

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes
November 1, 2005**

(Note audio tape (#2) dated November 1, 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 Vice-Chair Steve Clayton at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

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

Staff Present: Bob Fink, Barbara Adkins, TJ Martin and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0025) Steve Clayton: We have several public hearings on the agenda tonight. Let's get a show of hands who is here tonight for the various hearings. Okay, it looks like the majority of the people are here for the Transportation Element.

(#0055) Bob Fink: Good evening. My name is Bob Fink and I'm the Planning Manager for the Department of Community Development. The Transportation Element is on the work program for updating as part of our 2005 update for a few issues. One change is that state highways are supposed to be incorporated into the local county Comp Plans along with their levels of service. There's also an amendment to the statute that was made that requires airport compatibility to be addressed. The current plan doesn't contain a proposal of change in language to address airport compatibility in the Comp Plan because that was added a couple of years back, but there is a separate proposal for regulations to support airport compatibility. Also, the update is required because of the passage of time, and we're changing the timeline from one that was twenty years ending in 2014 to twenty years ending in 2025. We also had some recommendations for some new policies to be incorporated in the element. One is to develop a plan for a network of roads that can be used for future construction during development by private individuals or by the county to basically plan for and eventually facilitate the development of a network of roads to serve the county in the future, and also to provide explicitly for good coordination with the new Trails Plan that the county early adopted this year. Charlie Butros, Public

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

Works Director, and Dave Whitcher, Transportation Planner, along with Bill Tabor, Assistant Public Works Director, are here to respond to questions. The Consultant, Skillings and Connolly, are also here.

(#0120) Bill Tabor: We updated the element with new traffic counts, collision data, to come up with new levels of service for roads.

(#0135) Bob Fink: Did you have any questions? Thank you.

(#0145) Steve Clayton: We'll now open the public hearing up to public testimony.

(#0160) Rob Drexler: I'm Rob Drexler and I live in Allyn. I'm here from the Mason County Association of Realtors this evening. We have prepared a handout that I'll give you. What I want to say tonight is that it seems that all our money and the things that we plan for in the transportation component all goes to either more shoulders on the highways, and things like that, which granted we need, but I think we've missed something in most of the planning and that is keying money, time, and effort into fixing roads within UGA's. We have a Comp Plan that's supposed to alleviate sprawl and control our growth, but we can't develop in those areas because there's no infrastructure and no roads. Capital Hill, which is in the Shelton UGA; there's really some question about whether you can drive on those roads or not. Another one is near me down in the township of Allyn. The whole platted township down there doesn't have roads. We all know that way back when they vacated the easements and we need to get them back and put some roads in there. What we're saying that is in order to achieve our goals with the Comp Plan, we think about, allocate, and put some time and money and effort into putting infrastructure and roads into the UGA's to get to areas that we need to get to. It's not in the UGA, but Razor Road up in the north end is a prime example. If we fix that road, we'd have places to build.

(#0240) Drew Noble: My name is Drew Noble. On the transportation issue, right now I'm sure everybody here is going to vote to defeat the gas tax initiative. In case you haven't heard, one of the programs the state DOT is coming up with is maybe just letting the local jurisdictions that collect the taxes spend what they collect. I think the last I heard, Mason County could construct an eighth of a mile of new road with what we collect. That's how much we're funded from out of the area. We've got roads out there that really need repair and need upgrading and to put money into ... I realize you need growth, but we've got to put our money where the safety is concerned as well as our citizens. I remember when several roads were brought into the system through political pressures and one of them definitely does not meet grade standards. Why that was allowed, I'll never know. Another one was brought in and the county basically had to go in and rebuild it to bring it up to county standards. I don't see why the county roads department should be used to basically finance development. If there's money available, fine, but right now we're running right on the edge. I sit on the TIPCAP and I see the budgets and I see the way things operate, and they do a heck of a job with what they've got, but they don't have a lot to play with.

(#0295) Terri Jeffreys: The plan talks about the priority system you folks use but it doesn't outline it. Could you talk a little about your project priority policy?

(#0300) Drew Noble: Primarily, safety is first.

(#0315) Dave Whitcher: I'm Dave Whitcher, Transportation Engineer. Our priority policy is mostly based on safety. Having to do with alignments, speed reductions on curves, on widths, both pavements and shoulders, the amount of traffic volume on those roads. The other things are how many people it serves, is it a truck route, is it a school bus route? The other factor is what it serves. The more businesses, the more traffic generators, the higher the priority. Those are all calculated for each road block segment in the road system, and they're prioritized based on their score.

(#0350) Terri Jeffreys: So you assign them a score?

(#0355) Dave Whitcher: Yes, based on what is actually there.

(#0362) Tim Wing: I have a question about your priority list. If you look at Allyn and Belfair you have a state highway that carries a lot of traffic so how does your priority system work when there is a proposed Bypass

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

from Belfair, there's been other testimony tonight that you need to open up additional roads in Allyn, so if you look at your system that you're describing there's no safety problems with those, and there's no safety problem on the state highway because it's a state highway so there's no attention paid whatsoever then to that part of the county. Would that be correct?

(#0382) Dave Whitcher: No, that would not. The roads that are there are considered just as every other road. If there isn't a road there yet, there's nothing to rate.

(#0388) Tim Wing: There isn't, although it's on paper and places where there have been vacations and virtually no traffic because they don't go anywhere. So there's no safety problem ... to me it's like the ostrich putting their head in the sand, that there's a huge transportation problem in both those UGA's and yet the system to prioritize pretends it's not there, because it's a state highway or a road that's not built yet. There's no safety problem yet on the Bypass, there's no accidents. The other road is a state highway so let's go out in the boonies and find someplace to repair where there's some evidence that there needs some repair. Does that make sense?

(#0415) Dave Whitcher: Yes. The main thing is the current priority of the BOCC is to maximize our county funds by leveraging state and federal funds. Those are only eligible for the collector system, which are the major roads, which because of the traffic volumes being higher. In Belfair there are some collectors and in Allyn there are not so they are not eligible for federal funds. The BOCC could change their minds and say they want to improve these roads and then we would. Currently it's going after the federal and state funding to maximize our capabilities of improving our road system.

(#0444) Tim Wing: Does the priority system take into consideration where GMA requires future growth to go?

(#0446) Dave Whitcher: No, it doesn't.

(#0448) Tim Wing: What do you think of that?

(#0450) Dave Whitcher: We're evaluating our existing road system.

(#0455) Tim Wing: Can you address this Bob? Can you tell me whether there's anything in this transportation plan that addresses this at all?

(#0475) Bob Fink: As I mentioned before one of the things that we proposed to be laid out better in this plan is the potential to develop a future road network; not just dealing with existing roads, but also try to develop a future road network of how you might intensify the road network and connect future areas of more intensive development. It might better connect areas where there's already development but maybe not quite enough yet to justify a new shortcut from one place to another. There were a couple of policy changes and one of the changes was actually in the project priority policy. The last one of the prioritization process factors ... it's actually an added consideration which is 'opportunities for expansion of the transportation network or implementation of the network system plans in cooperation with private development for improvement projects'. The idea being that a lot of road construction is done by private developers when developers wish to subdivide land or develop a site. They're often responsible for making those improvements, or at least share in the improvements to develop those roads. Typically cities and counties build roads on occasion and they might build major collector roads or new roads between population areas. They're usually not building local roads for local development but they might assist in that. When the local developer builds a road for their subdivision, hopefully with this plan, if that's an area where you need a collector road instead of simply a local service road, or you need a thru road to other properties, then the network plan would give direction and guidance to when those things would be required of developers and when the county would want to participate in that improvement, so it was more than required by the developer. Generally when you make requirements of the developer to do improvements, there has to be a relationship between the impact they're creating and the needs. You can't expect someone doing a short plat to create a super highway in front of their property, but you can expect them to contribute towards the share of that cost. So that new priority policy is addressed. There's also some other new language in the policies which call for that network to be considered. For Allyn in particular, there's an ongoing effort to identify issues like where should public right-of-way be preserved or established. In the case of Allyn, particularly downtown Allyn, it was platted a

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

long time ago. So the county could play a role in preserving or establishing right-of-way which the developers might be responsible for making improvements to or at least sharing in the improvement. Those are issues that can be addressed and should be addressed and that the county has been working on.

(#0620) Tim Wing: I still have concerns with it, Bob, because everything you've said so far, and you've talked twice now about this, you've never mentioned the UGA's. I assume that you're thinking about the UGA's because you're talking about developers, and developers aren't as likely to be outside the UGA's, but they could be. So I'm talking about the UGA's. Is it here that there's going to be some priority focused on that? Or is the idea that we ought to start thinking about it?

(#0642) Bob Fink: I don't know that in any of the amendments that we've proposed that they specifically call for a priority to road improvements in the urban areas as opposed to the rural area. What it was intended to do was put the issues of enhancing the road network and building roads and the issues of the importance of making connections and making those into a planning process that would then presumably address the issues in the urban areas just as it might address issues in the rural area. Obviously in the urban area there is a need for a more intensive road network. Some thought has to be given as to what kind of pattern we are trying to develop. And, what should be done to roads that will make logical sense in the long term for the county and allow the urban areas to develop out? That takes a thoughtful approach and consideration of how to do that. Without having specifics, it's hard to say we should prioritize this over that. The needs of the urban system should be taken into account but I don't think any of the proposed policy language in here specifically directs a share to the urban areas.

(#0700) Tim Wing: I'm also concerned with traffic in both of those two north end UGA's. What we talked about a few minutes ago gives no hope that the current system will ever address the traffic jams in those two towns. The system is broken, in my opinion, and I'm not seeing you talk about anything in here that will address that other than we ought to start looking at it.

(#0728) Bob Fink: In Belfair, in particular, my understanding is the state has taken over the project of building a Bypass, assuming funding remains available. That should relieve the congestion issue on the route through Belfair. All the traffic information I've seen suggest that it will do that. In addition, they propose as a separate project, widening Route 3 through Belfair by adding a third lane. That also will greatly ease the congestion and make turning easier and deal with those issues. The issue is that there are two systems. There is a state road system and a county road system. Previously to a recent amendment to a statute, the counties and cities couldn't even spend money on the state road system even if they really wanted to. It's my understanding that there's a little bit more flexibility now, but generally maintaining a state road system is the state's responsibility. The county should be involved in encouraging the state to address those local issues and have been. A lot of that is political and keeping pressure on the state so they don't neglect these areas where there are issues.

(#0785) Charlie Butros: I'm Charlie Butros, Director of the Public Works Department. I would like to add something to that. Even though those are state systems, the county has spent a lot of the funding to try to improve in those areas. The Belfair Bypass study, for example, cost the county over a million dollars. That was county dollars spent to relieve a problem in a UGA on a state highway. There are many that could challenge the issue as to why we're spending money on a state highway problem. That was an example of how county road funds were applied to help alleviate a problem in the UGA. There is a lot of expenditure in the UGA's. We repair roads, we deal with traffic and sign problems, we resurface roadways. There are records we could share with you but I don't have them here with me now. Since the last exchange that we had at the last meeting where you had a workshop on the Transportation Element, I went and extracted some of those to try to assess whether there was some proportionality with expenditures in the UGA's compared to the other county roads. I think there is a lack of proportionality there, but based on the traffic counts, the population densities, and other things, that is appropriate. The roads wear a lot faster, there's a lot more traffic on them, they get more attention in the way of frequent attention. They get resurfaced, they get repaved, they get chip sealed, they get preleveled, and you'll see that on a continuing basis. That has been more frequent in the last five years than in the last ten years. So as the population and density increases in those areas the attention to the roadways in those areas is increasing. From a standpoint on your point on planning, we are probably not planning as far ahead as we could be or should be, and Bob addressed that, but we will be. As far as the way we apply funds and the way we deal with roads countywide, we are dealing

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

with the roads in the UGA's and dealing with the roads in the UGA's in a similar fashion as we do the roads in other areas, and they are getting more than proportional attention.

(#0900) Terri Jeffreys: Do they exist on this list?

(#0912) Charlie Butros: It's in this area where it shows paving overlays, and chip seals. Those are not specific to roadways and there's an expanded list on those, but you'll see that the majority of that work covers the years through the six year plan.

(#0928) Steve Clayton: Perhaps a philosophical question for you, Charlie. How do we justify subsidizing roads for private developers, what I think basically is what we want to do? For GMA, to encourage development in UGA's, essentially we put roads in and that helps subsidize for particular developers. How do we politically do that? If we shift the whole burden to the developer, then the developer's don't develop as much as they could. If we pick up some of the tab, then we'll be doing what GMA wants us to do and grow faster. How can we make regulations, or is that feasible. It's like the Razor Road into the back of Allyn. I assume that's to help open up Lakeland Village in the back area.

(#0965) Charlie Butros: I think the best way to deal with that is to look at the multiple factors that we have for consideration of projects and for prioritizing projects. We have issues of traffic congestion, accident rates, safety. The biggest one that concerns me at this point is accessibility. We don't seem to have enough flexibility in our transportation network in the county to allow for the flexibility in the event that we have a significant problem with one of our major roadways. Typically what we end up doing is closing it or constraining the traffic on it for a period time, which causes a great deal of disruption. I think that one of the factors that I would like to raise in priority as we go through the planning that Bob was talking about is accessibility and flexibility of the transportation system. Those are issues that we will need for long range planning for the transportation system. How does the network connect? Do we have long stretches of major arterials without any cross connections, and is that appropriate from a safe and flexible access prospective? If it's not, if we can look at the overall array of roadways in the county, and determine areas where we need to improve that flexibility, where we need to improve that accessibility, then maybe we should consider and bring to the TIPCAP a recommendation for that improvement to be added into the six year plan and start thinking about how we put that in a long range plan to improve flexibility and transportation access in certain areas of the county. Mr. Wing had indicated that we need to focus that attention in the UGA's. I think many of the roads that we have in the UGA's provide for that flexibility, but perhaps there's an opportunity to improve that or deal with expanding or widening an existing roadway that may be a minor part or minor connector as part of the transportation grid to improve transportation along a certain segment of the UGA's. Those are things that we really need to talk about and look at. That is something that we will be working with planning on over the next several years.

(#1075) Terri Jeffreys: I'm assuming that you're speaking to the Land Use Policy. There's a policy to meet future needs. The county will consider developing a future transportation network plan. How much BOCC guidance was there in inserting this policy? How much buy in is there currently on that one? In our Economic Development Element, one of the most refreshing things that I saw was there was actually a timeline under some of the strategies to achieve some of the goals of that plan. Is there anything that precludes us from being able to put a timeline on that?

(#1120) Bob Fink: Basically the Department of Community Development proposed it because after discussions with the Public Works Department, and after going to the joint meeting of the PAC / TIPCAP, and various other things that has been going on including our work with the Allyn group on their issues with transportation, this seemed like the best way to approach the issue of new roads. Actually planning for new roads and making a rational system that's going to work for everyone. That's how it got there. This is our response to this general dialog that's been going on here tonight as the way to address this in the long run. I couldn't tell you what the BOCC think of it. They went to those meetings and I'm sure they have many of the same concerns because they heard many of the same things we heard. This hasn't been reviewed and discussed specifically with the BOCC. This is something that you recommend to them and then they look at it. That's how the process generally works. I can judge by being at their public appearances and meetings that they have concerns about these issues.

(#1185) Diane Edgin: At one point the Belfair Bypass was being proposed as something that could be paid for

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

out of county revenues. Then the last I heard, it was part of the project if the gas tax passed, which it did, which is now being threatened with a recall, so where are we going from there if it does get recalled?

(#1200) Bob Fink: I have no idea.

(#1202) Tim Wing: I might be wrong, but I think in the room there's three people only, that on a daily basis, experience the traffic in Belfair and Allyn. I drove down here eighteen miles on a two lane road that the county has built in the last ten years from Trails End Road all the way down to Johns Prairie. I passed two cars. I know because I go into Belfair every morning, and there's two cars every two car lengths through Belfair. Once a week in Belfair there's a traffic jam where the cars are moving about one mile an hour as if it was Seattle. I drive into Shelton and there's very little traffic here, by almost any standard. Even at 5:00. My point is that I don't really believe yet that the BOCC, the staff here, or the TIPCAP takes it seriously the safety issues and the traffic problems in those two towns. I see the priority list just totally ignoring it as if it's not on the radar. I don't believe it yet has the attention it deserves. I think you have made a real strong step in the right direction. But I personally don't feel that it will get enough attention if it's only that much in that book. I'm worried that it only came from you guys. I'm pleased, but I feel like I'm going to have to keep talking about this for more years and my concern is that I'm a citizen and I'm representing that part of the county and I can tell you there are people up there that are getting fed up with the traffic up there. Whether it's a state road or not, these BOCC have an opportunity to do something about it if they start now. Even if they start right now, they might get something built in five years.

(#1312) Drew Noble: I've been on the TIPCAP since it's inception and I can remember discussing the Belfair Bypass, the 101 Connector, and everything until we were blue in the face. The direction for that has to come from the BOCC. If you want a Razor Road put through, I suggest somebody on this committee figure out where the terminus on Highway 3 is going to be and how the county can get their hands on it. We've been working on that project as a safety issue for the people back in there for six years. We can't come up with a terminus on Highway 3. The one terminus we could get to, we can't get to because of BPA restrictions. What I'm saying is that it's not that these haven't been addressed. They've been addressed and beaten into the ground. It's just that there's no way to get there from here. I personally would love to see Razor Road put thru. Every time when we had certain members of the TIPCAP and certain members of other committees that you would start talking about it ... it's the 'not in my backyard' syndrome. The problem is not what Public Works is doing; the problem is there's no directive from the BOCC because they don't want to step up to the plate and get certain people upset that live around Mason Lake. People on TIPCAP thought the Belfair Bypass was going to be a bypass. You start at one end of Belfair and it ends at the other end of Belfair with one in interchange in the middle to get on and off. Now it's up to a frontage road. To me, that's not a bypass. A bypass is something you're going 60 miles an hour on without having to worry about slamming on your brakes for somebody turning into a store. The 101 Connector would be ideal, but somewhere somebody has to have the BOCC step up to the plate and make the actual policy decision that they're going to do it. I've been around this program for quite a while and I see lots of people come up and say we've got to this and we've got to do that. Then everybody starts pointing fingers at everybody else for not being able to do it. It just gets me very frustrated. The first thing that needs to be done is you come up with your proposed plan and before you come to us on the TIPCAP with it, you go to the BOCC and get their buy off on it and then come to us. Our primary purpose is to suggest road improvements regarding safety issues. We don't prioritize the overlays or the chip seals. We rank the actual safety problems out in the field.

(#1465) Steve Clayton: We have a copy of the six year TIP in this plan. There's also a TIP that goes out 2012 through 2029.

(#1472) Drew Noble: We don't see that. We just go by the six year plan. We roll it forward every year. Every time I hear Public Works getting put down and us being put down because we haven't improved a road or we haven't put a road in ... give us the legal authority to do it. Go out and start condemning property and it can happen. It happened over there off Agate. It's action by the BOCC to go forward with it and until you tell them to tell Public Works to do it, they can't even expend the money to plan for it.

(#1525) Bob Fink: I'd just like to say that this is your opportunity to strengthen the language. If you have something that you can propose ... that's one of the reasons you're sitting here. If you don't think that the proposal we made is worded strongly enough or something needs to be added to it, let us know because this

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

is your opportunity.

(#1535) Steve Clayton: Dave, we've got a couple of questions for you.

(#1550) Jay Hupp: When I was a little boy, it seemed to me that highway safety engineering intended to prevent people from winding up in ditches that were dangerous. It seems to me that we have dug ditches deeper and deeper and deeper along the county roads; and I see the same thing along the state highways, to the point that we have literally created miles and miles and miles of death traps. I don't understand why.

(#1580) Dave Whitcher: The answer to that is drainage. So we can get the water away.

(#1585) Jay Hupp: When you dig the ditch below the level that will drain the water off, that doesn't make any sense.

(#1590) Dave Whitcher: That's a good question.

(#1595) Bill Tabor: Are you talking about any particular area of the county road where you see that situation?

(#1605) Jay Hupp: Rather than belabor specifics, I'm just saying in general when you drive along county roads today it's not safe ... in fact, I got a chuckle as I drove out Arcadia Road going home this afternoon. There was a county road truck on Arcadia Road that was parked half on the pavement because there wasn't enough shoulder for that truck to get off the pavement without falling in the ditch. It just seems to me from a safety aspect, that we really ought to start paying attention to the depth of these ditches because they really are death traps.

(#1645) Bill Tabor: It sounds to me like it's more of a shoulder issue; we don't have enough width on our shoulders.

(#1648) Jay Hupp: I think it's both. Even if you have a wide enough shoulder, if you have to escape a head on collision by going off of the road, and you happen to get in one of those ditches it's going to have you on your head. It doesn't make sense to me that we've gone so far in the direction of making sure we get the water away from the roads that we've created death traps.

(#1675) Wendy Ervin: At the corner of Spencer Glen Drive and Spencer Lake Road there were two instances. One where a car was coming out and he just made his right turn a little too sharp and wound up laying on his side in the ditch. The other one was a school bus stop there. Kids were playing around and a kid got pushed and fell in the drink and it was about this deep. A little kid could drown in that much water. That's an example of exactly what he's talking about.

(#1700) Jay Hupp: It just seems to me the safety section here ... we're really missing an opportunity here to address that safety concern. Even though we might be driven in a direction from an engineering standpoint; dig them deeper and make sure all the water drains off. From a safety standpoint maybe we ought to be risking a little bit more protection of the road for the safety of people.

(#1750) Steve Clayton: I sent Charlie some questions. Did you get a chance to review those?

(#1760) Dave Whitcher: Yes, and I responded back to him. I don't know if he got it to you.

(#1780) Steve Clayton: So all the little typos and stuff. All that will get straightened out?

(#1790) Dave Whitcher: Yes.

(#1800) Steve Clayton: Did we do this element in house, or by a consultant?

(#1805) Dave Whitcher: I don't know how the original was created from the time we updated this one. It was done under the direction of Bob and our people, but Skillings Connolly did the actual working of it.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

(#1825) Steve Clayton: The critical accident locations is one of the questions I had. That didn't line with the data there. Are you going to fix that?

(#1828) Dave Whitcher: Yes.

(#1835) Steve Clayton: I raised a question on the future traffic assignment. You mentioned 5,000 vehicles a day for the proposed Razor Road extension. Why in particular I ask that is that particular assignment wasn't done in the draft that you handed out to us in September. This one it didn't show Razor Road as having a 5,000 vehicle day assignment and in the new draft you gave us it is. My question being is in September you were looking at expanding Allyn by three times. It looks like that is not on the table to expand that UGA and if the reason you gave it that high a projected volume ... it's hard to take things back if we put them in the Comp Plan. If we do an estimate for 5,000 it's hard in five or ten years to come back and figure out where it came from. I'm questioning if we built that projection based on the Allyn UGA expanding and that's not going to happen, maybe that isn't appropriate.

(#1910) Dave Whitcher: I don't know where that number came from, but we will look into it.

(#1918) Terri Jeffreys: There's a map showing some projects under 5-2. I don't see any accompanying language with it. Can you explain what this map is?

(#1930) Dave Whitcher: Yes, I can. The first time I saw it was in this document, and as I commented to Charlie and Bill, I didn't know what it was showing either. It's not the six year plan ...

(#1944) Steve Clayton: I had asked a question similar along those lines, in the twenty five year TIP we have some proposed new construction. Perhaps it would be nice to have that mapped out. There was an item VII-2.1 that had a public participation policy. It showed a Growth Management Advisory Committee.

(#1975) Dave Whitcher: That would be a Bob question.

(#1977) Steve Clayton: It shows there was a Growth Management Advisory Committee that developed this plan and as far as I know they don't exist. Is that old language?

(#1982) Bill Tabor: I think that's old language.

(#1985) Bob Fink: When the 1996 plan was done, there was an ad-hoc committee that was instrumental in putting it together.

(#1994) Steve Clayton: So if we're going to update this do we want to maintain the language that infers that this plan had a Growth Management Advisory Committee?

(#2000) Bob Fink: That could be you, but if you think it's appropriate to modify that language because the process is different now, that would seem appropriate.

(#2030) Steve Clayton: Just some language on traffic impact fees. That didn't seem to be consistent with the concurrency ... on page VII-5.9, I had trouble with this one being consistent. It infers to me that developers will never pay for the required improvements, and that was different than back in the rest of the plan.

(#2088) Dave Whitcher: In the short time I've been here I've reviewed the Public Works part and this I know nothing about. Is it planning or community development that's handling traffic impact fees?

(#2100) Bob Fink: That's all existing language. There is a section where there was a discussion of the impact fees. There's no requirement of the GMA to establish impact fees, but there's a provision in statute that sets the parameters by which you can establish impact fees. What that paragraph says, and it hasn't been modified since the plan was originally proposed, it was identified as a need at that time to adopt impact fees. Impact fees would be one way to address general road improvements in an urban area, for instance, that would be funded by growth, it would serve growth; it can't be used to address existing deficiencies in the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

system. It can only be used to address the new needs that are created by the growth that you're imposing the impact fee on. So it's not a way to cure the current problem, but it is a way to fund the area wide solution to the growth that goes on.

(#2155) Steve Clayton: We have a concurrency management policy and that appears to say that if you build a major development next to the road and it needs a lot of work on the road, then the developer pays part of the upgrade. Under impact fees, under development review, the way I read it it says that if there are significant impacts then the development may be denied. It doesn't require or even address that the developer should be pointed in the direction ...

(#2200) Bob Fink: You're right, and that paragraph also addresses impact fees that are identified and collected as mitigation as part of the SEPA review process. So as part of the environmental review, one of the impacts they looked at is traffic impacts. If they're having a major impact on a county road, they might need turn lanes. If the engineer determines they need a turn lane, in that case, the mitigation can be offered by the person developing it or required as part of the approval by the county to fund that improvement to serve that development to reduce that impact.

(#2245) Steve Clayton: That's the way I read the concurrency management policy ... is that old language?

(#2250) Bob Fink: That's not been changed. Concurrency is a different concept. Concurrency has to do with maintenance of the level of service, and the county has policies and regulations that says that development can be denied if it violates the level of service. What this means is there's a level of service on county roads of 'c' I believe and in the urban areas it's 'd'. So on a county road if a developer wanted to put a large project on a small county road, and that would push the level of service on that county road below 'd' in the urban area, then that project could be denied, or it would have to be improved within six years.

(#2350) Diane Edgin: Johns Prairie as it enters into Highway 3; I can't tell you how many times I've seen semi's stalled out on that stretch trying to get up that hill. Is there any records on that?

(#2370) Dave Whitcher: Not to my knowledge.

(#2375) Diane Edgin: I know of at least a dozen times over the last few years that I've seen that happen. This is an issue because that serves our port area.

(#2390) Dave Whitcher: Yes, it does. There are several options. Close the road so they have to go around. That's not practical. Or make a much flatter grade by cutting way back into the hill, or putting in switchbacks. All are very high cost options. Even putting in a third lane so that if they stall everyone can go around them safely. That's another high cost option given the hill there.

(#2415) Wendy Ervin: How come the third lane couldn't be brought further down?

(#2420) Dave Whitcher: You would have to cut into the hillside to do that.

(#2450) Tim Wing: You talked earlier about state and federal money. If the county spent a million dollars on one of the roads that are typically on the plan, what % of that money would be coming from the county, state and federal?

(#2462) Dave Whitcher: That depends on the particular funding program. There are a number that require no match; typically the federal and state funds are something like 17% each.

(#2480) Tim Wing: Do the state and federal funds come together for a total of 34%?

(#2485) Dave Whitcher: They can.

(#2488) Tim Wing: So if you spent a million dollars on a road, most of that money is county money?

(#2490) Dave Whitcher: No. The majority is federal money. For a million dollar project, we would put in about \$170,000.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

(#2500) Tim Wing: Why are some different than another?

(#2504) Dave Whitcher: The funding program, as established by congress.

(#2506) Tim Wing: So it has to do with what road it is then.

(#2508) Dave Whitcher: No. What the program is.

(#2510) Tim Wing: Do some programs fund certain types of roads and other programs other types?

(#2515) Dave Whitcher: It's different things they fund. There are safety programs, there are railroad crossing programs, there are bridge programs, there are roadway programs; each one having different criteria, both for eligibility and funding.

(#2525) Tim Wing: You said something about feeder roads.

(#2530) Dave Whitcher: Those that are classified as a collector in the federal function class scheme.

(#2544) Tim Wing: Is an alternate route around Belfair, which is often called the Bypass, would that be considered a collector road?

(#2548) Dave Whitcher: It could be proposed as one, and then it would be up to the state to concur and the feds to approve.

(#2560) Tim Wing: Is that likely to get approved?

(#2565) Dave Whitcher: Having worked with the person who approves them now, probably. The catch, though, is that we are limited to how much state wide % of major and minor collectors we have. We would probably have to give up something else.

(#2577) Tim Wing: You mean one of the other projects?

(#2580) Dave Whitcher: No, one of the other collectors. You can only have a certain % of major collectors.

(#2610) Wendy Ervin: We talked in the county about the Belfair Bypass, and Overton's were going to put in all this money and this was going to happen, and then we have an election, and then we talk about it again with a different group of BOCC, and then we have an election and we talk about it again. Is that just an endless sort of a cycle? That appears to me to be the way of the world.

(2675) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#2795) Wendy Ervin: I had not received this until tonight so I haven't had a chance to read it. Are we going to have a chance to come back to this later before it's approved?

(#2800) Bob Fink: I was going to save this until the end of the meeting but we have prepared a new schedule for the hearings for this GMA update and other items on the work program for 2005 into 2006. So I'll hand that out to you now. This chart tracks the different subjects that we've been dealing with with the update. It has one column for the date of the PAC hearings and another column for the BOCC hearings. The BOCC is not expected to make a decision on these issues until they discuss it on the 29th of November. The last hearing that's on this schedule is the 22nd and the last hearing before the PAC is the 14th of November. If the PAC needs more time to consider some of these issues in more depth we certainly could arrange another meeting. It is a very tight time schedule and I would suggest that if you want to continue the discussion on the subjects for tonight's hearing beyond tonight, that we schedule a special meeting as soon as possible so that you could meet and discuss it and be ready for the next group of issues coming to you next week.

(#2975) Steve Clayton: Okay, any other comment on the Transportation Element? We'll close the public hearing portion of this. We'll now go on to the Capital Facilities Element.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

(#3085) Bob Fink: The PAC has already received drafts of what's proposed and a staff report on the proposal. Basically the updates to the Capital Facilities Element are primarily because of the change of the time frame of planning and projects that have come forward with the passage of time. There's a number of new projects to discuss. There's the relocation of the county fairgrounds and convention center, new public works facility and maintenance shop, rehabilitation of the Mason County courthouse. Although these projects have been identified, the actual dollar amounts haven't been calculated yet as to what they're going to cost. The exact budget and timeline is still being worked on and will be proposed as part of the budget process. Mike Rutter is here who is the Manager of the County Facilities, and Doug Micheau, who is the Director of Wastewater and Utilities.

(#3188) Doug Micheau: There are a couple of changes to capital facility plan projects that are in the packet you've got. Through emailing them back and forth, we neglected to get them current in your current copy. We will be doing that by tomorrow. One change is that the county wide park plan update is now being funded with current fund revenues as opposed to REET 2 funding. Upon investigation with the Municipal Research Services Center we found that a general planning project is not an appropriate use of REET 2 funds and so DCD was able to use some of their ending fund balance from this year to be able to provide the dollars necessary to carry that piece out. The other changes that we have are principally to the North Bay / Case Inlet Sewer Utility. We've actually shifted out some dollars in projects like most notably the one for treatment plant capacity upgrades. We went back and re-evaluated the time horizon for the existing plant capacity and we won't need to spend funds that were shown in there until beyond the planning horizon for the current capital facilities plan. It has a \$65,000 amount out in 2011 that is getting us prepared for where we head next with treatment plant capacity upgrades. That's a significant dollar reduction in the existing projects. Those things all filter to changes in the summary tables. The good news is that those sheets are actually done, we just didn't get them into your packet. I don't think there's any projects that have changed in terms of their scope or directions. Simply dollar amounts and where they fall out over time. Part of that was a really critical evaluation we did in preparation for a potential rate increase in the North Bay / Case Inlet Sewer Utility and it necessitated us tightening down as far as we could and making sure that we were still adequately maintaining operating a plant but yet we moved dollars out where we could so we didn't have an inordinate impact on the current needs for finances in that utility.

(#3365) Tim Wing: Doug, you're involved with stormwater management policy?

(#3370) Doug Micheau: I'm not, but I did look at them and I thought there was some pretty good things there. I do have some knowledge of some funding that's available for stormwater planning for Mason County in this current funding cycle. I have paperwork on my desk that we can actually get an agreement with DOE now for a \$300,000 grant to do stormwater planning for the Hoodspout and Belfair urban areas.

(#3400) Tim Wing: Are we in the process of integrating the new DOE stormwater manual?

(#3410) Emmett Dobey: The answer to that is 'no' to the stormwater manual, but we are in the process of developing our own stormwater program that would be in concurrence with the state guidelines.

(#3434) Tim Wing: I've had just enough training to be dangerous about that. I took a course on low impact development and there was some elements of that that I thought made total sense and some discussion about all these stormwater ponds really not working the way they were supposed to, and so I'm just hoping that we're really looking to implementing a policy on that.

(#3462) Emmett Dobey: One of the better parts of the stormwater manual is a site specific review based on soil structures. In some cases you win, and in some cases you lose, but on balance you can sometimes very much reduce the amount of stormwater that goes into the ground.

(#3490) Tim Wing: Is that something that is in here or are these are just general goals?

(#3495) Emmett Dobey: These are just general goals and policies.

(#3500) Emmett Dobey: What we do propose as part of the 2006 work program is to develop a stormwater management program for Mason County.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

(#3508) Doug Micheau: We're looking at an across department coordinated approach right now to form a comprehensive water resources management approach for Mason County which would provide how all the elements of groundwater, stormwater, drinking water, all integrated into a balanced approach that will preserve our resources and still allow development to occur.

(#3550) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#3610) Emmett Dobey: If you're interested in the review of stormwater practices, both Doug and I are very much involved in other communities developing stormwater programs. Before I came here I was instrumental in developing one of the first low impact projects in the area. If you want a session about stormwater planning, why don't you let Doug and I do that.

(#3650) Wendy Ervin: On CF-507, it says to encourage innovative approaches to onsite wastewater treatment. Are we discussing their gray water and composting toilets?

(#3685) Doug Micheau: Yes.

(#3690) Wendy Ervin: How much is wastewater from sanitary plants being used as irrigation for forest, and how much is going into the running water?

(#3715) Doug Micheau: Currently the only place that we're utilizing Class A reclaimed water in the spray field is up at the North Bay / Case Inlet facility. What we're currently doing is operating primarily during the summer months and I think we're limited to six inches a week for the irrigated area in our spray field. It amounts to about 30% of our flow in the summer time. The rest is going into infiltration basins that then goes back down into the aquifer.

(#3750) Wendy Ervin: Is that feasible to use in other places in the county?

(#3760) Doug Micheau: It's a matter of pipeline costs to get it to someplace else. The Class A reclaimed water at North Bay / Case Inlet facility, and then ultimately in a system that's developed out in the Belfair area, will be the most critical in offsetting the demand that people are currently using potable water for in non potable uses. The development that's anticipated over time in the Allyn UGA will not likely be able to occur given the existing domestic water rights capacity unless some of that current use is being offset by water we already have at the top of the hill. As growth continues, we will continue to serve a leadership role in helping to develop some coordinated water supply plans that will then highlight the need for the utilization of that additional source at the top of the hill to offset the current non potable uses down below.

(#3830) Wendy Ervin: And the way that works is that the wastewater is actually piped up to the point at which it's sprayed.

(#3840) Doug Micheau: It's actually a little bit lateral and down from where it's currently being processed.

(#0115) Steve Clayton: You previously distributed to us a parks capital project list. That was not included in the Capital Facilities Plan that we've got. Are you intending on including that?

(#0122) Doug Micheau: It's supposed to be in there.

(#0135) Steve Clayton: Under CF-704, is that what that list is and maybe we should change that verbiage there and say that we did rather than doing it in 1996?

(#0150) Doug Micheau: Yes, it should read '2006'.

(#0200) Steve Clayton: On page 5-13 where we're identifying different recreational facilities throughout the county, can we put in 'other' the Theler Wetlands in Belfair? It isn't listed here and that would seem to be a place to put it.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

(#0230) Terri Jeffreys: I don't see the Oakland Bay on here.

(#0240) Doug Micheau: Yes, that should go on 5-11.

(#0250) Steve Clayton: I couldn't find that this refers to the new Fish and Wildlife access at Victor.

(#0260) Doug Micheau: Yes, that should be in there, too.

(#0270) Tim Wing: The purpose of this report is to outline the inventory of what we have?

(#0270) Doug Micheau: Correct. It says the purpose is to also identify plans for the next eight or ten years?

(#0284) Tim Wing: Can you tell me where in here it talks about increasing the types of services in the north end of the county? What facilities are planned to be enlarged up there so that people that are in that end of the county don't always have to drive down here to get their services? I also recognize that this question may be a technology question as well. I'm looking at a list on 6-2 and it looks like about 2% of the buildings the county owns are in the north end. I'd like to know more about what plans are to expand the services up there.

(#0310) Mike Rutter: I'm Mike Rutter and I'm the Facilities Director for Mason County. I'm glad to be here tonight. Just listening to you folks I like your dedication and commitment to Mason County as a whole. In 1996 we put together a facility steering committee, which came out of that our bond issue that addressed facility needs at our downtown campus and also in the north end. That bond issue failed. We updated that plan in 1999 to reflect staying in the downtown campus. Our growth in the north end ... I've been talking to the BOCC of next year doing a new plan that addresses not only the wants and needs in the downtown campus but in the north end. When I say the north end, it's the Allyn and Belfair area. We have some services that you know are in Belfair right now, but our plan for the north end was to take a five acre parcel and put a building in the middle of it, which would also have community access to it in which we could have different events in it. The wants and needs are there. We've got a new BOCC and a new vision. We talked about having commissioners every four years or eight years, but I do like the policies that have been coming from the BOCC and the direction to do certain things. I know there's a commitment there so I look forward next year coming up with a new capital facilities plan that addresses services. Flow of government is very crucial to me. One new element we have tonight is we have an RFP out for the restoration of the courthouse. Hiring an architectural firm to do a study of the courthouse. There's possible in the spring some grant monies that are available. This year they started out with twenty million and went down to five million, and we hope to have the study done where we can access that money and restore that courthouse.

(#0412) Tim Wing: Is this the only page in here that talks about the space planned for the north end of the county?

(#0415) Mike Rutter: I think that's correct.

(#0418) Tim Wing: It just shows the amount that we have now. Is there a plan to increase the services up there?

(#0422) Mike Rutter: It's going to be dictated on an assessment on wants and needs in the county. In the north end we've had sheriff services, planning is up there a couple of days a week. In the past we've had probation up there, we had district court up there, but the law has changed that dictates where services can go and I don't think district court can go up there any more. It's the wants and needs that the elected officials see that will dictate where services should go. You really need to build a building that the county owns and have those services in there.

(#0490) Tim Wing: I'd like to see something in here that says that's something that we're going to start working on. I recognize the complexity of it and I'm not expecting it to be a specific plan for next year, but ...

(#0500) Mike Rutter: So you'd like to see some kind of policy statement that addresses the services.

(#0502) Tim Wing: Even if it's just a statement that that's going to be on the discussion table for next year,

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

rather than having it not mentioned at all.

(#0515) Wendy Ervin: On page VI 2-5, under Administrative Services, it says 'Develop and implement a long range program of expansion and improvement to accommodate the county's projected administrative staffing requirements'. That sounds to me like let's figure out how much of a vacuum we can fill or how big we can make government or something like that. This actually sounds like an order to expand the county government and I just think that should be more closely written. Under Stormwater Management, CF-1001, I propose it should read 'Investigate means of implementing and maintaining safe and cost effective stormwater systems in identified problem areas'. That would make that an awful lot more clear.

(#0580) Doug Micheau: In response to your comment on Administrative Services, that may be something related to CF-801. Maybe we should say something like putting the services where the people are.

(#0598) Wendy Ervin: But it's not saying that. It's saying how can we expand; let's look for ways of implementing expansion of government. That's what that says, instead of how do we match facilities to needs, or how do we match staffing to space needs. That was kind of a nonsense statement and I object to nonsense statements.

(#0620) Steve Clayton: Wendy, under Section 6-4, that's what they've done to address that.

(#0630) Wendy Ervin: Okay, and I studied that and everything is deficient. Very few people think that they've got enough room. Also, that little gray house on Alder. I was told several years ago that that was going to have to be removed. I would hope that somebody would advertise that for removal rather than knocking it down. You could sell that to somebody for a buck and they could take it and put it on a different lot. I've investigated it and it would cost \$15,000 to move it within Shelton.

(#0670) Mike Rutter: Just as a update on surplus county items, and that is real property. We've had houses that we've advertised and even tried to get people to come down and take wood out of them, and when it gets to a point where we can't get any response from the community, that's when we tear them down. It looks to me that there's a beautiful lot across the street it could be moved to, so we do take a look at the value of the facilities that we do have. It's being used for storage right now, and it's still on our inventory, and until we really come up with a plan for the downtown campus ... it's a real nice building.

(#0715) Steve Clayton: Any other comments on the Capital Facilities Element? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing portion on that item.

(#0720) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#0820) Steve Clayton: Let's move onto Open Space.

(#0835) Barbara Adkins: I'm Barbara Adkins, Planner, with the Department of Community Development. I'm going to talk about Open Space and the Shoreline Master Program policies. The open space update addresses an item in the work program that was not mandated but it was put on there as a DR to assist in the implementation of open space corridors. I have taken the policies from the Trails Plan that was adopted in March, and incorporated them into the Open Space policies of the Comp Plan. The policies were not really changed; we've just added the policies from the Trails Plan. There are also changes on page 6.6. There are two paragraphs that were deleted. This is something you did last year. It just never made it to the BOCC. So these changes will go through when this goes through as well.

(#0910) Tim Wing: The map shows an L-shaped large green area. What is that?

(#0918) Steve Clayton: We designated that last year as an open space buffer between the Shelton and Allyn communities

(#0925) Barbara Adkins: This map is not new; it's just a re-creation of the existing map.

(#0935) Bob Fink: If you remember, at the request of the Overtons, there were two corridors between Allyn

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

and Belfair that were removed and this map reflects that change. It was approved by the Planning Commission, but it was never acted on by the BOCC. The rest of it is all the same.

(#0955) Tim Wing: What is the ramification of that being designated as an open space?

(#0960) Bob Fink: The main implication of that is that the county is starting a process of parks and trails planning and this is an area that was identified as one of the places that would probably be looked at to see whether there's opportunities or not. It was actually designated to meet the GMHB requirements that there be an open space corridor separating Allyn from Shelton. Some of the open space is long term forest lands, and some are ag resource lands.

(#0988) Tim Wing: Some of them are residential properties.

(#0992) Bob Fink: There's no practical effect on the individual property owner not developing their property. The only regulatory effect is that if they do a cluster subdivision where they need to establish open space, that this is something that may play into the design of the open space subdivision.

(#1010) Wendy Ervin: When we had our discussion before and the Overtons were here, they were expressing their concern that the designation of open space implied that it was to be used as recreational, and they were afraid of the impact on their forest and the insurance, etc. It is private property. They were assured that it really had no impact and it had no connection, and yet here it says that trails should be integrated with the designation of open space corridors during Comp Plan updates. So it's telling us that we should integrate public trails with open space, which very well may be private property.

(#1065) Bob Fink: I think those issues are going to be addressed better as the county continues with their trails planning. When that is fully developed, there won't be a need to designate these corridors that aren't in use. I would also point out that most of that land is actually state forest land. That's one of the benefits of continuing with the trails planning is that a lot of these corridors may be unnecessary.

(#1122) Wendy Ervin: I think designating private property as open space is a wrong approach.

(#1124) Bob Fink: Why?

(#1130) Wendy Ervin: For the same reasons I said before. It implies that the public can go play there. Those people that own that property deserve protection. If it's state forest lands, then maybe there's more of a justification there. We need another term to address private property that is not being used for development.

(#1180) Diane Edgin: Maybe you could use 'proposed'; 'not available to the public'.

(#1195) Jay Hupp: On 6.3 under Development and Multiple Use, it says that Fully Contained Communities should be developed under a master plan that provides for at least 30% of the site to be designated as permanent open space. I assume that's something that's been in the plan for a long time and it's dictated by something other than common sense.

(#1220) Bob Fink: One of the conditions the county was looking for when someone proposed a FCC that there be substantial open space included in the proposal.

(#1230) Jay Hupp: If I wanted to develop a piece of property and wanted to guarantee that I would lose 30% of it, I would designate it as a FCC. Otherwise, I would develop it some other way.

(#1242) Bob Fink: A FCC is a new urban area; a new city. If you're not urban, then you're rural, or a resource based, and then the level of development is entirely different. If you're adjacent to the existing urban area, and you wanted to have the urban area expanded, then that's part of the expansion of the existing urban area and it wouldn't be considered a FCC.

(#1262) Jay Hupp: But if I wanted to create a FCC ... the objective is to create a FCC.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

(#1274) Bob Fink: The objective is to create a well designed FCC. That's why there's an open space requirement.

(#1278) Jay Hupp: It's guaranteed I'm going to lose 30% of it if I create a FCC. If I simply develop it, then I'm not guaranteed that I'm going to lose 30% of it. I might get away with not losing any.

(#1288) Bob Fink: Looking at it as a developer, if I had 500 acres of rural land and I wanted to build a new town that might allow me to build 2000 houses ... it's currently zoned RR20, which would allow me to build 25 houses, so I'm going to give up 30% of the land area to gain 1000 houses, and consider that a cost to me as opposed to leaving it as a rural area and not a FCC.

(#1325) Jay Hupp: So where did the 30% come from?

(#1350) Bob Fink: County adopted that when they proposed this plan. That's been there since 1996.

(#1385) Jay Hupp: The same question applies to Master Planned Resorts. You're going to give up 50% there.

(#1400) Bob Fink: The MPR's were also intensive development that's allowed in the rural area. The standard of 50% is something the county created in this provision. It's been there since 1996.

(#1410) Steve Clayton: Any more questions for staff? Do we have any public testimony on this element? Hearing none, we'll close the public portion of the hearing. Let's move on to the Shoreline Management Program integration.

(#1445) Barbara Adkins: This is not new information. This is just a reshuffling of existing information. This is a mandated item on the work program. Integration of the Shoreline Master Program into the Plan and DR's. We've taken the SMP and broke it apart and put it in different places. The policies were extracted from it and put into a new chapter of the Comp Plan. All the regulations were separated out and put into a new chapter of the Mason County Code. This is to keep all the DR's in one place.

(#1520) Jay Hupp: Are there any new policies that result from this shuffling?

(#1525) Bob Fink: No.

(#1532) Terri Jeffreys: Did we review for any contradictions or conflicts?

(#1535) Bob Fink: Our SMP was adopted in 1978. To go through an amendment process, if we were going to do that, we would need to do it under the new SMP guidelines, which we're scheduled to do in 2012.

(#1575) Jay Hupp: On page 3 under 17.50.034, Unspecified Uses, this paragraph seems to me to take the same approach as the matrix of permitted uses in that if you want to use the property for something that is not specifically specified that you can use it for or can't use it for, then you try to match that to some other use that is defined in the regulations. Historically, if something isn't specifically prohibited, then it's permitted.

(#1635) Bob Fink: It's really a little bit different. The SMP has essentially three categories of things. Things that are prohibited, things that are permitted, and things that are conditional. Essentially any use that's not prohibited can be allowed as a conditional use. One of the things that's different about the SMP is that any conditional use permit is sent through the state and the state has final approval over whether to allow it or not.

(#1700) Wendy Ervin: On page 1, the second paragraph, the third sentence is eighty eight words long. There is no reason to write an eight-eight word sentence unless you're busy polishing your ego or something. There's no sense to be made of that sentence. On page 2 of definitions, Accessory Living Quarters. This is the point of the SMP ... to deal with how we deal with the shoreline, how we deal with setbacks, runoff, sewage; all of the things that have to do with the shorelines and protecting the shorelines. How does having a dollar bill pass from one persons hand to another in rent make any difference at all in the number of times the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

toilet gets flushed, or anything else; the traffic, the services. This accessory living quarters says 'provided no accessory living quarters shall be rented or leased'. I don't see any reason why that should be there. That has nothing to do with protecting the shoreline. I think that whole provision about renting or leasing should be taken out. If you can have an accessory living quarters, you're limited to it's size, so therefore you're limited to the number of people who can be in there. If you build it for your mother in law and she dies then you just declare it to be an abandoned building and leave it? There's no reason why this can't be rented so I propose that be taken out. Something else I think should be taken out. On page 19, Mining Operations and Public Access. It says 'some form of public access to the shoreline for private noncommercial recreational purposes shall be afforded in a manner compatible with mining and accessory facilities and uses. Such public access may be restricted and shall be consistent with the protection of the health, safety, and welfare of the public'. There is no reason why people should be encouraged to go someplace where there may be falling rocks, or a mining activity. If the public wants to see it, let them go to the managers and let them ask the manager for a tour. Putting a public access in that kind of ... it causes that company that's putting in this activity to expend a whole lot of money protecting a public who doesn't have any business being there. I think that should be taken out.

(#1850) Diane Edgin: That's part of the SMP that's been around for years.

(#1855) Wendy Ervin: I don't care. I want to reform it.

(#1862) Diane Edgin: Under Accessory Living Quarters, where it says subject to all health department requirements. It has to do with having more than one living quarters on a well.

(#1875) Wendy Ervin: But whether you rent it or not, the problem with the well, etc., are the same whether you're providing free housing or renting it.

(#1885) Diane Edgin: That's true, but my point is it's nothing that we can deal with because of it being in place for so long. Until it's ready to be overhauled in 2012 ...

(#1898) Bob Fink: The new guidelines for the SMP are much more stringent than the guidelines that existed when these plans were developed and they're more complicated.

(#1905) Wendy Ervin: I know people who have rental units on their property that are accessory building and I'm sure they don't know that they're not supposed to be renting it. Who's going to go around and police that?

(#1918) Bob Fink: To police it is difficult. When the county adopted new accessory dwelling regulation more recently they were specifically allowed to be rentals as well as for family use, because of the difficulties in policing it and the difficulty removing it when the situation changes. One of the problems is if it's family members then people can get special waivers from health code requirements because they're all family. What happens then if they rent it, they no longer meet code requirements, and how do you address that after the fact? We haven't changed this code because there are difficulties with changing this code without bringing the code itself into compliance with the new guidelines. We're not proposing any changes here.

(#1980) Jay Hupp: I have a question for T.J. Are you comfortable with integrating the SMP with GMA in spite of the fact that the two statutes stand separated in state law? You're comfortable with marrying the two together and are not uncomfortable with the potential for decisions to be made based upon SMP rules and policies that are inside the GMA that may stand differently if you only view them as that statute?

(#2022) Bob Fink: Before you answer that, keep in mind that the statute was changed to actually make the SMP part of the GMA. That's exactly why we're taking this action.

(#2038) Jay Hupp: But that's not been done at the state level.

(#2044) Bob Fink: I'm not going to disagree with you that the state has done a fairly poor job of actually coordinating it's various land use controls. Regardless of that, they did say essentially that the SMP is part of GMA. The processes are still different and they'll continue to be different until the statute is changed. Eventually the critical areas regulations under the GMA won't apply to the SMP jurisdiction. Once the county updates it's SMP to comply with the new guidelines then the restrictions on critical areas that come out of the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

SMP will apply to the shoreline areas rather than the critical area regulations that come out of GMA.

(#2115) T.J. Martin: I think there's going to be a little bit of a distinction between the two but that's something we're going to have to deal with and address and try to get to as closely in alignment as possible. We can't avoid every possible legality with something. You just try to do the best you can and comply with what's out there as it now stands. Just to build upon the issue that was brought up about the accessory living quarters. That's something I dealt with with the City of Olympia and as Bob talked about it, that's the whole reason why that's in there that you couldn't rent to another party is for the whole basis that you have a family member who moves in, and they move out, and before you know it, you bring in a completely unrelated party in and you're not complying with health code regulations. That's the basis for the regulation.

(#2200) Tim Wing: I don't understand that part. You can't put a second home on the property for grandma. It's got to meet all the standards for health and safety.

(#2210) Bob Fink: The standards are different if it's all family.

(#2214) Tim Wing: What standards would be different?

(#2216) Bob Fink: They do allow those mother in law units to be hooked up to the same septic. They'd never allow that in the case if it was two different families.

(#2230) Steve Clayton: Do we have any public comment on the Shoreline Master Program Integration? We'll close the public hearing portion. We'll take a short break.

Break in meeting.

(#2265) Steve Clayton: We'll call the meeting back to order. We'll start our discussion on the SMP integration. Any discussion?

(#2275) Tim Wing: I move that we accept it.

(#2278) Jay Hupp: I'll second the motion.

(#2280) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. We'll move onto Open Space.

(#2300) Wendy Ervin: I would like to have some language that makes a differentiation between open space that is owned by the county and is some sort of an extension of the trails and parks, and open space that is owned by private people.

(#2330) Tim Wing: I think we could add a strong sentence there that says that none of these things shall occur on private property.

(#2345) Wendy Ervin: Or say that this does not infer permission to trespass on private property declared as open space.

(#2355) Tim Wing: It appears that that is the intent of this. Just because it's designated as open space it in no way intends to state that that means that we can have public using private property without permission.

(#2370) Bob Fink: That's the intent.

(#2375) Tim Wing: So could we add a sentence like that?

(#2380) Bob Fink: Yes, it may just clarify it. If you said something like 'Designation of open space is not intended to mean that there is any public access to the property which may be privately held and may not be available or accessible to the public'.

(#2390) Wendy Ervin: I think that would be satisfactory. 'The designation open space in no way implies

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

permission to public access or trespassing upon private property designated open space'.

(#2440) T.J. Martin: You could possibly say that this policy will in no way void or violate private ownership rights.

(#2475) Steve Clayton: Put it on the first page as OS-050 under Planning.

(#2530) Wendy Ervin: I'll make that my motion.

(#2532) Tim Wing: So it would read 'this designation shall in no way violate or void private property ownership rights and does not imply or create access to open space property'.

(#2550) Wendy Ervin: Yes, that's my motion.

(#2552) Tim Wing: I'll second that motion.

(#2555) Steve Clayton: So we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#2565) Tim Wing: I move we adopt the open space policy as amended.

(#2570) Jay Hupp: I second that motion.

(#2675) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Let's discuss the Capital Facilities Element.

(#2580) Wendy Ervin: I propose that the several things that were not listed be included.

(#2740) Tim Wing: I move that we accept the Capital Facilities Element with the following changes: pull out the Harstine Island Park, add Theler Center, add Fish and Wildlife access in Victor, Add Oakland Bay, add parks capital projects summary list, change funding source, add revised budgetary numbers, and on top of page VI.2-5 change to 2006.

(#2940) Terri Jeffreys: I second the motion.

(#2985) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second to accept the Capital Facilities Element with the proposed changes. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Next we have the Transportation Element.

(#2995) Terri Jeffreys: I'd like to make a disclosure that I assisted with the development of the testimony of the Association of Realtors.

(#3010) Tim Wing: I propose that we delay our approval on this until the meeting on the 7th and that we will allow for staff to bring us a revision of language regarding the development of transportation corridors within the UGA's.

(#3035) Jay Hupp: I'd also like to see some language under the safety section that at least intends to balance between the intent of protecting the roadbed and creating dangerous ditches. I'd like to get that in writing.

(#3100) Tim Wing: I move that we continue this transportation discussion until the meeting on the 7th of November.

(#3150) Jay Hupp: I second the motion.

(#3175) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second to continue the Transportation Element until the 7th of November. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 1, 2005

(#3200) Tim Wing was excused from the December 5th meeting.

(#3250) Steve Clayton: Our current dates for upcoming meetings are the 7th and 14th of November. That leaves us the 21st if we don't get finished on the 14th.

(#3300) Bob Fink: I'd rather you have another meeting that week of the 14th instead of on the 21st so we can get things to the BOCC.

(#3350) Jay Hupp: In the Economic Development Element that went before the BOCC today, in the opening paragraph, we wrestled with that hard for a long time and there's still a statement in there that reads and is speaking of economic development for the benefit of all citizens, and then especially for unemployed and disadvantaged persons. We went around and around about that and I thought that we asked for that to be taken out. Is that correct?

(#3435) Bob Fink: That sounds right to me.

(#3445) Jay Hupp: I intend to write a letter to the BOCC as a private citizen and I'll bring that up.

(#3455) Bob Fink: I'll check on that. That should have been corrected if that's what you did. I also wanted to relay to you that in the hearing this morning with the BOCC they did recognize the hard work that you were putting in and will continue to put in to get this all done.

(#3545) Wendy Ervin: Since the Economic Development Element was brought up ... I sent somebody an email about my discomfort with the fact that the contributions to the economy of Mason County made by the Skokomish and Squaxin; they need to be incorporated in our thinking. They are part of the reality of Mason County and yet we write an Economic Development Element and act like they aren't there.

(#3585) Bob Fink: As I remember, they were added to the agencies involved in economic planning and development.

(#3600) Wendy Ervin: They're not observed in the text as being a viable integral part of Mason County's economy and they are. They employ a huge number of people.

(#3640) Emmett Dobey: Steve has included that in his latest draft that's not out yet.

Meeting adjourned.