe there's some things we need to do more stringent. That's my big concern. Does that make sense?

(#1775) Bill Dewey: It makes sense what you're saying. I think the way that staff has inserted it in here they're not saying the county will, it's just saying that consideration should also include adopting that manual.

(#1785) Jeff Carey: The other thing is if we're going to list projects, like public projects, we should list all the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

projects. You've got water systems in Allyn that are needed I know it will come out in time, but I didn't know there was a million dollars worth of improvements to go into the sewer system in Allyn in the next six years. All I'm getting at is you need to include them all.

(#1830) Steve Osguthorpe: My name is Steve Osguthorpe. I'm here representing the City of Shelton. I appreciate to speak. We're currently in the process also of updating our Comp Plan and particularly plans for our UGA. One of the things we want to express to you is that we do support economic development as far as the City of Shelton is concerned. We need to make sure that we have growth opportunities in that regard. We also have other objectives that we're concerned about and want to make sure that we balance those with those other objectives. Some of the things I think you've done very well on in the draft you have before you tonight. For example, the policies and the goals regarding maintaining rural character. Shelton isn't rural, but it does have that small town character that a lot of people associate with surrounding rural areas. We've also had a lot of folks express a desire to maintain the small town feel of Shelton. Tourism was another thing that you identified in here, and that's something that we also want to make good on if we can, and a lot of tourism is having a place that people want to come. People want to come here for economic reasons, of course, like industrial, and people just out enjoying the weekend want to come for other reasons. They want to enjoy the place in terms of what they can do and individual environment. Another thing we're trying to balance in all of this is our housing needs. We're anxious to provide more of a diversified housing stock in the City of Shelton. I don't think anyone could argue that we don't already provide our fair share of affordable housing, but we want to create the opportunity for some upscale housing as well. As you are aware, housing, in most cases, draws from our resources until you reach a certain point that it's upscale enough that it might also contribute to our resources as will other retail and industrial efforts. For us to balance all of these, the one thing that we're going to be looking at ... I should preface this by saying that as we've worked on our urban growth plan, we've done some analysis. We've hired a consultant to help us with the analysis in terms of the capacity of our area. One thing we realize is that our capacity in terms of residential is too large and I realize that's another topic. What we're going to have to do to address that is one of two things. Either reduce our UGA by size, or change those residential designations to something nonresidential. There are perhaps some other land use designations we might identify in terms of our UGA land use designations. I suspect we'll be heading in that directions. There are some areas that we've already identified preliminarily as potentially changing from our draft residential to industrial, and that would include some land along Highway 101. To dovetail that back into some of the other objectives we're concerned about, the one thing that I want to encourage you to look at, and I'm not sure it's clearly spelled out in your draft, and that would be development standards. We've talked about performance standards and I think some folks may have confused that with development standards. Those would be things pertaining more to the lay of the land and the performance standards they would meet in terms of screening buffering. If we're going to redesignate in our land use proposal some of those lands that are residential to industrial, we're going to want to make sure that Highway 101, for example, doesn't turn into just one long industrial strip and that we retain that rural character. That will be something of concern to us as we look at our land use designations. Will we and the county be able to address performance standards for those types of areas. In terms of the city process, we are going to move forward. I've had our consultants work with us and we now need to start our workshops to address some of these issues with our city commission. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you and your efforts in developing this, and look forward to working with you more. You've got a good draft here except for that one item. I'm a little concerned about the language regarding allowing expansions of nonconforming businesses. I think the intent is good, but I think it will be difficult to determine how you're defining what an expansion is and how it balances with other things. The city want to make sure that whatever occurs that we don't have a disincentive for businesses to locate out of Shelton's UGA. Thank you.

(#2085) Matt Matayoshi: My name is Matt Matayoshi with the Economic Development Council of Mason County. My hats off to the staff for putting together, in the timeframe they had, a very good document. I'm also pleased to see that the Port of Shelton was concerned about protecting the airport and there was due consideration given in the Economic Development Element for the Port of Shelton and the airport at Sanderson Field. One area of concern that I had was the language of characterizing Mason County as a bedroom community. Although that may be one way to characterize our community, there may be more optimistic ways that that could be addressed. We want to change that trend. Under Economic Development Principles, there's consideration for a number of items, and of particular interest, I was glad to see that Items 4, 5, and 6, addressing rural based industry, considering the streamlining of the permit process, expansion of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

employment, and that should include economic opportunities for those graduating from high school that would like to live and work in Mason County. I was glad to see there was consideration for the shellfish industry, and looking to expand ways to make consideration for protecting the shellfish industry, including on page 21, where it talks about boater pumpouts and pet waste facilities like we have at the Port of Shelton's marina, and Port of Allyn's marina. There's a number of things we could probably address in the future, but considering the timeline, I think the county did a great job in putting the Economic Development Element together and having public participation, both at the north end of the county and down here in Shelton. Those are all the comments I have.

(#2230) Bonnie Knight: My name is Bonnie Knight, Executive Director of the Port of Allyn, and tonight I'm here in that capacity. The Port of Allyn has two of the three UGA's in Mason County. I think you've heard that a county can handle more than one city. Belfair is a testimony that we're going to have a second city up there thriving and Allyn can be that third and probably Hoodsport the fourth. I'm pretty comfortable with Belfair. It's been through a really good planning process. They're moving ahead very well. From the port's perspective, we want to split sewers and the other things that are necessary there, but it's on a good track. Allyn is not doing so good. It hasn't done well in at least ten years. A good deal of that, in the beginning, was because there were no sewers, the bay was polluted, and the port stepped in and said you need to clean this mess up. Thankfully in 2000 our sewers went on line. Then about 2001, because of a court ruling, the ability of commercial development to get water changed. Because of the GMA, commercial development is now required to hook to an existing municipal system or comparable. Now, if you're in someplace that already has water, like Shelton, then that's not the issue. If you happen to live in the Allyn UGA, you virtually can't get water if you tried to do a commercial development. The last hookup to an existing system was in 1997 when Washington Water Service reached the capacity for their water rights. The Port of Allyn has had a water system there for 30+ years. We presently have five residential and five commercial hookups. Around that time we started working really hard trying to expand those water rights because we had two developers that wanted to come into Allyn. Good property, good projects, but they couldn't get water. So we went through the process and got our water plan updated and those developments will hopefully still take place. This last year we had two brand new commercial buildings in Allyn. Two coffee stands. One is an espresso stand that worked two years and finally had to put in their own water system to get started. Then the Allyn town coffee shop, and because we got our system updated, we've been able to add them. With that having been said, I'll digress back ten years when this planning committee started. While we were going into it, I testified about the two UGA's in our port district. We all see Belfair as the city and we all see Allyn as doing little tourist stuff. Well, as it turned out, we realized that in order for Allyn not to fade away, it needed to become a UGA. My naive thinking had to be changed. My association with Jay, my association with the EDC; tourism is still a strong element there, but it will not support the growth that has happened as far as any kind of economic development. I'd like to point out a couple of things that have happened since our planning committee started. Ron Sageron of Stretch Island Fruit, he was on our original committee to make it a UGA and to get his plant included in there so that he could continue to grow and thrive. The bottom line was our boundaries were set so tight that Ron was long left off. He left our committee because he just could not exist. Through a long struggle, and only with tremendous help from the EDC and Senator Sheldon, was he able to be designated as a LAMIRD (local area of more intense rural development). He came very close to not only leaving the area but leaving the state and taking all of his jobs with him. Those are some of the best paying jobs in North Mason. We would love, at some point, to include him in our UGA. We don't see that happening in the foreseeable future. Jay is aware that we had another business in Allyn three or four years ago that came to the EDC and wanted to find 5,000 sf to produce their product here. We couldn't come up with it. When our boundaries were set, we ended up with one very small, difficult area because of the topography, access; it just was not feasible for him to get any place in Allyn to build 5,000 sf of light industrial. Tourism; in order to have a balanced community that can grow and thrive, you have to have a balance of uses. Allyn is going great guns with residential, and we are very close, if not past, 2000 people inside of our UGA right now. There is no balance for the commercial and the industrial land to be able to bring jobs and provide the tax base that a future city will need. I want this committee to very seriously consider a boundary adjustment that allows for a balance of uses within our UGA.

(#2580) Bill Dewey: Is there anyone else who would like to testify on the Economic Development Element? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing portion on this. What is the input from the commission.

(#2595) Steve Clayton: Other than just some small adjustments, I was happy with it.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

(#2610) Tim Wing: I have a comment again about the builders community. The statement talks about the tourism industry, which is very diverse, it talks about the shellfish industry, but yet when I asked about the building industry and the small businesses that exist doing that business, it seems like it's difficult to put into this. For some reason it's not the same as a lot of small businesses involved with tourism. I don't understand why that's really that different. I want to again say that I'd like to see things in this that specifically address the need to support the builders in this county that includes affordable rural housing. What I'm driving at there, is to loosen up some of the regulations about how hard it is to build affordable housing in the rural areas in this county. We've created a county, in my opinion, that the rural areas are going to be relegated to very wealthy people over time. I think we need to expedite lot creation, both in rural areas and in the UGA's, in order to ensure that the builders and the businesses that they run and the people they employ and the subcontractors that they hire, that those people have a place they can do their business. I don't see it in there to the level that I think it should be in here. I'm very impressed with a lot of what is in here. I do want to support any protection that we need to give to the water for the shellfish industry and to ensure that we can continue to attract tourists. But if we don't have employment for these builders and the people who work for them, then there's a major segment of our work force that won't have jobs. I want to reiterate my concern about that.

(#2735) Jay Hupp: I, too, want to echo my absolute delight with the quality of the Economic Development Element that's been put together. I think you've done a sterling job. I do have a number of comments that I would like to see considered before this is finalized to go to the BOCC. I would like to suggest that if we leave this open for another week for input from all of us in written form, that may give them an opportunity to maybe have another look at some of the areas that might be changed. We've got the opportunity in the creation of this Economic Development Element to do it right and make it a model across the state for rural counties. I'd like to suggest that we leave the comment period open for written comments for another week, and continue this discussion next week.

(#2820) Steve Clayton: We've talked in previous times about corresponding with the entire group outside the public realm is something you're not supposed to do. So to send an email out to one or two people is okay but if you want something distributed to the group, send it to Bob so he can redistribute it.

(#2845) Bob Fink: Why don't you send it to Steve for distribution to the rest of the commission.

(#2855) Bill Dewey: So is our action tonight to continue the PAC's discussion on the Economic Development Element until our meeting on the 19th? Okay. So we need a motion to continue this discussion.

(#2900) Jay Hupp: I'll make that motion.

(#2910) Terri Jeffreys: I'll second that motion.

(#2915) Bill Dewey: So we have a motion and a second. Further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes to continue PAC discussion on Economic Development Element until the September 19th meeting.

(#2935) Terri Jeffreys: I think we should have a due date for written comments to get to Steve. Maybe Friday?

(#2852) Bill Dewey: Thursday might be better just out of courtesy to Steve.

(#2955) Steve Goins: The format which I respond could depend on how much time I need. If you're asking me to simply incorporate your edits, that's a lot easier to do than providing some sort of analysis.

(#2972) Bill Dewey: I would definitely encourage the commission members to be specific in your comments to Steve. Present them so they're a language insertion and not a theoretical or philosophical discussion.

(#3000) Steve Goins: I'll print out all the comments, copy them, and forward them to you.

(#3015) Bill Dewey: The next item is the Population, Housing and other Informational Updates.

(#3025) Bob Fink: I'm Bob Fink, Planning Manager for the Department of Community Development. The county has prepared two draft revisions, one of the Housing Element, which is Chapter V, dated April 18,

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

2005, and one of the Land Use Element, dated May 16, 2005. The updates in this draft are primarily informational in nature. They address the fact that we're trying to change the timeframe of the Comp Plan, which ran from 1994 to 2014, to 2005 to 2025. So what we've done is incorporate new information from sources such as the 2000 census, from the Mason County Housing Needs Assessment that was done a couple of years ago, and from recent building department information. What these elements do not contain that is important for their ultimate adoption is that we haven't addressed the population projection for the allocation of that population to the UGA's for the new time period. That's an issue we've discussed before here. These chapters won't be finalized until such time as we have a recommendation and ultimately a decision on exactly what population allocations we use. There are implications from that population allocation, for instance, on whether the size of the urban areas is going to change or not, and exactly what factors go into that. There's some part of these two chapters that may change based on other decisions that aren't being considered tonight. With all that said, we did leave these two chapters on the agenda for discussion.

Error at end of tape. Minutes continue with the beginning of the second tape.

(#0070) Bill Dewey: Since we don't have the information we need to make a decision on this tonight, Bob, will there be an additional public hearing on these chapters?

(#0076) Bob Fink: Yes, we'll readvertise these chapters when we've gotten to the point where we're considering the population allocation.

(#0085) Terri Jeffreys: Looking at state law and what a housing element ought to contain, it says a characterization of current housing stock, the need for future housing stock to accommodate population growth, especially for low-income housing. Frequently the number of houses needed to accommodate population growth; currently that information resides in the Land Use Element hidden in tables, and I would like to see the Housing Element state the number of housing units needed to accommodate that population growth. Then perhaps some discussion or analysis of what type of housing stock are we hoping to increase because there a shortage, for instance, of rental housing, or housing in certain price ranges. Currently that information is somewhat covered in the Land Use Element, but move that into the Housing Element.

(#0140) Bill Dewey: Any other comments to help guide staff here?

(#0145) Diane Edgin: Ms. Knight said that they're running up against a problem in that they don't have any land left for commercial development of any size, and I remember some years back when we were talking about the creation of the UGA, we tried to include Stretch Island, and at that time they didn't want to do that. Do they have the water quantity? How far can they expand at this time? Is the water there for expansion?

(#0165) Jay Hupp: On that point, has, in fact, GMA been changed to where you cannot have commercial development unless it's hooked to a municipal water? Is that a true statement?

(#0175) Bonnie Knight: That's not from the GMA; that was a reinterpretation of the court ruling right about the time we were going through all the meetings in Allyn trying to figure out how we would get more water.

(#0192) Terri Jeffreys: That water supply to commercial is considered urban service and therefore it needed to be in the UGA?

(#0198) Bonnie Knight: It was the philosophy to encourage development within UGA's., assuming that's where the services would be. It was a reinterpretation of an old rule, that you can't just build a well for a commercial service. You have to go through the water rights process.

(#0220) Diane Edgin: I'd like to find out the exact acreage for Allyn if we're going to be looking at expanding it.

(#0245) Tim Wing: I find the whole topic a bit troubling because in my opinion if you don't have sewers to hook to as in Belfair, or water to hook to as in Allyn, guessing how many homes you're going to need is like you're just shooting in the dark. If you had sewers, water, and roads in those two UGA's you would need to expand them greatly because of the need for housing. There would be people who wanted to buy houses there, there would be builders who would want to build them, and the population would be double or triple

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

than it will if there's no water or sewer there. My point is until you have those answers you can't really project the population.

(#0275) Terri Jeffreys: Unless you did it backwards and say if you are allocating populations to certain areas that means you're putting a #1 priority ... water for Allyn ... if you're going to allocate a certain amount of that population growth to Allyn, that means you have to bump up your list of priority infrastructure projects. Then bump up sewer in Belfair to meet those population projections.

(#0290) Jeanette Moore: Excuse me, I hate to be rude and interrupt; my name is Jeanette Moore and I'm chair of the planning committee for the Allyn Community Association. We had been apprised of the conversations around your table about a lot of these concerns. You spoke to one that is absolute priority to us today in these deliberations. We met with Steve last Thursday and suggested to Steve that we try and get together with you tonight during the workshop and discuss exactly where we are on some of these issues, and tell you where we're coming from and ask you how we can work together through this. That is the issue of water in Allyn and sewer in Belfair. The county resolved the sewer in Allyn after being under a consent order by the state. The money was found and the users are paying for those sewers; both the capital and operating costs. There is no water system. There are several problems in Allyn that complicate things to the point where it will make you crazy. If you could give us fifteen or twenty minutes of your time this evening we could really try to bring you up to speed as much as we understand it after working on these problems for nine years. It's a tough deal, and we're talking about numbers, and we're talking about whether we're off here and there, but there are some foundational issues and I think that they were just raised. If you don't have sewer and you don't have water, how will you approach it? I was going to wait until the Capital Facilities Plan was brought up for discussion, but we're running out of time. The county has to make some decisions regarding the boundaries for Allyn.

(#0368) Bill Dewey: We'll try to get into a more elaborate discussion when we get to that section of the agenda in the workshop.

(#0375) Jeanette Moore: I would so appreciate that.

(#0380) Bill Dewey: So on the Population, Housing and other updates, do we have any more input to provide staff at this point? Okay, let's go ahead and move onto the Manufactured Housing policies.

(#0410) Allan Borden: Allan Borden with the Department of Community Development. One of the tasks in the work program for the Comp Plan update was to look at policies and regulations concerning manufactured housing and the fact that manufactured housing is not being regulated differently than site built, factory built, or other homes built to state construction or local design standards. The legislature did adopt a new RCW that deals with the regulation of manufactured homes, which went into affect on July 1st of this year. The state law was to implement the federal code that protects consumer rights to use manufactured housing as a means of affordable homes to own or rent, and offers protection against state and local governments to restrict such construction and siting of these homes. To conform with the state law, the Department of Community Development staff reviewed the development standards that are used to review manufactured housing to provide such owner and rental housing on lands in Mason County outside of the City of Shelton. We reviewed our DR's, the SMP, the Mobile Home / RV ordinance, flood damage prevention ordinance, RO, development code, and the county's building code. Upon reviewing these, we find that there is no restrictions on the location of manufactured housing in Mason County. Only the Mobile Home / RV ordinance addresses proposed configuration or placement of mobile homes and manufactured housing when a park is proposed, or when replacement homes are proposed. The building code addressed the placement of structures as part of development and does not restrict manufactured housing in Mason County. So as a result of this review, we come to the conclusion that no DR used in the review of proposed development would restrict the location of manufactured housing upon lands in Mason County outside of the City of Shelton. There's no discrimination against use or location of manufactured housing in Mason County. No proposed change in development standards regarding the use and location of manufactured housing in Mason County is merited.

(#0542) Diane Edgin: But developments can restrict them, right?

(#0550) Allan Borden: Right. It doesn't override any legally recorded covenants or deed restrictions of record.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

So that means that homeowners associations that have covenants, if they have a restriction on design or placement of kinds of dwelling units, then those are to be abided by.

(#0568) Bill Dewey: Any questions for Allan? Hearing none, we'll go on to the public testimony portion. Anyone here that would like to offer testimony on this topic? Seeing none, what is the PAC's direction on this?

(#0582) Terri Jeffreys: I move that we accept staff's report on manufactured housing.

(#0588) Diane Edgin: I second the motion.

(#0590) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second to accept staff's report on manufactured housing. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Next up is the Harstine Island policy review.

(#0600) Bob Fink: The review of Harstine Island is a bit like the review that you just completed. One of the tasks before us is to look to see what changes, if any, were made to the GMA or the regulations or decisions of the GMHB to see if our regulations are appropriate to those. In the case of Harstine Island review, we had a comment that some policies in the Comp Plan may not have been implemented through the DR's. So we conducted a review and we identified the policies that were referred to and we concluded that those policies have been implemented in some appropriate fashion, which is to say not always through regulations, but sometimes through other programs. There was an exception we identified, which was for forest practices, where we essentially said that forest practices, unless they're forest land conversions, are not within the jurisdiction of Mason County to do anything to regulate. There was a change to state law regarding forest practices a couple of years ago which set up a process over several years, which is supposed to end this year, to turn over authority to the counties for reviewing forest practice conversions. So the policy in question is Policy B-2-b-3, says 'Buffers required between roads and occupied properties and clear cut areas'. It's a call for preserving a buffer of vegetation or trees along the roads and between the clear cut areas and occupied properties. These policies were written specifically to apply to Harstine Island. So the question is do you want to keep this policy as it is, or preferably rewrite it. It really calls for actions from the county that the county can't take in the sense of regulating most forest practices. This policy could be rewritten either to apply to forest practice conversions only, to forest practice conversions on Harstine Island only, or you could decide that you don't really want to pursue preservation of these buffers along the roads and between the clear cut areas or any adjoining occupied properties. Is any action necessary, similar to the previous case, by the county to come into compliance in this update process? My suggestion is, the only action necessary would be changing that one policy, or eliminating it so the county could be consistent. There's a group of policies around forest practices. The previous ones to that one, all the B-2 policies, would be eliminated, and then you'd keep B-2-b-3, to require the buffers. The big distinction between people doing a land conversion is that the regulations regarding critical areas, and a SEPA review has to be done when they're doing conversions. So when they're converting the land out of forestry then the county's protection for critical areas come into play. We apply our policies for protecting streams, wetlands, etc. If it's a forest practice that's not a conversion of land, then DNR would regulate that.

(#0800) Diane Edgin: I do know of some areas that were conversions that are along the main roads and there's no buffers. So I don't think the policy is even being followed.

(#0805) Bob Fink: We haven't implemented this policy in regulation.

(#0808) Diane Edgin: I like things from a consistency point of view, but I do know this is a hot button issue out there. I don't even think they're aware that we're reviewing this now. I don't think they pay that close of attention.

(#0815) Tim Wing: Are you saying that if you implement the policy, that would be in violation of the state rules? That we don't have the authority to do that?

(#0822) Bob Fink: We have no authority over forest practices. The exception to that will be conversions.

(#0850) Jay Hupp: Are there any ways to enforce the policy?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

(#0855) Bob Fink: Not against the forest practices that aren't conversions. We should amend the policy to clarify that the only thing it would apply to is conversions. The question is still do you want to keep the policy to the extent it can be applied?

(#0900) Tim Wing: Do forest owners favor the requirement where they would have to leave a buffer? Do we have any policy in the ag lands where they can't harvest the wheat or corn near the road? Is there anything like that with the forestry lands?

(#0920) Bob Fink: No.

(#0940) Tim Wing: So if they're converting it, what are they converting it to? Residential?

(#0945) Bob Fink: It could even be ag. Typically it would be residential, industrial, commercial; it could be any use that's not consistent with the continued forestry use of the property. We will be adopting a regulation very soon that addresses this issue, and is there any direction that the public or the PAC wants to give as to what that should look like?

(#1000) Jay Hupp: I'm troubled by how a policy stands up in court if it ever ends up there as opposed to a regulation.

(#1035) Bob Fink: Like any regulation it has to be soundly based and it has to pursue a public purpose and it has to be within the various legal frameworks of what regulations can be adopted. This kind of regulation is certainly conceivable. One of the suburban cities outside of Seattle recently imposed a moratorium on some types of development because they thought they had a requirement that there be a vegetative buffer around these developments. They found out that they hadn't actually written the regulation right to have it effective, and they were not able to keep a buffer; to keep these green areas. So they imposed a moratorium until they could get their regulations straight. It's certainly legal to have restrictions like this as long as they're done for the right reasons and they meet the other tests of a reasonable regulation.

(#1090) Tim Wing: I've got a problem with trying to deal with this tonight. It seems like a minor issue in the whole scope of the GMA update for this county. Also, the recommendation is very vague. Even the recommendation from the community didn't have a distance. I'd rather get on to some of the more important issues. Is there a way for us to put this into the Plan is that we review the rest of the Plan and this one needs community involvement and further study and get past this tonight?

(#1110) Bob Fink: There's another way to address the policy in the Plan. You can say we're going to delay implementation of the policy until some point.

(#1120) Tim Wing: Can we isolate this one issue?

(#1125) Bob Fink: The only thing that makes this especially timely is the fact that we are in the process of adopting regulations for forest practice conversions. This is an appropriate time to consider whether this is something that you want. Do you have to make that decision conclusively now or do you want to defer it? Then the policy could be written so that it won't be challenged as not being implemented. If this is a policy that we want to investigate the preservation of buffers on roads and between properties when performing clear cuts, we could give it some date, say by 2007, that you want to review the policies and come up with alternatives.

(#1155) Diane Edgin: I think so.

(#1158) Bill Dewey: Let's go ahead and open up the public hearing on this issue and then come back to our discussion.

(#1170) David Overton: I'm David Overton from Belfair. I didn't come to speak to this item specifically, but there's a lot of legislative intent behind the issue of why you have conversion options, and why you have a 6-year moratorium for forest land. What you're not getting is the context of this issue. I don't know specifically how it relates to Harstine Island, but if this is expanded in other areas of Mason County, it certainly will

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

become an issue. It goes back to the 1960's and 1970's when a lot of developers were using forest practice applications to do pre-development activity. So they would punch in roads and start doing their development activity before submitting for this, so the legislature came back and allowed for a moratorium or the other option was to have a conversion option. So you really need to understand the intent and what this law would do. It's a very onerous thing to put additional buffers on converting land, and you're dealing with an interim state where it's going from forest land to being cut forest land and then an application being submitted to develop it at some point. You need to look at the whole process coming through and it needs to be much more comprehensive than just further passing it on. I know that the Washington Farm Bureau would certainly be interested in being involved in it and I know that they're not aware of this. This small issue will expand.

(#1225) Tim Wing: So you're recommending that a very careful look needs to be given to this?

(#1228) David Overton: Yes, and really understand what the legislative intent is and why we have these laws here. There was a specific problem that these laws were set to fix and you don't want to open that up again because then you'll be going up against the state WAC's. You want to make sure that you're telling a story from forest land converting into something else and what that process is.

(#1250) Bill Dewey: Anyone else wishing to testify on this tonight? Seeing none, we'll close the public testimony portion on this item. Any discussion?

(#1260) Tim Wing: Could we get a recommendation from you, Bob, on how we could get past this and state that we want it further studied?

(#1266) Bill Dewey: If we're going to be having a hearing in front of us in a few weeks on regulations for these land conversions ... we've already heard during our workshop that the county was going to be looking at examples from other counties that have these in place already and we'll probably get more guidance at that point.

(#1285) Bob Fink: It would be an appropriate time to address it, but it could be deferred ... you could leave it out and not require it now, but say this is something that needs further study and it needs careful consideration because there are implications. As David Overton correctly said, there are people that are not aware of this. There is not specific proposal at this point, but they have not been consulted at this point. When the draft comes forward for the county regulating forest practices, it will be advertised, and these people will be aware that these things are going on. There two parts to this. One is, is there anything else that you want to change of these various Harstine Island policies, and two, you could consider deferring consideration of that group policies regarding forest practices until we hold the public hearing on the forest practice draft regulation that will be brought forward in a few weeks.

(#1335) Bill Dewey: That sounds like a good motion. Should we capture that?

(#1338) Tim Wing: That works for me. I think that we could easily get to a point where we're having a hearing in a few weeks and decide to even defer it further like into 2007, but we could make that decision at that time.

(#1345) Bill Dewey: I'm thinking more information will come forward during that discussion. We'll have more people in the audience and have information from staff specific to that issue. So deferring the decision on the forest land use section on Harstine Island policy until we've had that discussion seems like an appropriate action.

(#1385) Tim Wing: I'm concerned also that any decision, whether it's denied or approved, I want to know what the impacts are for the rest of the county.

(#1395) Bill Dewey: That's what we're going to be getting at with this regulation. It will be countywide; not just for Harstine Island.

(#1400) Diane Edgin: I can tell people that things are coming up about Harstine and they need to be aware of it, but as a member of the PAC, I can't get into specifics with them because then I'm outside the context of passing on information.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

(#1415) Bob Fink: This process that you're in, when you're not dealing with rezone requests, is usually not a quasi-judicial process; it's a legislative process. There's no restriction on your freedom to talk to members of the public outside of the context of these hearings. What you have to realize, though, anything that you learn there or discuss there is not part of the public record and it's not available to justify or defend your decision unless you bring it and put it in the record. It's one of your roles as planning commission members to talk to community members about legislation.

(#1450) Bill Dewey: So outside of this forestry land use section, is there anything else in the Harstine Island policies that we need to be addressing? Can we have a motion as to how to dispense with this.

(#1465) Tim Wing: I make a motion that we pass it and accept all but those policies that deal with the forest practices and defer them to another time.

(#1468) Steve Clayton: You're making a motion that we accept staff's response; that there is nothing we're doing on the rest of it, right?

(#1472) Bob Fink: That there's nothing that needs to be changed because the policies are recommended in some appropriate fashion.

(#1484) Steve Clayton: That's what staff has done is to clarify where things have been implemented.

(#1488) Bill Dewey: And that we would defer the decision on the forest land use section until we've had that discussion on the countywide forestry conversion regulations.

(#1490) Tim Wing: Yes, that's my motion.

(#1492) Diane Edgin: I second the motion.

(#1494) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. The last item for the public hearing is the Countywide Planning Policy for Urban Area Sizing.

(#1525) Steve Goins: You had a staff report as part of a previous workshop which is the same analysis I would provide you tonight. In summary, what staff is requesting that you do is adopt a countywide planning policy that limits the amounts of size that we would plan for in accommodating growth in the urban areas to 25%. This is to conform with previous decisions by the WWGMHB where they've determined this is an appropriate number to plan for. In addition, in past planning efforts, this is the number that the county has used to plan under, whereas the policy actually accommodates for 50%. We're recommending that it be changed to 25%. That summarizes the policy change that we're proposing tonight.

(#1572) Terri Jeffreys: So this would not necessarily change the size of the UGA's.

(#1580) Steve Goins: That's correct.

(#1585) Bill Dewey: Any more questions for Steve? Hearing none, we'll go ahead and open up the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#1600) Jeff Carey: Jeff Carey, President of the ACA. The only issue is that while I understand why the county wants to go to this and structurally I don't have a problem with it, but I do have an issue with where you start in the process with your UGA's. In other words, if you started with a UGA with 1,000 acres, and another one with 3,000 acres, and you find that the growth is happening in another area in that 1,000 at a different click, and this other one of 3,000 is growing slow, it's kind of out of whack. You haven't started the same qualifiers at the base. When we created these UGA's, somehow we didn't get the same basis across the board. I think you have to understand, if you look at all the UGA's and their sizes, does this make sense? That's what I'd ask you to consider.

(#1660) Matt Matayoshi: Matt Matayoshi with the EDC of Mason County. I just wanted to raise a couple of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

issues in considering the size of our UGA's. Most of our county is made up of long-term forest resource land. When you look at the percentage of land that's available for development, because most development, according to the GMA, is to occur in UGA's, and our UGA's make up 2% of the entire land mass of our county ... so we're looking at a very small area where most of our development is to occur. My concern is that as the growth is huddled into these UGA's and that these mandates lack flexibility in being able to change and plan with the changes in growth ... Allyn is a good example of that. Belfair is another good example. Anecdotally, if you look at Lakeland Village, they have no lots available. When four lots came up for sale recently, they were all presold without structures on the site. We don't have land available for development, which is driving the price up of our real estate. So there's some real concerns in assuring that we have UGA sizes that are adequate to include our growth and future growth.

(#1745) Bonnie Knight: I'm Bonnie Knight of Allyn. I just have one short comment about the percentages. I know that there was some question in Thurston County, but I think that was based on a countywide total. I think what Jeff was saying, if you go 25, 25, and 25, but your base is not the same, that could run into real problems when you start looking at a countywide across the board. If you do 25% of 1,000 acres, you can actually fill up that 25% pretty quickly, where 25% of Shelton, it could take you years to do it.

(#1775) David Overton: I'd like a copy of the staff report to review for this issue before I make any comments.

(#1800) Bill Dewey: We'll go on with our discussion while David is reviewing the draft. Is there anyone else that has comments on this particular item? Let's go ahead with our discussion.

(#1845) Terri Jeffreys: I am curious as to whether or not this could be interpreted to be an averaging of 25% countywide or is it UGA by UGA? It seems to me that averaging it across the county ...

(#1870) Bob Fink: You have to realize what you're talking about, which is a market factor adjustment, so that as you approach build out, assuming that you haven't expanded the UGA 10 years earlier, you need to make sure that you have 125% land available for development so that people don't bid up too much the price of the land that's there. It's a market factor so that's a surplus of land available more than what's needed. The GMHB has ruled consistently, and specifically in the case of Mason County, that the appropriate market factor is 25%. That 25% is actually the market factor that was used in sizing the current UGA's. We just never got around to changing the countywide planning policy itself to be consistent with the GMA.

(#1940) Diane Edgin: So you're just asking us to make it consistent.

(#1942) Bob Fink: That's correct. To answer your question, Terri, it's by UGA. You can't say if we have available land in Shelton, therefore you need any extra land available to keep prices down in Belfair. It's an area specific market.

(#1985) Jeanette Moore: Can I take exception, Bob, of your characterization that Allyn and Belfair are the same, as far as the 25%. The Allyn UGA is virtually built out for easily developable land. We have no space for a grade school, for example. Two hundred kids get bussed to Belfair right now. There's no space that's flat, dry and useable to build a grade school in Allyn. There are 900 acres of forested land in the Belfair UGA, so to say that this was somehow all on a par is ... there's a big difference between having zip and 900 acres for our future build out. The other problem is Allyn never had a manufacturing area. We're now 2,000 people and we have no plan for manufacturing. When you talk about this sizing, this makes us very nervous. I think there was a misunderstanding, because if I understood Steve correctly, he's saying you take what you're going to need for the next 20 years and then you add 25% more land to accommodate that. The trouble is, Allyn never had what it needed in the first place just to be a whole community. That's what's making Allyn nervous. It isn't the 25% more for residential development; we need 100 more for commercial, retail, institutional, and manufacturing. That's where we're at with the sizing issue. Before you make a decision on the sizing issue, I would really like you to hear us out.

(#2090) Bob Fink: The 25% market factor is added onto what the community needs for its growth. The market factor doesn't say how much you need for industrial and how much land you need for residential or commercial. All it does is say these are my needs and I need 1,000 acres and then the GMA says to make sure the market isn't crowded too much you can have 1,250 acres in the UGA. You can also look at what the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

zoning is of each area and make sure you have appropriate distribution of that land amongst the different types of uses.

(#2144) Tim Wing: Clearly there's a lot of interest in this topic and how big should these UGA's be and the process we might go through. That's not what this is about. This is simply about the fact that we used to have a number of 50%, although we used 25% to size our UGA's, and now we're required to have the number be 25%, and that's all this is about. It's another topic and another issue, and an important one, that we all work together to figure out how big these UGA's should be, but that's not what this question is and we've got to get on to these other issues. So if I'm right, let's make a decision about moving this to 25% because we don't have a choice. It's the state law, right?

(#2175) Bob Fink: Right.

(#2177) Tim Wing: Then let's do that.

(#2180) Diane Edgin: I make a motion that we move this to 25%.

(#2182) Bill Dewey: We're not done with the public testimony yet. David?

(#2184) David Overton: As I understand the ruling in Thurston County, you should be moving towards 25% and it was sized that way back when we originally created the UGA's. I think the issue that may solve this is requiring some sort of buildable lands inventory, because when you're looking at sizing the UGA, you want to know what you can build on. That might be the effective tool to help appropriately size the UGA's. I agree with Steve's recommendation.

(#2210) Jeff Carey: I know where you're coming from, Tim, and I don't have an issue with that. The funny part is I participated with this whole project since 1997, both as a RAC and a UGA. Interestingly, never was there any discussion about this. It was always to size it to the built environment. Somehow we have a policy now, but when we were created, it was the built environment, plus a little, and it wasn't 25%. It was never discussed.

(#2270) Diane Edgin: I will restate my motion that we accept the 25% to make it compatible with the state regulation.

(#2275) Jay Hupp: I second the motion.

(#2280) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

Break in meeting.

(#2320) Bill Dewey: We're going to alter the agenda tonight to get the bulk of the people out of the room at a reasonable hour. We'll do the update on the Capital Facilities first, then we'll bump up the county recommendations for population and we'll take up the discussion from the folks here from Allyn at that point. So we'll start with the Capital Facilities.

(#2365) Bob Fink: Just to lay a little bit of ground work, most of the changes proposed to the Capital Facilities Plan have to do with updates consistent with current county programs. We have Doug Micheau with us who will speak later and answer any questions you may have. You received drafts that he prepared prior to tonight's meeting that has the changes in it. Most of the drafts are updating and address capital programs and parks and rec, and also the desire to work on more detailed parks planning over the next couple of years. I wanted to talk about other facilities besides parks. There's been an update of the Mason County Space Needs Analysis, which was updated in 1999. It's predecessor is referenced in the county Comp Plan for the county facilities, which are different county departments. They're all addressed in this Needs Analysis. It examines how fast the county space needs are growing and what those needs will be in the future. It lays out a program for when new facilities or major renovations might be done for those areas. It has a summary of the overall program, dollar amount, and space needs. For each county department, it has information about

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

the area, with a floor plan and current needs and an assessment of their needs for the future. I'll let you look at that. We don't have a draft yet of what the Comp Plan changes would be, but one part is the summation of the space needs and then the other part of that is the capital program. It's a detailed 6-year program. The other parts of the Capital Facilities Element are utilities, solid waste, parks, water and waste treatment plants.

(#2570) Doug Micheau: I'm Doug Micheau, Director of Parks, Utilities, and Waste Management for the county. This is my second year to form together a Capital Facilities Plan. The first one on parks you will see a little different format than what we've had in the past. Our goal is really to get to something that is kind of a February or March initiation of a process that culminates around June and hopefully get to you folks for some review on the preliminary phase before we do budgeting and then annually we would update that and adopt it as part of the budget process so that we would have the first year of the CFP be implemented through that next year's budget. We're a little bit behind this year but with some new directors on staff and some new processes, we're doing the best we can to try to get projects in front of you to take a look at. I've actually got a pretty large chunk of CFP. The first piece you have in front of you is noted as VI.5, Parks and Recreation Facilities. I can only speak to the parks that are the Mason County piece. A lot of these elements that are the inventory of parks of all sources, I claim ownership to them, although I did try to add things where I saw we didn't have things on. Of note in the Parks CFP for this year, is a little different approach to the projects. We've really done a pretty thorough job of defining a project description for each of the park projects. It's no longer a park by park listing of potential specific elements that will be accomplished, but rather a narrative description and then we try to address a justification and then at the bottom of each of the project sheets is where the funding tables are. Bob will get you those sheets and we'll come back to that.

Let's talk about the Wastewater Utilities. This is the second year we've pulled together project sheets like this for water and wastewater. We have three water systems and three sewer systems that the county is responsible for operating and maintaining here in the county. Those are actually listed on the narrative part of your capital sheets. We have a sewer system at Rustlewood, a sewer system at Harstine Pointe, and the large sewer system which is called North Bay Case Inlet in Allyn. We also have an independent water system up in Beards Cove as well as a water system at Harstine Pointe and a water system at Rustlewood. With the exception of the sewer system at North Bay Case Inlet, the county received those from prior developments. All of them, except for Harstine Pointe, were done through a receivership. We're the avenue of last resort if the development goes bankrupt and they don't want to operate it anymore. You'll find that if you look at most counties, they're not in the utility business as a primary core function of the county government. Those are usually left to independent water and sewer districts or through individual homeowners associations. The Harstine Pointe system came to the county by transfer from the homeowners association and we agreed to take it over. This thing that is not part of the existing utilities is the 405 Fund, which is the wastewater development fund. Those are the areas where we're looking at facilitating the development of systems for communities in order to provide urban services for our UGA's, as well as those that are emerging as population centers. So the 405 Fund, we have projects at both Hoodsport shoreline area and RAC, and then the Belfair North Shore area. Most of the funding that's anticipated to be spent over the next six years in utilities is in that 405 Fund in wastewater system development. Any questions about utility projects? I did see an email that was forwarded on to me a question regarding the level of expenditures anticipated for the Belfair North Shore area.

(#3005) Steve Clayton: I had that question. It was particularly for the 405 Fund for the Belfair project. You've got designated thirty two million and I sat in on the committee to do the Belfair sewer and it was sixteen million, for which we got state funds.

(#3025) Doug Micheau: That would really help me in being able to provide that sort of clarification in an open forum like this. There's a little bit of a lack of understanding regarding the Pertee Engineering and Feasibility study that was done to address the State Route 3 corridor that came out in March of this year. That study was very restrictive in scope with regard to looking at sewer. It was really looking at just to serve the Belfair UGA, and had one arm going out to serve just the state park. That's the five million dollar element that was in that study. The sixteen million was the amount that would be needed to serve the Belfair UGA in conjunction with roadway improvements. Since that time, in going through our facility plan and trying to figure out what we would do with that arm that goes out to the state park, we took a look at the language in our approved facility plan and it said basically to serve the North Shore or Belfair state park area in order to address the declaration of severe public health hazard for that North Shore section and the water body #9 that's

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

immediately out in the water along that section. We're looking at about 1,800 parcels there. In 2001, DOH issued a declaration of sever public hazard for water body #9 and when we started going through the development of preliminary design work for the Belfair sewer system, we looked around and researched and nobody could tell us what that area was supposed to be. So we were authorized by DOE, who is administering our state revolving fund, which is the current source of funding we have for design on the Belfair sewer, to go through a delineation process and really try to figure out what is the area of contribution to this contaminated portion of the canal known as water body #9. The results of that study are going to be provided to the community on September 26th up at Sand Hill Elementary at 6:30 pm. The cost estimates, in order to get something into the CFP, the current cost estimates are that's going to probably take roughly fifteen million additional to serve that area out in the North Shore as it's currently being delineated for service. That's the difference between having a sixteen million dollar figure, which is now thirty two million. Those are the most recent cost estimates that I've been feeding the legislature for the last session and we're going to continue to seek funding for that. Hopefully we'd like to get 70%+ of the funding to make it viable.

(#3250) Diane Edgin: I've been told on the Harstine Pointe sewer system on this outfall that's being required by DNR that there actually is a system that exists currently that you put on line for a fraction of the cost that would put the output able to drink water right out of.

(#3275) Doug Micheau: The cost estimates for moving that outfall are around \$500,000. I take it you're talking about a membrane bioreactor, which would produce Class A reclaimed water, which is not suitable for drinking.

(#3292) Diane Edgin: I was told by somebody, and he should know because that's what he did for a living for the State of California.

(#3300) Doug Micheau: Well, I've been working with reclaimed water for thirteen years here in Washington and I can tell you that's not an approved use for Class A reclaimed water. Regardless of the outfall effluent, to provide a membrane bioreactor for your size of facility would be in the neighborhood of 2.5 to 3 million. We did estimate those costs. The one that was just put in up at the Suquamish was a million bucks just for the plant to plug it in, and it's 30,000 gallons a day, which is about half the capacity we have to provide for you folks.

(#3440) Steve Clayton: You've got facility improvements for the North Bay Case Inlet facility, as I understand it through Mr. Carey, that the facility is running at a pretty good deficit right now. Is there a significant increase coming on board? As I understand it, it's being subsidized by the loan that was given for the North Shore and Belfair plan.

(#3465) Doug Micheau: That's actually not true. We're just spending the cash balance that's in the facility at this point in time. It's very restrictive, if you get approval for funding for a loan or a grant, they're very specific as to what you can use it for. In fact, it is in some financial difficulty. I'll be briefing our BOCC; the consultant who is doing the financial analysis and the rate analysis for that utility completed a preliminary set of numbers in June. The BOCC asked him to go back and do some additional work and run a couple of different scenarios and that work is supposed to be ready and available to present to the BOCC on the 19th. Then we're going to be going out to the public in a series of public meeting in that area in Lakeland Village and Allyn to share the results with them.

(#3540) Steve Clayton: So some of the scenarios would be higher rates, higher hookup fees ...

(#3542) Doug Micheau: Yes, and we're going to continue to pursue legislative opportunities for lower interest loans. One of the things that kills us on that is we have a four and three quarter percent loan that's a forty year loan. It's really a tough cookie to pay back out of existing rate structures.

(#3560) Steve Clayton: Is one of the funding schemes hooking with Belfair and having those rate payers pick up some of the tab?

(#3568) Doug Micheau: With the sewer facility plan update that we'll be doing for the Belfair area, which will be kicked off probably in the next three weeks, we'll be reevaluating the economic viability of shipping flows

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

with the new area south to Allyn. My intuition and experience in this area tells me that it's not going to be viable to do that from the standpoint of the transmission costs for that level of flow.

Solid waste. I'm doing some speculative planning in this in looking at transfer station capacities. We're getting maxed out at all of our outlying areas, with the exception of perhaps of Hoodspoint and Union. This year, as part of our update to our solid waste plan, we have a consultant that is going to be analyzing the existing capacity of our facilities as well as the geographic distribution of those facilities and making recommendations for the next fifteen year period about where we should be looking to expand or build new facilities for solid waste transfer. Potentially looking at interface with the rail line so that we can eliminate some of our long haul contract costs to Centralia, which is then shipped to Klickitat County. That's the whole purpose of this. You have to recognize that it is a plan we want to make sure that we're thinking about these things and allocating the funds in their direction and as they come closer for the time for them to be implemented in the budget then we tighten up on the estimates and make them a real number.

(#3745) Jay Hupp: Are we absolutely out of the landfill business locally?

(#3748) Doug Micheau: Yes, with the exception of post closure and the monitoring and maintenance we have to do for that facility out there.

(#3755) Jay Hupp: Is there the possibility that there would ever be another one opened?

(#3758) Doug Micheau: I don't think so.

(#3772) Jay Hupp: So we're pretty much a hostage to what it takes to haul it out of here.

(#3776) Doug Micheau: In a way that's true. There are a few large facilities down in the Columbia River Gorge and in Eastern Washington over by Goldendale that are taking material to date. They're owned and operated by different entities and so there is competition there. They know in order to capitalize on their investment that they can't just continue to raise their prices. In terms of getting the material there, we have options we haven't availed ourselves of yet. Currently we're in a long term contract out through 2013 with RDC Corp, which is our long haul contract. We think there are some opportunities to look at our own rail system and eliminating that piece of that, which would be a substantial savings in the cost.

(#0125) Bill Dewey: On the solid waste one, the only comment I would add is I'm a recycler and it doesn't seem like there's adequate planning in here for recycling.

(#0138) Doug Micheau: We do operate the drop box stations. They're not the most effective means, but they do get us a little further down the road for our waste reduction goals. That's one of the issues that we'll be picking up in the solid waste management plan update is how far do we go in this next planning period with regard to the county's statement and policy for curbside recycling and providing additional opportunities for people. Some of the facilities in here are directly aimed at the household hazardous waste capacities that we have today. We have a contract arrangement with Kitsap County right now. Anybody in the north end has to run their stuff up to their facility. We think we can probably do a better job of providing our own, maybe in conjunction with somebody like North Mason Fiber and make it accessible when they're doing multiple item dumps. We're moving in that direction. We'll have a new plan for that next year.

(#0180) Bill Dewey: So Bob has handed out these number for the parks. Is there anything you want to highlight on the parks?

(#0185) Doug Micheau: I just wanted to point out a couple of shifts in direction that I've taken initiative on for this year. On the summary sheet at the bottom, there are a few new programs. One is the community playfield partnerships program. That's an effort to work in conjunction with the school districts or other jurisdictions who would potentially need some level of improvements to one of their fields in exchange for making it accessible to the public, or broadening its use by the public for multiple purpose sports. I think that's a really keen strategy for us to maximize the resources in the REET fund while still making more facilities available for those same dollars. That's a new effort by the county. The other one is the Trails Development Program. The fifty thousand in 2006 is to come back on the heels of our Master Trails Plan and take a look at where we go with implementation of that in really looking at corridors and specific trail projects.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

Then a pretty healthy dose in the several years after that to actually build trail projects. We also have a program called Water Access Improvements Program. That's basically looking at any opportunities we have for enhancing our ability to provide water access for our residents and visitors.

(#0245) Bill Dewey: Any questions for Doug?

(#0248) Steve Clayton: I'd like to go back to wastewater. You said 1,800 parcels in the Beards Lynch Cove area.

(#0252) Doug Mischeau: In the North Shore area.

(#0254) Steve Clayton: What kind of count is there for infill development?

(#0255) Doug Mischeau: There are currently 1,300 of those developed.

(#0258) Steve Clayton: We've currently got county water on half of those ...

(#0262) Doug Mischeau: It's actually 450. It's permitted for 534.

(#0264) Steve Clayton: Has it been discussed with Community Development about expanding the UGA given we're giving urban services and we have urban density there?

(#0270) Doug Mischeau: If you mean Community Development at the state, they definitely have their eyes on that. In the sewer arena there are three ways you can provide sewer service to an area. One is if it's in a UGA. Two it's a subject of a public health hazard, which is where this one falls into the category. Then three is if in the name of environmental protection. No one has ever exercised this third prong yet, so that's one of the things we're trying to do on the Hoodspout shoreline area is develop a template that would make it acceptable for doing it in the vane of environmental protection instead of waiting until water bodies are degraded to the extent that you have to come clean them up as opposed to being proactive and insuring those kinds of situations don't emerge. Then in discussion I had with CTED this last week, they're very concerned that only existing homes would be allowed to be connected to the system if we built it out in the North Shore area.

(#0308) Steve Clayton: Unless it was in a UGA.

(#0310) Doug Mischeau: That's correct. The problem with that is if you connect only those homes that are currently in existence, and everybody else continues to build on septic, which they would be allowed to do by our current codes, you end up with the exact situation that you went to resolve ten years down the road when the rest of the infill occurs. We're trying to convince them that that's probably not the most prudent approach and we're trying to use part of North Bay Case Inlet system as the example in that anybody that's been along our lines up there has been, if they weren't within 200 feet and required to connect in the initial stages, as they are coming in and using their legal lot they're hooking up to the system. It may also be a subject of discussion at this next legislative session in regards to sewers in the Hood Canal.

(#0345) Jay Hupp: Can we talk about Webb Hill. There was a question that came up several months back when the low oxygen level in Hood Canal was first being looked at, and the question as to whether or not there might have been nutrients leaking out of Webb Hill down the backside into Hood Canal. Was that ever looked at?

(#0355) Doug Mischeau: The DOE's permitting process for that facility involved a pretty extensive hydrogeologic study. It's my understanding that the Environmental Protection Agency is now picking that study up again and are going to look at it with a peer review prospective. In addition to that, our Environmental Health Division was successful in obtaining a grant to study some of the water quality issues in Annas Bay, and part of that study involves sampling seeps along the lower hillside below Webb Hill. The issue is being looked at. We're talking thirty million gallons a year of affluent and other sewage waste being deposited at that facility so it definitely bears review and further discussion.

(#0395) Jay Hupp: How much of that thirty million gallons is hauled in from out of county?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

(#0398) Doug Micheau: I couldn't tell you.

(#0404) Bill Dewey: Okay, thanks Doug. We'll now take up our discussion on recommendations for county population allocation.

(#0450) Steve Goins: I can also provide you with information on Allyn. The planning committee members are here to discuss these concept plans and we wanted to have that dialog in a concurrent fashion with this allocation discussion, and we thought this might be a good opportunity to start to discuss with you some of the things that the committee has been discussing with me over the past several months, and hear from them a little bit about the thought behind some of these concepts. Perhaps at this point, they could go first so they could discuss the larger plan on the left, which we call 'The Big Allyn' plan, and I could jump in and discuss this other concept, which is a smaller expansion of the UGA.

(#0500) Jeanette Moore: Let me give out to you the Vision Statement for Allyn that was done a few years ago and it was adopted by Mason County. Let me give you a quick history of Allyn. Not all of you were around when Allyn became the community it did. The Allyn plat was filed in 1889 and that's the lower Allyn plat. It has very small lots and it has virtually no public streets at all. Approximately 1,000 feet of the streets are publically owned. Lakeland Village, which I believe was started as a turn key project for moderate income housing in 1963, is a good part of the rest of Allyn, then there are some small areas to the north and south. The county signed a consent order with the state to clean up North Bay and the sewer program was developed. At that time Commissioner Marv Faughender recommended that Allyn begin planning for growth before the sewer was built, which we did. The planning committee of Allyn Association was formed as part of the Allyn Community Association in 1997, so we've been working on this for a while. Just to clarify, the ACA was established twenty years ago. There are close to two hundred members today and there are a number of committees; the planning committee is a committee of the Allyn Association. In 1995 we started the North Bay Review paper; the publication now goes to 3,800 addresses informing the community of all facets of community life, including planning. So over these years, since 1997, the community has been informed of the work of the Allyn Association and specifically of the planning committee of the Allyn Association. We have tried to keep everybody apprised at all times of what we're doing and the meetings we're doing. The notifications were made in the papers; they were always public. Bob Fink sat through a bunch of them and we appreciate him coming all the way to Allyn over those years. I gave you a copy of the Vision Statement, which was adopted around 2000. We had a policy plan, which we sent the county in 2002 and Steve Goins, who we're very happy to have working with us at this time, is revising it and I would expect it to be adopted in the near term. That plan was developed by a consultant planner, which was hired by the ACA; I think it cost us approximately ten thousand dollars. The county simply had no resources to devote to the Allyn plan. The ACA raised the money itself to guide us through this. The ACA also raised approximately another three thousand dollars for maps that we would need. Jeff worked with GIS and the county and others and we were always able to keep maps to use for the work we were trying to do. This process has been consistent and ongoing. There is an interim zoning ordinance, which the committee proposed to the county, and that was adopted in July in 2004. It was extended again, as an interim ordinance, in June of 2005. There was also an ordinance passed recently requiring setback requirements for future street right-of-ways where the streets are still private. That's so you can't build your house right up to your lot line. That was a very positive thing.

The other thing we provided to the county is a street plan for lower Allyn. Some of those streets are simply gone. The port had a consultant who also took the zoning from the interim zoning ordinance and generated what kind of traffic that might go on those streets and what size the streets might be. That's still in play right now.

There is an understanding community wide now of where we are and where we need to go. At the same time this was happening in Allyn, the GMA was getting adopted by the county, and Allyn chose to become a UGA as opposed to a RAC. At that time the county was resolving its compliance issues. The boundaries established are inconsistent with both the counties policies on goals for UGA's, and inconsistent with Allyn's vision statement, and it's inconsistent with common sense. What we've got are 2,000 people living here. We need retail area; we tried commercial manufacturing down in here but people who live up here on Rainier Court have come unglued. They don't want commercial manufacturing right under their \$300,000 houses so we've got another problem with that. We just have no land for a complete city, and a UGA eventually has to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

become a city. The county, with its tax structure, cannot maintain urban services in a city. It's a different tax base. So you've got both Belfair and Allyn to eventually become cities, but the only way I can describe it to you is it's like building a house. You build this house, but you don't put in a kitchen, you don't put in laundry facilities, you don't put in a garage or a workshop. So what you've got is a living room and bedrooms, and that is not a house that anybody can live in. This doesn't work. There is so little flat, dry usable land that's left. Belfair has 900 acres of forest land and that might be fine, but Allyn ... then you start talking about what you need here, we need some space.

We have a plan, the county had a plan, and I was just reading over the policies for the UGA's and it got out of wack when these boundaries were developed. In light of the Katrina hurricane, I was reading about an interview with the head of the Chief Executive Energy, which is the primary power and light company in New Orleans. He said one of the most important things is that your plans can be useless, which they became, but the planning process is invaluable. It teaches people how to get back on the page when you're off of it. And we're off the page and we need to get back on. So today what we need, and what we're requesting, is to recognize the larger UGA map on the left as the potential build out for Allyn, and we are going to request the county to expand the boundaries to those that you see on the map so that we can plan and grow.

Capital facilities is a huge problem. Let me tell you about the investment that the county has made in Allyn in its development of an infrastructure. There is no investment in the streets in lower Allyn. They're still private. They've been private for 116 years. There is no water system that the county has provided in Allyn, except for the small one provided by the port. It's either Lakeland Village Water or Washington Water. There's no stormwater system. The systems are either on private property, or a few ditches in Lakeland Village. The Lakeland Village roads were developed by the Andersons, as is common, and the county does maintain those roads. Allyn's two public parks were developed by the port with private contributions and port generated funds. The county did put the sewer in and we're very happy with it. But the users are going to pay the capital and operating costs for that sewer plant. But I looked over the park plan that Doug just proposed and there is not one park for Allyn. Somehow Allyn gets left off the map when it comes to how are we going to make this community work. We've got to think about the fact that this is one of the fastest growing communities in the State of Washington. I can't tell you how much I agree with Tim Wing that we need low and moderate income housing. Right now you can't touch one of those houses in Lakeland Village for under several hundred thousand dollars. We need land up here so we can get a variety of housing. We cannot just have high end housing; that doesn't give us a diverse community; it doesn't give us a very interesting community. One of the issues is roads and Jeff will talk about that. It's time that we think about these UGA's in a creative way. One of the things that I worry about when Steve brought forward this Economic Development Element Plan is he talked about having it in there that the county will help areas get LID's and whatever. There isn't the money in a lot of these communities to do that right off the bat. What the county did with the sewer project was very admirable. It was a low income area at that time, they got as low interest loans as were available, they got grants and they got the sewer system up and running.

Water is such a huge issue. You have to proactively deal with it. The county is really blowing this off because they've sat here for so long and done nothing. Most of these streets will probably stay private. If we're going to have a town with 7,000 or 8,000 population you need a market center that serves Grapeview, Victor, and Razor Road is one of the keys to that. I really appreciate you giving us a chance to discuss this with you.

(#1150) Bill Dewey: That's been good background.

(#1152) Jay Hupp: Wasn't the UGA size of Allyn originally quite a bit larger, and it was chopped down by the GMHB?

(#1160) Allan Borden: That was just a study area that went to the north.

(#1172) Jeff Carey: There was a RAC boundary that was quite a bit larger than any of the UGA boundaries. Then when it was proposed to be a UGA, it came back and lopped this undeveloped area behind Lakeland Village. Then we lobbied to get the boundaries expanded back out to include all of Lakeland. That was the course of the map issue. When the community in the public meetings decided to look at a UGA, because we were concerned about what we could or couldn't do in that community, then it got pulled in tighter. People have asked the question of how we got to these boundaries. What we did was we worked on the issue of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

population density. We had no guidance other than we knew we had a problem. We started out the process with working with GIS and then they got busy and couldn't turn out any custom work for us, so then we went back to the assessor records and came back with the inventory of lands out there west of the UGA and a little bit north and a little bit south. We figured out what we had going on out there, and then started the process of looking at urban development. We have this issue of flat developable lands. We started looking at the area of Razor Road, then we looked at how many people and parcels were there, and there's roughly 74 structures there. Knowing that we're going to need a certain amount of acreage for a park, knowing that Green Diamond has this timber here, know that we have a private development here, how do we tie this together. There's urban density there denser than Lakeland Village. They have water, they have acreage, then you start working your way backwards. We looked at right-of-way for roads, how do we least impact people, where is the power, how close are we to substations, what's the terrain? So it wasn't done willy nilly. We also tried to get an urban reserve; that was really our goal #1 so some kind of organized development can occur over time. So that's why we're looking here by Razor Road.

(#1408) Steve Clayton: That's an unimproved not county maintained road in that area?

(#1412) Charlie Butros: It is a county maintained road and there are plans to surface a portion of it that's currently unpaved next year.

(#1422) Jeanette Moore: And the owner of the missing link in between would like to be part of the Allyn UGA.

(#1440) Tim Wing: I have a question on procedures here. We're not tonight trying to figure out how to size any of the UGA's, is that correct?

(#1450) Bob Fink: This is a workshop and we're not looking for any decision from the commission at this point.

(#1455) Tim Wing: I appreciate people coming and talking about this but it's now 10:00 pm and there's about an hours worth of business left here. If there are other really important points I'd like to hear them but I don't want to spend a lot more time on this tonight. The county needs to spend a lot more time and energy on it in the future.

(#1475) Jeanette Moore: We have tried for eight or nine years to bring it to peoples attention and that's what we're doing.

(#1485) Bill Dewey: This was a good opportunity and I'm glad you were able to take advantage of it. It's been good information.

(#1488) Bonnie Knight: I'd like to address the water. The port has gotten some water rights so we now have some capacity and the port passed a resolution several years ago that that would only be used only for commercial development. You could get a lot of small businesses in there. We do already have a signed agreement to link the three systems together; Washington Water Service and Lakeland Village, for emergency purposes now. Washington Water is anticipating additional water rights next year. The port has already requested additional water rights for the future expanded UGA. Belfair has water, but no sewers, and they've still been growing like crazy. Allyn has had sewers, and no water, and without that water it really was restricted, but it has not restricted the residential growth.

(#1595) Bill Dewey: Do we have anything else on the population allocation, Bob?

(#1600) Bob Fink: We don't have anything new to add to the population allocations. We developed a number of alternatives to consider and to whittle down into a set of few alternatives and eventually a recommendation on what the population for 2025 should be and how it should be allocated among the urban and rural areas. What we're really waiting for is the analysis that goes into considering sizes and implications of what those allocations are. We really aren't ready to move forward any further on that discussion until we have that information. It's still some time out. Let's go on to the Transportation Element.

As part of this update, one of the changes that was required for the Transportation Element was to incorporate the information about that state highway system, and the state adopted levels of service on the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

state highway system. The draft that you have is what was prepared by the Public Works Department, and before we have a final draft ready for the public, there's a few more changes that we want to make. Principally, trying to integrate some of the language from the Trails Program that was adopted this year, and also establish some policies regarding a program of planning and design for a future county roadway network trying to address the issues of designing the roadways and other transportation options for all this growth, for instance, in the Allyn Community that they were just talking about. They're talking about how to build that network of public roads and public transportation options. It would be appropriate for the county to look at how they're going to do that. What requirements are going to be made of developers and what projects are going to go into the county capital projects to work towards building a network to provide for the growth in the county. Other changes necessary are updating tables and general information with more current information, clarifying the existing language, clarifying road classification and other terminology within the Transportation Element. We have Charlie Butros, Director of Public Works, here and Dave Whitcher, who has been hired to assist the county in its transportation planning, and who is responsible for promoting most of these amendments you have in front of you. So they're here to answer any questions you might have.

(#1800) Bill Dewey: Any questions for these gentleman?

(#1810) Tim Wing: I've said numerous times in the last four or five years that I thought it was nuts that this county has spent so much money straightening out and paving roads out in the boonies where there's hardly any traffic. These people from Allyn come up here tonight and make an absolutely perfect example of what I've been talking about. The roads inside the Allyn UGA and inside Belfair have absolutely had almost no county money spent on roads, and the result is that we're facing the potentially huge growth in this county, and it's supposed to go inside the UGA's and there's no roads there. My big question is, what policies are going to change in this county to guarantee that major amounts of the road money will be spent in getting roads to places that can be developed inside these UGA's, and curtail the expense of building roads out in the boonies where no one drives? Where are we going to go from here to ensure that there's going to be proper transportation corridors inside these two UGA's in particular in the north end?

(#1875) Dave Whitcher: The situation for the past funding is that is what the federal funding programs dedicated the money to those type projects. They are for the functionally classed roads; major collectors. The federal functional class scheme, which was added to the draft, so that the roads in this area in Allyn and in Belfair don't qualify for those funds. It would take county only funds or other sources of funds that aren't federal funds; maybe CTED or something else, or it's county funds only. One of the goals in there was to leverage county funds and federal funds as possible.

(#1920) Tim Wing: The road that was improved up Sand Hill, which was about a three or four mile project a few years ago, what percentage of the money that was spent on that road was federal funds versus county money?

(#1928) Dave Whitcher: Typically it's in the 70% to 80% range, depending on the particular program.

(#1932) Tim Wing: The 70% to 80% is federal money?

(#1934) Dave Whitcher: Yes. So we get more road for the county dollar, where we'd be getting less road for the same county dollar here. Yes, it is important, but the way the funding programs work, it needs to be on the federal functionally classified system.

(#1945) Tim Wing: So we take 25% of the money needed to build those roads and we build roads where about 1% of the cars are compared to downtown Belfair or downtown Allyn. It doesn't make any sense to me. We don't need those roads out there anywhere near as much as we need them inside the UGA's. If it means we're only going to make 25% as many roads, we need to do that to get the roads inside those UGA's so that you can get to properties or build commercial buildings. If it means we only make 25% as many miles of roads, so be it. We've made almost no miles of roads inside Allyn, except the roads the Andersons built and gave to the county. In Belfair, it's Belfair Street and Romance Hill, which goes nowhere. For ten or twelve years now we've known that 65% of all of our growth is supposed to go into those UGA's and so I hope it's not just a statement in here that says we're going to look into this or think about it. I'd like to see a policy change that required it. I frankly think that the citizens of this county could sue over this and say that the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

county has been woefully inadequate in terms of abiding by the GMA because they haven't done as they're supposed to do. The plans says everything is supposed to go in those areas yet the county has spent all their money somewhere else. I'm going to look for that in here.

(#2020) Dave Whitcher: I don't think you'll find it.

(#2025) Tim Wing: I won't find what? That kind of a commitment?

(#2028) Dave Whitcher: It should be there if that is what the county wants.

(#2032) Bill Dewey: Tim's point is well made and it's a very valid point and it's something that I think there was a good dialog that happened when the PAC met jointly with the TIPCAP group. I think there were revelations from both sides of the equation. We came to understand this federal funding structure and why our monies get spent out away from the UGA's. The TIPCAP committee became more aware of growth management and why we need to spend that money in the UGA's. It was a good exchange of information and I hope a revelation for the county that we need to look to new funding sources beyond the traditional federal funding.

(#2080) Diane Edgin: We were talking about Allyn and we mentioned Stretch Island Fruit. Stretch Island Fruit actually got the state representation to Washington lobbied to get the classification that they could sell that fruit to the schools. If we can't get the kind of funding to really do a lot of these projects then somebody needs to be talking to Washington.

(#2120) Bill Dewey: Mason County can't be unique in this. Other questions?

(#2134) Steve Clayton: The origination destination survey. Is that current?

(#2148) Bob Fink: It's the traffic study. I really couldn't tell you any more.

(#2195) Tim Wing: So you're going to come back with a draft that you're going to want us to approve?

(#2198) Bill Dewey: We'll have a public hearing on this later.

(#2205) Bob Fink: Yes, we'll have a public hearing on this. We haven't set a date yet.

(#2215) Bill Dewey: To address your concern, Tim, I recommend you look at it intensively and try to figure out how to come up with your recommendations.

(#2220) Tim Wing: I will do that but I'm also asking you to do that. I don't think I'm alone on this viewpoint. In fact, I think if you polled the commissioners ...

(#2226) Charlie Butros: I don't disagree, Tim. The problem that we have is that we cannot set all the other project aside and spend 25% of the money on the urban areas and not spend anything on the rural areas. I agree with the concern, and I agree with the recommendation we seek additional funding to allow us to spend more money in the urban areas. I hardly agree that we need more attention and more funding spent in the urban areas. The problem is the matching constraints that we have for the major of the funding that we get doesn't allow us to do that. So how we get past that hurdle is something that's a challenge and we will be working on it.

(#2275) Tim Wing: I understand that it may be painful to spend all the money in the UGA's and no money anywhere else; I really wouldn't want to do that. But it is very painful to recognize that in the last ten years we've done the exact opposite and so how come that was okay? If it was okay, how come it wouldn't be okay to reverse that for ten years? I really don't want to do that. We really just need a consensus.

(#2330) Bill Dewey: What do you want to do next, Bob? The Skokomish Valley or the site specific rezones?

(#2340) Bob Fink: The site specific rezones are scheduled for September 29th. I think you already have the information. Do you have any questions at this point?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 12, 2005

(#2360) Bill Dewey: I think we'll wait until we've received the staff reports on them.

(#2400) Bob Fink: The only other item on the agenda is the Skokomish Valley review. I just passed out a brief memo. We don't have draft information to look at. We're doing an investigation of the channel migration zone in the Skokomish Valley. There's a consultant working on it and they're examining historical records, aerial photos, and other information to try to scientifically determine what the channel migration zone is in the valley. It is believed with that information that might provide a basis for a more reasonable consideration of the DR's within the flood plain of the valley. It will assess what their actual risks are in the valley from the movement of the Skokomish River and its tributaries. That will provide a scientific basis for determining the level of risk in different parts of the valley. Although we don't know what the conclusions are, presumably there are some places in the valley that are at higher risk and some places in the valley that are within the flood plain but actually are low risk. Within a fairly short time we should have the preliminary findings and start preparing more specific recommendations for consideration. Hopefully we'll be able to combine that review as part of this update process. It just depends on the timing. As you know, there's a lot of things on the agenda that we're trying to get done. This is something the county is interested in looking at but not necessarily mandated by the ACT. Any questions?

(#2545) Jay Hupp: Can we go back to the specific requests for rezone subject? Are we going to get a chance to discuss that next week?

(#2555) Bob Fink: When are you going to have the staff reports ready, Allan?

(#2560) Allan Borden: Either by the end of this week or I'll hand them out next Monday.

(#2564) Bob Fink: Then the hearing is the following week. So you won't have much time to review the staff reports prior to being able to discuss it next week.

(#2580) Allan Borden: Tonight I just wanted to communicate what the issues for each one of the requests was.

(#2595) Jay Hupp: Can we do that next week?

(#2600) Bob Fink: Sure. We'll put it on the agenda.

(#2650) Bill Dewey: So we need a motion to continue the workshop on the site specific rezone requests until next weeks meeting.

Motion made, seconded and passed to continue the workshop on the site specific rezone requests until September 19th.

(#2700) Bill Dewey: I need to be excused from next weeks meeting.

Motion made, seconded and passed to excuse Bill Dewey from the meeting on the 19th. Meeting adjourned.