

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

## Minutes November 7, 2005

(Note audio tape (#3) dated November 7, 2005  
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

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

=====

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Dewey at 6:00 p.m.

### 2. ROLL CALL

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

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

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the October 10, 2005 meeting were approved as presented with  
the following requested changes:

On page 14 under (#1375) it should read: 'Were we still going to draw lines around it'?

### 4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0065) Bill Dewey: We have a public hearing on several of the Comp Plan updates. I understand there's  
going to be some continued discussion on the Transportation Element.

(#0085) Charlie Butros: Charlie Butros, Public Works. Dave Whitcher will be presenting some of the updates  
and corrections to the plan you received at the hearing last week.

(#0100) Dave Whitcher: I'm Dave Whitcher, Transportation Engineer for Public Works. I'm looking at the  
changes and the consultant followed our directions almost exactly. Figure 3.1, they updated it with the  
information that was supposed to be on Figure 5.2. It's the federal function classification for Mason County.  
Figure 5.2 was the one that nobody knew what it showed because it had just random roads on it. What we  
did was take from the 25 year plan and other sources. You will note that Belfair and Allyn are on the map  
and these are areas for consideration of new roads when it's determined where they should go. Another thing  
that was asked about was our project priorities policy. When I was traffic engineer in Grays Harbor County I  
put together the priority policy there 25 years ago. I came here two months ago and saw what they had and it

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

is very similar in what they looked at but it was quite different in the approach they took. The concerns that were brought up last meeting are underlined on here. The question of clear zone, which addresses the question of the deep ditches. We should be including that as to if it has an inadequate clear zone, it should be higher on the priority list. The change from surface condition, which is the existing condition, where you lose all your priority points for surface condition each time it is resurfaced to actually measuring the structural adequacy of the road to handle the vehicles on it. The next one was the bicycle and pedestrian plan. If a road has been identified as being part of the proposed bicycle and/or pedestrian routes based on our prioritized list of routes, it should have a little higher priority because of that. The current service rating is what the road actually serves. Economics like businesses, industries, recreation, and civic that are actually there. What Bob added for the opportunities for expansion of the transportation network labeled Future Service Rating. If an area has great potential for development, include priority points for the potential of what might be there once it is developed.

(#0325) Tim Wing: If a portion of the county is served by a state highway, the service level is not adequate, how does it fit into this priority list? I'm talking about the UGA's.

(#0250) Dave Whitcher: This is the priority for the existing roads for what they are. This is the way things are now and what their deficiencies are and prioritize what should be done first. Bob mentioned last week that Planning and Public Works will get together to look into precisely where should roads go to provide better connectivity.

(#0265) Tim Wing: Have you made a proposal for how we're going to address my concern about it?

(#0368) Dave Whitcher: Yes, that's when Planning and Public Works get together to discuss that very topic.

(#0370) Tim Wing: When will that be?

(#0380) Bob Fink: What was proposed in here is a policy change that would call for developing a network of roads. If you're asking when will that plan for a network of future roads be developed, we're thinking in the near future; over the next two years or eighteen months.

(#0395) Tim Wing: And what would happen in that eighteen months?

(#0400) Bob Fink: The investigation of the development of the future network would be done in that eighteen months so that would be identifying what the needs are, where the opportunities are, trying to figure out where you need to make new connections, where you need to provide alternative routes.

(#0415) Tim Wing: My question really zeros in on where is it in this plan? I'm not willing to vote for this plan unless I see something that says that we're going to address this issues so that ultimately, assuming the BOCC pass the plan, that they are on board in addressing this issue.

(#0425) Bob Fink: It's on page 2.11 under Land Use Policy. It says 'To meet future travel needs, the county will consider developing a future transportation network plan. The plan will help guide the establishment of new or improved roads and other transportation facilities during private or public development. The plan should support the Mason County Comprehensive Plan and be coordinated with the Mason County Trails Plan'. That was one of the changes that was made.

(#0444) Tim Wing: Can you show me in that paragraph where the deadline is for that?

(#0448) Bob Fink: There is no deadline in that paragraph. What we were thinking of starting the work in 2006 and carrying over into 2007. The exact schedule will depend on more careful review.

(#0465) Dave Whitcher: Another comment on the priority array. Again, it will take time because we need to do a lot of investigative work in the field to determine what the clear zone deficiencies are, what the non-width related deficiencies are, review the drainage, so we're looking at probably a two year effort, having both winters to review the drainage and summer to do all the measurements for what is really there. That also fits in with the funding schedule. One of the priorities is projects that we already have funding for. Right

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

now we have funding for a six year cycle. When we are done with the work, we will have a new priority array that will indicate the future from there based on the additional information.

(#0500) Jay Hupp: Could you amplify as to what clear zone really means?

(#0515) Dave Whitcher: That is when you're driving down the road and for whatever reason you stray from your lane, that there is adequate room with nothing to run into or obstruct your continuing safely until you can come back to where you need to be or to a stop.

(#0520) Jay Hupp: So it really means the usable shoulder?

(#0525) Dave Whitcher: The shoulder and the side slopes and beyond that where there are no trees or rocks.

(#0530) Wendy Ervin: I think Tim's concern is that we need to not just consider developing a future transportation network work plan, but we need to develop instead of just considering it. This is very weak wording.

(#0560) Tim Wing: I also have a concern about the economic development of the county and how the road system affects that. There's virtually no effort to emphasize economic development in the rural areas; if anything it's the opposite direction. And yet the priority system here, although it's mentioned in here a few times, I don't see it doing that. I don't see a commitment to put roads inside the UGA's. I'm still seeing this as inadequate.

(#0600) Wendy Ervin: We need to address the economics of the various elements. Not just the roads, but the health, and all of these different things. They give lip service to 'oh, yeah', then economics, too, and maybe we can get those people to shut up who want jobs'. It's patronizing. It's not worded in ways that say we are tying these things all together.

(#0625) Bill Dewey: It almost seems to me for this future transportation network plan that you need a different project priority policy. Bob was trying to articulate them but they're not written in here anywhere. It seems like you'd need a different set of criteria for evaluating whether your existing road network is adequate.

(#0650) Jay Hupp: The Economic Development Element is the step child of the plan. It comes at a late time. In fact, the way the GMA reads is really disturbing in that it's making the economic development element a mandatory planning element when it says that the economic development element must be compatible with all of the aspects of the approved plan. Which means that everything that has been approved to date dictates the nature of the economic development element that you're creating. I think here's where we get into the difficulty of bringing the economic development element into proper balance with the entire plan.

(#0705) Wendy Ervin: I'm assuming from last week that this was done by Skillings and Connolly?

(#0715) Dave Whitcher: Yes.

(#0717) Wendy Ervin: How much of it was done by the county and how much was done by Skillings and Connolly?

(#0720) Dave Whitcher: I don't know. I came here well into the process.

(#0725) Bill Tabor: Bill Tabor, Mason County Engineer. We hired Skillings and Connolly to take the old plan and update it with new information. Specifically, new traffic counts, new collision data.

(#0750) Bob Fink: There was certain verbiage that was changed that we distributed before. Like the change in the policy language to incorporate references to the Trails Plan and the future network design planning.

(#0765) Bill Tabor: There were also some updates associated with transit.

(#0770) Bob Fink: We also did population projections.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

(#0772) Bill Tabor: They used that to run a new model to look at the level of service on our existing roads. That's basically what Skillings did. The rest of the document is pretty much the way the old document was worded.

(#0790) Wendy Ervin: Skillings is expensive. There's a lot of stuff here but I'm not sure there's a lot of information. I have been in a position where Skillings charged \$2500 for the plan for an 8 x 12 shed and I was pretty appalled because that was almost the cost of the shed that they charged to draw something on a piece of paper. I'm skeptical when somebody gives Skillings a contract; I'm skeptical if we're getting our moneys worth out of them because I think they live very, very well. How much of this could have been done by the county without ...

(#0818) Bill Tabor: The reason we hired a consultant was because we lost our Transportation Engineer. We were caught short handed. We hired Skillings to help us ... we were essentially ten years behind on collecting traffic data. Several years behind on the collision data. The model hadn't been updated since the last plan was put together ten years ago. Skillings already had the model for the work so we figured if we could at least collect some new data and get it to them to put in the model, we could get a new look at the level of service needed. Skillings was helping us with that effort and we were fortunate a couple of months ago to find Dave Whitcher to pick up the ball and review this and help out with the process as well.

(#0870) Steve Clayton: Was it a conscience thing to remove the 101 Connector from potential roads?

(#0874) Bill Tabor: Yes. It was our understanding that it is no longer a project the county wants to consider. If the BOCC wants it back in, we'll put it back in.

(#0888) Wendy Ervin: A huge percentage of the accidents seem to happen up in the North Shore area and Dewatto. Why are there so many accidents up in that area?

(#0898) Dave Whitcher: They're narrow and winding and when it rains they get wet and drivers decide how fast they're going to go and those white signs with numbers on them are just a blur on the scenery. Now that we have more up to date information on crashes we will hopefully next year be preparing a crash report for this year that will show, as it states in there, that 60% of the crashes involve too much speed, inattention, or lack of sobriety.

(#0945) Terri Jeffreys: It says that the county is using 2004 editions of the green book, etc., and it seems like by adopting those standards then we found that our roads are too narrow and our shoulders are too narrow. Policy wise, do you see this moving the county towards spending a tremendous amount of more money by adopting these standards on more widening of roads and shoulders than we might otherwise have?

(#0965) Dave Whitcher: No. We'll be spending, as some people may say, way too much as we still are, but the situation is, case law, if something happens, if it met standards when it was last reconstructed, our liability for having too narrow a road isn't there.

(#0984) Terri Jeffreys: So these standards are applied to new construction?

(#0986) Dave Whitcher: Yes. If somebody sues us because of standards we have to go back and determine when it was last reconstructed, determine the standards of that time, and did that reconstruction meet those standards.

(#1005) Wendy Ervin: In Thurston County there are several roadways that have been redone apparently to accommodate working in the trails. So now you have bicycle paths on roads that have not had bicycle paths before. I'm seeing ... they'll have a bicycle path that's coming down the highway, then they want to have a right turn lane, so now all of a sudden you've got your progress lane, your bicycle path and your right turn lane, which means that you have a mixing of traffic between the cars and the bicycles. I see that as a potential for accidents so I don't know how people are hoping to plan to put trails along side our roads.

(#1050) Dave Whitcher: You're totally correct. What they are doing is they need to get the bicycle paths for

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

whatever reasons, and they can't widen the road so they have to fit it in somewhere. Those are the currently adopted standards for that situation.

(#1170) Tim Wing: Do you analyze the accident rates on the state roads through the UGA's?

(#1180) Dave Whitcher: No, we don't. That information would be available from WSDOT. I can inquire about that.

(#1188) Tim Wing: One of the things that I'm wanting to see is that we evaluate the UGA traffic regardless of whether it's a state road or a county road then we make a decision about where we're going to spend our money. We could make a decision that we need to get the state to try to fix the roads, but if the answer is that we can't or we won't, then I think we need to look at the evaluation of the accident rates and other issues and make a decision to spend money in those areas, if that's where the highest priority in the county is. Right now our whole system totally ignores that. I would like to see an element in this that you're going to evaluate the traffic inside the UGA and come up with a plan to resolve it.

(#1266) Bill Tabor: We do have a process where we address concerns on state roads and we do that through the PRTPO (Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization), which includes several counties and some of the projects that are currently on their list for state consideration is the SR3 - Johns Prairie intersection, as well as various other improvements on SR3, SR3 - 101. As you know, SR3 through Belfair was funded for improvements. That was the result of a study that the county did for those improvements. I'm convinced that if the county hadn't stepped forward and done that study and identified the costs, we probably wouldn't have gotten funded for that project. It still remains to be seen if it's still funded. Also the Belfair Bypass; the same situation. The county did the study on that and identified the costs and that was another project that was approved. So projects of that nature have been identified by the county and have been funded by the state. One of the processes to get a project through the state is through the PRTOP, which we actively participate in. So there is a process in place to do that.

(#1335) Bill Dewey: Any other questions? I'm thinking we'd move on to the public hearings that we've got scheduled for tonight, and then come back to this and have our discussion. So let's go ahead and move on to the population projections and allocations.

(#1375) Bob Fink: I'm Bob Fink with the Department of Community Development. Tonight one of the subjects for public hearing is the population projections and allocation to the urban areas from 2005 to 2025. I distributed a memo that discusses two new alternatives that we're considering as recommendations for the board. There was a table that had a number of different alternatives that basically established a very broad range of population growth rates and allocations that could be done. The situation that we find ourselves in now is that there is still a significant amount of sub-area planning going on both for the Allyn community and for the Shelton UGA. Because of that we're very reluctant to recommend significant changes to the UGA's and what we would recommend instead is to keep to the status quo of the current UGA's and allocate sufficient population to those areas to maintain that boundary with the expectation that next year we would revisit both Allyn and Shelton when those sub-area plans are adopted or at the end of the year when the annual amendment is done. The proposal itself is actually pretty close to one of the alternatives that was under consideration previously. The actual population allocation that we think seems appropriate is basically the intermediate projection from OFM plus 10,000, which would be a total growth of 31,299 people. That's more than 10,000 people less than the high growth scenario provided by OFM. Alternative #6, which is the population distributions that are currently adopted really is about the closest match, but there is no exact match in the previous alternatives from what we're proposing here. Since the time that I distributed this memo I did talk to Steve Osguthorpe of the City of Shelton. The City of Shelton just recently passed an expression of their intent that their preference is to maintain a 2% growth because of various concerns that they have with their rate of growth, sewer and water planning, and their expectations for the future.

(#1545) Wendy Ervin: Is that 2% growth within the city limits or the urban area?

(#1548) Bob Fink: It's for the city and the UGA altogether. There is a concern that we have in that it's clear that the city is not sure how that would come about or what you would do to bring into balance the population allocation and the capacity of the city to accept population. It's clearly mandated in the GMA that you have

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

that balance. Something has to be changed and while the city has indicated it's preference for using the lower allocation number, they haven't indicated the preference of how to address lowering the number if we don't use the higher number. For that reason and also because we haven't had this memo on the website I would ask the committee to continue the public hearing until next week and then have the discussion next week after the opportunity for further public comment.

(#1630) Wendy Ervin: Allyn and Belfair UGA's are not incorporated and therefore while they do have local bodies, can't decisions be overridden by the county?

(#1645) Bob Fink: The jurisdiction for land use management and planning for Allyn and Belfair is with the county government and the BOCC. The authority for the Shelton UGA, outside the city limits, is also within the county jurisdiction. The authority to allocate population to UGA's ultimately was given to the county rather than to the individual cities. So the county has to make that decision and adopt that action in its plan.

(#1670) Wendy Ervin: I find a conflict there because you've got the city that does have authority over the city limit areas, and then you've got the UGA's, which is the county. But the city is expected to expand services into ... there's a real conflict in no mans land. You can't treat the urban area around Shelton in the same way that you can in Allyn or Belfair.

(#1695) Bob Fink: Yes, there are differences. One of the requirements in the GMA is that the cities are intended to be the principle service providers for urban services, and the city can expand anywhere within the UGA but the city is actually limited in expansion. It can't expand beyond the boundary of the UGA boundary.

(#1730) Terri Jeffreys: By continuing it until next week can we anticipate some information from Shelton explaining how they propose dealing with their allocation?

(#1735) Bob Fink: I don't know that we will get additional information from them except for a record of their decision. The timing and issues were discussed with having to take action by December 1<sup>st</sup> several weeks ago when the city and county met. We are trying to work with the city in a joint planning effort. We have a formal agreement with them to try to come up with something that works well for the public. These are difficult decisions for the city. What they call down zoning property, where you have to lower the expectation of property owners, regarding what kind of development they can do. There's a lot of important questions that still need to be resolved.

(#1800) Terri Jeffreys: Can you tell me if that is the tone they're going? Are they okay with downsizing?

(#1830) Bob Fink: I haven't been to the recent meetings. Steve Osguthorpe has only related to me generally their content. He doesn't know if they're going to try to achieve some kind of balance between the zoning and the size of the UGA. In other words, not try to make up the total difference by simply reducing the UGA by an appropriate amount, but to make up the difference by changing the way they had tentatively zoned the area so there wouldn't be as much residential land available for development. The population allocation directly affects the residential land demand.

(#1850) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#2045) Wendy Ervin: Looking at the proposed alternatives, if we accept the alternate that says 10,500 people for Shelton, and they're saying they want to stick with the 6,100 figure, would we ride with this 10,500 figure until next year and then alter it?

(#2050) Bob Fink: Right. One possibility is if we don't know how to reduce the UGA in a way that makes sense in a matter of only a few weeks, and we allocate population to hold it in place, when the City of Shelton develops their sub-area plan and the county and public has a chance to consider it ... next year we want to re-evaluate how much industrial land is needed along with the commercial. There's a large part of land that's industrial because it belongs to the Port of Shelton. There are limitations to the development that would take place there. It's limited mostly because of the airport.

(#2170) Wendy Ervin: But the city UGA could have industrial zones that weren't part of the port, right?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

(#2180) Bob Fink: Yes, they do now. The port isn't even in the city limits. This analysis is based on a proposal that's under consideration that does have industrial lands outside where the port is. What we haven't done is gone back and looked at that in a more detailed fashion. We're hesitant to zone things one way right now and then go back six months from now and change it. It seems more reasonable to simply hold things as they are now until that planning is done.

(#2220) Steve Clayton: I have a question on consistency in the plan with Allyn population allocation. Since last week, the sewer plan for Allyn came out and it looks like approximately a 2% population increase a year plan is what they're planning for infrastructure. Doug Micheau said last week that there's no plan for expansion of the plant. We took that out of the Capital Facilities Plan. If this is what the county is accepting as the plan for infrastructure in Allyn, then maybe we need to do the population allocation based on what the infrastructure will support.

(#2275) Bob Fink: That's the financial plan for eight years for the Allyn system.

(#2280) Steve Clayton: And their growth projections based on how much the plan will carry and that they're planning on expanding. Just to maintain consistency between what our allocations are and what we're planning in the Capital Facilities Plan, we don't want part of ... with GMA, as I understand it, it's consistency between our different plants so if we have a growth projection in our Capital Facilities that says 2%, and we have a growth projection in our population that says 5% that's not consistent.

(#2300) Bob Fink: We can look into that a little bit more. There doesn't necessarily have to be a complete identity between the plan for the different purposes. The timeframe is different and also the purposes of the planning document is different. One of the things I cite in the memo is a recent decision from the WWGMHB that recognizes that planning is done for different purposes and sometimes you want a more conservative number and sometimes you want a less conservative number because there's risks each way. The key thing they're calling for is not necessarily an absolute consistency in the numbers but whether the one plan supports the other and whether the planning you're doing is for transportation or whether it's for sewer, it is supportive of the goals in the GMA. They're not looking at only the fact of if the two numbers are the same; they're looking at what the intent is and what the consequences are of having different numbers.

(#2395) Jay Hupp: Does all of the growth in Allyn have to be sewerred?

(#2405) Bob Fink: I believe there's a regulation that if you're within so many feet of the sewer line that you have to connect up to it. I think it's within 300 feet of the sewer line.

(#2425) Terri Jeffreys: From what I saw up in Jefferson County, if you expand the UGA, then your sewer planning should be planning to service those expanded areas.

(#2455) Bob Fink: Not necessarily every single lot is sewerred, but apparently there is a problem with ... Yes, there's a recent decision in Jefferson County where they were trying to expand an urban area and their calculations ... they calculated and they admitted that they weren't going to provide sewer service to an existing area that was platted but not developed. So in a sense it was urbanized and you recognize the distinction of urbanized and within the UGA; they're not necessarily the same. They decided to include that urbanized area within the UGA but then they decided also not to provide sewer because of the economics and the GMHB found that noncompliant with the GMA.

(#2500) Wendy Ervin: Is there any developer or any plan ... you have this allocation for a FCC. Is that just another placeholder, or is there any kind of discussion of a specific project?

(#2520) Bob Fink: I'm not aware of anyone who is actually in the process of proposing a FCC. It is a placeholder; it's a placeholder that you need to have in order to allow the creation of a FCC under the ACT.

(#2530) Wendy Ervin: So it can just stay as a placeholder?

(#2535) Bob Fink: Right. In this case we are in the process of giving better guidance and design requirements to give more direction if someone wants to create a FCC.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

(#2575) Bill Dewey: Let's open up the public hearing portion of the population projections and allocations to the UGA's.

(#2600) Jeff Carey: Jeff Carey, President of the ACA. Just looking at a few things here like Land Use, there seems to be a mismatch on ... Land Use drives the population. I'm not trying to cause trouble with staff. We've talked about it and I know we're going to work it out, but I want to keep it in front of the PAC what our concerns are. Roughly in Allyn we have approximately 2,000 people in our UGA based upon roughly 860 dwellings, and when I look at this right off the bat if these acreage numbers are correct that means that right now 60.4% of the land has already been allocated to the population. If you're taking a 2200 number to add it to later, those numbers don't correspond out. There needs to be consistency between all the different pieces of this Comp Plan. I believe they're not there yet. If you're allocating a population for 20 years of 2200 for Allyn, it would seem that you at least would want to match up to what's happening here. If we've already used up 60% of the land with 2000 people, is the ratio going to hold through the rest of the way? That's my concern. I've talked to Doug Micheau and I pointed out to him as recently as Thursday regarding the sewer rates, that their numbers don't match ours, they don't match planning's and it's not an issue of whether all the lots will connect to the sewer. They're not counting the actual plat of Allyn. On top of that we found out that when they built the sewer system they didn't prepare the engineering to allow additional connections. They don't know what size to size the pipe going down to the plat. What I'm getting at is this whole thing is out of consistency between the different issues.

(#2875) Bill Dewey: Are these inconsistencies things that you say you're working directly with staff on?

(#2880) Jeff Carey: I've talked to them. They say they are.

(#2885) Bill Dewey: My point is we're probably going to keep this open for a week so if you've got some specific ...

(#2894) Emmett Dobey: Just for the record, would you list what you think those inconsistencies are so we can make sure that we do address your issues.

(#2900) Jeff Carey: There's inconsistencies between the Capital Facilities and your population.

(#2905) Bob Fink: What's inconsistent?

(#2910) Emmett Dobey: Just list them for us.

(#2915) Jeff Carey: Maybe I should have this discussion with you. You're going to find it's very interesting. It's like everybody is trying to do the right job all through this plan, but when you start looking at it there seems to be a lot of disjointed numbers and I can't figure it out.

(#2950) Bill Dewey: I know you're trying to be constructive, Jeff, and I think a number of us who've tried to read these see some inconsistencies periodically, and the more you can point out specifics, the more direction we can give.

(#2975) Jeff Carey: The Capital Facilities for sewer does not match the allocation of population for the Allyn UGA. No matter how you want to cut it. The reason that got my attention was because it had an effect of what the sewer rates were going to be.

(#3000) Jay Hupp: Could you comment where you are currently with what's proposed for the population allocation and the resizing or not resizing of the Allyn UGA?

(#3030) Jeff Carey: Not happy with the numbers. Through our discussion with our planning committee up in Allyn with Steve Goins participating in that, we came to an understanding that we felt that it was very achievable between 50 and 60 new homes a year going into the Allyn UGA. With that we talked about what number to use and we came up with 2.5 per dwelling. Now we're looking at somewhere between 2500 and 3000 going into the UGA. That was our understanding. As a result of the sub-area planning and with the



## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

county ... we're saying one thing and we're doing another and then we're waiting for the city and then ... that was our thoughts to be between 2500 and 3000. We're not happy but the county is saying they're going to work with us and we're going to come to some understanding.

(#3200) Buzz Moore: I'm Buzz Moore and I reside at Victor. I'm a member of the Allyn planning committee. I looked at this work that Bob put together. I would suggest you look at the Allyn permits chart as a % of total permits. I checked with Bob on this and he tells me that those are actual new residential building permits. I looked at the plot and the plot has a certain orderliness to it. If you look at that plot as being the ratio of being the % of the total permits, what you're really looking at is a probability statement. I used a different model and the results I see going out 25 years are quite different. If we were truly looking at the best estimate of 20 years, we would expect us to receive approximately 40% of the growth in Mason County if we continue to grow as we have now. It's probably not going to happen that way because things change. The housing market is going to change, but if you consider the fact that Belfair and Allyn both are going to be close to the new access to Tacoma, and so for affordable housing, people are going to come here and trade their cost savings in housing for transportation. I would expect that the demand is going to continue the same. What I'm looking at is the external demand for housing. That's really what that ratio tells us. Next week I'll have something that will pass the approval of the Allyn planning group and something that is written and you can see. We have to assume that we know where we're going and then add three years to that for the ability of platting the land, marketing the land, and development. Seven years we will be caught short; we will not be able to take advantage of the real estate market demand and that would be affecting our tax income, it would be affecting the welfare of this county so that's a very important thing to look at.

(#3600) Terri Jeffreys: When you looked at the trend for building permits, you saw a very smooth curve that you could extend that, and how far back did you start with that?

(#3640) Buzz Moore: I started through the time period on this chart, which begin in 1995.

(#3650) Terri Jeffreys: And I heard previously that there was a pent up demand for those building permits waiting for certain things to happen and so is it logical to assume that it will continue at that rate given the fact that perhaps there was a pent up demand, and perhaps that there will be access to more lands once a Belfair Bypass goes in up on that hill?

(#3688) Buzz Moore: Then that would be our proposal to expand the Allyn UGA up there.

(#3692) Terri Jeffreys: I was talking about the Belfair UGA and the Belfair Bypass.

(#3695) Bill Dewey: I think Terri's point is that there will be additional developable lands in the vicinity elsewhere.

(#3700) Buzz Moore: We have to make sure that we plan for those lands in an adequate time or we won't be able to make use of that. The only thing I'm saying is make sure that we allocate population out far enough into the future so that we have an opportunity to plan so we can watch for the trends.

(#3740) Jeannette Moore: Buzz, you did put in there that Belfair sewers would come on line in seven years and assume that a certain percentage of what would go to Belfair and it doesn't change the curve all that much.

(#3775) Buzz Moore: I said that in 2012 the Belfair sewers will come on line and that it will probably have the same characteristics that the Allyn population growth has experienced with the addition of sewers. Right now the Allyn experience is probably the best model of what's going to happen to Belfair. In 2025 with 50% of the Belfair growth being captured from the Allyn growth then we would receive about 40% of Mason County total out in 2025. If none of it went to Belfair we would receive over 55% of the growth. We're looking at the recent growth changes we've experienced. We've got to look at the right things.

(#0205) Tim Wing: I can comment on Allyn. The situation there, which is primarily Lakeland Village housing, when the sewer went in, builders building homes in a variety of price ranges went in and started buying up the lots. I personally rounded up 15 lots for a builder that I know that builds entry level houses. We bought 15 lots all for under \$25,000. Those lots now, three years later, would sell for over \$60,000. Those lots then

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

became all built out and my work and my builder were not the only ones in there doing that. There were a lot of entry level builders building homes that were priced over \$200,000 or less when we started that process three years ago. Those lots are all gone. The next thing that happened is that other builders came in and snapped up all of the remaining lots and there were a variety of builders that did that. All of them went down to get a few building permits. Two builders in particular bought up large numbers of lots and they're building three or four homes at a time and so all the lots are now gone. All the builders who bought a couple of lots built those houses and now they can't find any more lots. So the number of permits being requested is dropping because there aren't any more lots. I met with Richard Bell and he said they've got about two years worth of lots coming up in the next round of development for Lakeland Village. They might come on line within a year and about two years after that all the lots are likely to be gone and built on and there isn't anymore space for Lakeland Village. The town of Allyn outside of Lakeland Village needs roads in order to develop more and beyond that there isn't any space in Allyn. I think your numbers are well taken. What it boils down to is that if we had infrastructure that curve would be even steeper.

(#0300) Wendy Ervin: You're saying that at a certain point in the not too distant future there is no more space in Allyn to put things, but he's saying that 40% of the growth in the future of Mason County is going to go into Allyn. How are you going to balance those two things?

(#0320) Buzz Moore: What I'm saying is that given that we have adequate land, adequate infrastructure, and things remain as they are now, they will grow that way. But if we run out of land ... that's why I say it's important to look at the available land we have.

(#0330) Wendy Ervin: He's saying that the land is restricted. So the Allyn UGA is essentially almost full?

(#0340) Tim Wing: There's one more expansion of Lakeland Village that's in the works. When that comes on line, there will be 200 new homesites and when they're gone, there aren't any more expansions planned for Lakeland Village. There isn't any usable land to speak of inside the UGA unless you improve the roads and expand Allyn. The Belfair UGA is coming on line with sewer and infrastructure and there's quite a bit of space there to develop. That may well reduce the potential growth in Allyn.

(#0375) Emmett Dobey: If we were to delay to a consideration in the growth boundary this year until 2006, would that, in your estimation, create a shortage of buildable sites next year? If we fail to act on enlarging the boundary this year, would that impose a hardship in the coming year?

(#0390) Buzz Moore: I have no idea.

(#0395) Jeannette Moore: It depends on how people would behave who have the land that would come into the UGA.

(#0400) Buzz Moore: I think that looking at the potential for growth that we have that if we're interested in income in Mason County, we should move on expanding the Allyn UGA. We're losing money if we don't.

(#0425) Jeanette Moore: I'm Jeanette Moore. I so appreciated listening to all the concerns that have been expressed here which reiterates my concern that we have too many moving parts, and too much conjecture and not enough data, and too little time. I don't know what the impact would be of delaying going before the GMHB by asking for a continuation of a few months. I don't know if that would hurt the county just terribly or not, but I do know that we think we've got something that we're working toward and all of a sudden it's gone. It seems to me that if everybody has to answer to the state timetable there is a real incentive to get it right. If one were to take the process that we have observed in the last month or two of how we're doing our urban growth boundaries and the process, I think the GMHB would be fascinated at this process. Does this process meet any standard that the state expects out of a county for establishing UGA boundaries. I suggest it may fall short and I would really hope that the county and the PAC would consider just ... as Steve Goins said, you want to do it right. Most of us on the Allyn planning committee all agree that we want to do it right. But there is a deadline imposed by the state, and I suggest that that GMHB requirement to do this is looking at this. The Allyn planning group worked all through the summer, which we normally have not done to try and get something worked out with Steve. We'll participate to the extent we can. It's not just Allyn; all of North Mason county is where there's going to be a lot of growth and rather than have it just trashed by poor planning we'd

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

like to see it all be great. Allyn will be a very different city than Belfair and Belfair will have it's own characteristics. Incidentally, in the WAC on GMA, on the UGA's, it says that we should be providing for the eventual incorporation of those areas should they wish to incorporate. They need to be cities. Tim Wing eluded to the high cost of houses in Lakeland Village. There is no land in Allyn for a subdivision for low or moderate income housing. We will not have diversity. We don't want that.

(#0580) Bill Dewey: We'll close the public hearing on population projections and allocations to the UGA's.

(#0595) Emmett Dobey: There are two other issues that we want to continue the public hearing on. That is Health and Human Services, which we haven't opened, and Harstine Island.

(#0605) Bill Dewey: So to be clear, we're not closing the public hearing on population projections and allocations to UGA's. We'll continue that until next week. So we'll move on to the newly created chapter for Health and Human Services.

(#0630) Steve Goins: I'm Steve Goins with Mason County Planning. To give you a brief overview and summary, there was a lot of public discussion on a range of topics during the Future Search Economic Summit and one of those was improving our ability to provide quality affordable health care in Mason County and improve our social and human services. The BOCC also believed this is something we should be focusing on and this element was included in this years work program. We have been collaborating on drafting this element with our Environmental Health folks and that process really is still evolving. This is a draft. We're trying to make further refinements to this at this time but we wanted to get this before you and get some input and continue this discussion and allow the public hearing to get us to the point where we could bring it to the BOCC as part of this years update. In summary, what we tried to achieve with this element is take a three pronged approach to addressing the concerns that have been raised. Looking at ways that from strictly a natural environment standpoint that we could be attempting to enhance the health of our community, and one of the ways we focused on that was through enhancements to improve our water quality, particularly drinking water for our Mason County residents. The second approach was looking at the health care sector itself. We discussed the economics of that side to a great extent in the Economic Development Element. This side of it was more of a practical approach to looking at the services that are provided in the county, evaluating what strengths the county has in this area, what deficiencies might exist. The strategies are set up so that the county can study this in a holistic fashion and come up with some valuable solutions that would be efficient to what needs to be done. The third approach is from a built environment standpoint. We wanted to look at ways which we could make this community one where people have more opportunities to recreate and have a proactive approach within themselves opportunities to improve their own health and be proactive in that way as a county. Earlier this year there was some discussion about how to enhance and make more accessible health care programs and I think Wendy discussed this during the Economic Development Element phase. We're still working with Environmental Health on how to provide language where a policy or strategy would address studying the feasibility of setting up some sort of medical savings plan. Health and Human Services had some insights in that particular arena but their comments were if it was this easy to do, everyone would be doing it. It's actually very complex; there a lot of federal and state laws how it's set up and how you accomplish it and we just need more time to figure out how to do that but the idea would be to insert something in here that would allow us to make a feasible way to approach and study that as part of an ongoing work program. We're still receiving public comments as well as other refinements that we're making.

(#0775) Jay Hupp: On the first page there's a statement next to the third bullet that says that estimates suggest that 65 years of age and older population will increase by 27.9% by 2025. That kind of a statement suggests to me that somebody pulled it out of their ear. Is there a study that can be cited for that? It detracts from the credibility of the document. That falls in the category of 'fluff' when I look at it. On page 4, we begin to hit pretty hard on water quality issues and it seems to me that water quality issues more properly fall in the Land Use Element as opposed to the Health and Human Services Element. There's a sentence here that gets into the limiting of number of wells that can be drilled and I'm not sure that that really has anything to do with health. Over on page 5, there's a policy to limit automobiles to community amenities.

(#0855) Steve Goins: The first point, it doesn't sound that that number is based on fact. I didn't cite the source of that, but that's based on OFM projections and those are part of a table ...

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

(#0868) Jay Hupp: Then I would suggest to cite that that's from the OFM.

(#0872) Steve Goins: Regarding water quality, there is a lot of language and policy regarding aquifers and other types of water quality in Mason County. We thought there wasn't a lot of analysis of just how much impact there could be to the amount of private wells that are being drilled and the maintenance of those wells is something that we thought would be something we thought would provide considerable enhancement to public health. If a water system is a private system and it's simply Tim and I that have to maintain that system and nobody else is monitoring that, we might be drinking water that maybe we shouldn't be drinking and we're not even checking that system to find out of the water quality is good. If there were systems in place where that water was being checked on a routine basis, the reality of that system would increase, and the probability that somebody was drinking poor water would decrease. That was part of the idea.

(#0915) Jay Hupp: I would agree with that if there was any indication that we're having health problems in this county as a result of private wells, but to my knowledge, that's not true. So if the assumption can be proven by some sort of statistics that's fine. Otherwise, it's just political rhetoric.

(#0935) Tim Wing: There's a huge problem in this state with people getting access to water, and what I'd like to see written there is that this county would work with state government to try to loosen up the log jam with getting permits to drill community wells. One of the big reasons that people drill individual wells, or two party wells, is because the state has been sitting on some of the Class A systems for more than 10 years. I'm never going to be in favor any kind of limitation on drilling individual wells unless I see a corresponding loosening up of the water systems.

(#0950) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#1020) Steve Clayton: As I understand it, the paragraph on page 4 was specific to critical aquifer recharge areas. I think Steve's goal is to better identify it and on the last page under (B) it is addressed there.

(#1040) Jay Hupp: I think the intent to limit private wells is hit upon fairly heavily in that paragraph on page 6, and I'm not sure that it's warranted under a discussion of public health. Seems to me that more properly fits under the discussion of land use.

(#1075) Steve Goins: The policies that are listed there, there's nothing in there that says we're going to eliminate private wells. But there is language that tries to encourage multi party wells which would also encourage the testing component. It would also speak to Tim's discussion about trying to be more proactive and coming up with ways to give people more options as to what their course of action might be for providing water. The third item that you brought up about the automobile access, the intent with that is not to discourage automobile access; the intent is to encourage alternate means of access. It's more of a physical fitness issue.

(#1120) Wendy Ervin: On the first page you say that people 65 years of age will increase to 27.9%. Then you say that 2% of people walk or bike to work and 1% use public transportation. Then you want to put in bike trails to serve whom? At this point, there's no indication that people are using bike trails. There's 2% who walk or bike to work. The population is getting older, and I don't believe you're going to ever see me going to the grocery store on a bike. Especially if those bike paths are put in so that I'm having to mix it up with cars. I have some real questions about the economics of having ... you've got the huff and puff trail that frankly I would use if I could take my dogs. There is no point in me going out for a walk if I can't take my dogs because they're the ones who really enjoy it. I'm working; they're having a ball, so I'm not going to walk unless I can take my dogs. And I don't believe I'm unusual. You're telling me that only 2% now do it and you want to put all this money into bike paths and have an integrated system.

(#1210) Diane Edgin: I have a feeling that those paths will probably be used by tourists more so than residents.

(#1212) Wendy Ervin: More than likely it's a tourist thing, but I'm not sure that we need to take our transportation and health services dollars and put it into paths. I don't want my money and the money that could be spent ... for the cost of putting in paths, you could provide free testing for the water if you're so

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

concerned about the water quality.

(#1250) Allan Borden: Where do you start? Don't you start somewhere with integrating pedestrian and moving pedestrian types of activities in a community plan? We're not talking about roads or sidewalks on Highway 3 near Benson Lake Road. We're talking about sidewalks in Belfair or the northern part of Shelton. If you ever walked in Shelton, it's real hazardous the way people drive. You see the same car three times when you're walking through town because that person is driving from one parking lot to another when they could have parked in the middle and walked to all three places. You've got to start somewhere and show by example.

(#1295) Steve Goins: I think part of the focus of this was to think ahead in 20 years and think about a county that's probably going to change and have more of an urban presence in some areas, particularly in North Mason county with Allyn and Belfair in providing more urban like services. That was the direction this was going. It wasn't trying to create a bike network across the whole county.

(#1320) Wendy Ervin: But the wording is that you're going to have an open space and trails and bikes that connects all parts of the county and I just find that to be grossly inappropriate.

(#1330) Bill Dewey: Steve, I had a comment on page 4. You have an explanation of the value of social programs and the range of services they can provide. Then in the goals and policies there's nothing reflected to add to that.

(#1344) Steve Goins: That's part of our finishing touches. We just haven't came up with the language yet for the strategy for that.

(#1355) Terri Jeffreys: Is it also possible to identify what social services the county does currently provide?

(#1358) Steve Goins: We were going to include that in the analysis portion of that by speaking to some specific things that we're doing or not doing.

(#1365) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#1400) Allan Borden: I don't see anything in here about the community efforts of Mason Matters. Or the Hospital Districts and the Fire Departments to work together to provide some of these needs.

(#1435) Tim Wing: Is this a required element?

(#1440) Steve Goins: No, it's not. We spoke about crafting this and talked about it in pretty general terms in a workshop a couple of months back. This is the first draft.

(#1450) Tim Wing: Are we going to try to compete this in time to put it into the plan?

(#1455) Steve Goins: That's correct.

(#1458) Tim Wing: And what still needs to be done?

(#1460) Steve Goins: Largely we feel there needs to be more bolstering to discussing the social end of this and strategies to speak to some of the social needs.

(#1565) Tim Wing: So we're going to see this one more time?

(#1468) Bill Dewey: We're going to continue the public hearing on it at Emmett's request.

(#1470) Tim Wing: I just want to say that I think it's a good start. It's a pretty broad topic. I having a hard time figuring out what you're really focusing on but I'm glad to see it.

(#1477) Jay Hupp: On page 4, on the private wells, it says 'A number of policies and programs that help protect critical aquifer recharge areas and assist in the management of watershed areas are already in place

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

and carried out at a local and state level. However, Mason County may wish to craft supplemental policies that further protect these critical resources by limiting the number of private wells'. Would somebody explain to me how you protect the critical aquifer recharge area by limiting the number of private wells?

(#1498) Steve Goins: One thought is that each hole in the ground not only is a well but it's an opportunity to inject into the aquifer and every time you create a hole in your aquifer like that it's an opportunity for something to go into the aquifer as well. Part of that lack of monitoring of some of those private wells is a potential problem. I'm not saying it is a problem in Mason County but it certainly can contribute to problems down the line.

(#1525) Jay Hupp: Except for the current standards under which those holes are poked in the ground. With all the compliance that has to take place before you put a well in the ground, I don't see how new wells can danger the aquifer. That just doesn't make sense to me.

(#1535) Steve Goins: There's probably wells out there that are forty or fifty years old that may have been built under the conditions that you described but they've been abandoned or different things have happened, and those are still holes in the ground that are out there.

(#1555) Jay Hupp: But we're talking about new wells.

(#1558) Steve Goins: New wells in forty or fifty years will be old wells.

(#1560) Wendy Ervin: If those old wells are abandoned, they're no longer providing water so they are not a health issue in terms of potable water.

(#1565) Jay Hupp: He's talking about contaminated water and you're talking about pulling water out of the ground. That's two different subjects.

(#1575) Jay Hupp: My problem is that under current standards for drilling a well and protecting the aquifer with that drilling procedure, I don't see how it endangers the aquifer to be drilling new wells.

(#1588) Tim Wing: With all of that being said, I've been out and seen wells that have no caps on them, no house nearby, and I could have dumped 10 gallons of gasoline down it and I've also seen places that are supposedly residences that have all kinds of garbage and contaminated things around the well area, so I'm for punching as few holes in the aquifer as possible but I'm not willing to even step towards that unless the state will work towards opening up permitting Class A systems so that you can get big water systems with well managed wells that don't propose any problems.

(#1640) Allan Borden: When picking at a phrase in a sentence and dwelling on it too long, I think you're failing to get what Steve is trying to get across and that is the potential for contamination from activities is not necessarily the number of wells but you could interject to owners to protect their own resources as well as their neighbors to maintain water quality. You're correct, Jay, that you're not going to affect aquifers by drilling wells but you certainly would by bad land practices around wells.

(#1675) Jay Hupp: Okay, then say that.

(#1678) Emmett Dobey: You have a number of existing wells that need to be checked because they do create contamination issues. You need new wells drilled as few as you can with the idea, especially in the UGA's, that you're moving people towards public systems where there's more accountability that water is going to be provided in a safe manner. That's the idea. It's not to limit wells; it's to provide a safer source of water and I think it's pretty clearly demonstrated that one way to do that is putting people on a public water system so there's more accountability.

(#1700) Bill Dewey: I think that intent is clear and I think there's just a lot of sensitivity over the concern that it would limit our ability to grow if we were forced in that direction until the state gets their water rights straightened out. Let's open up the public hearing.

(#1722) Jeff Carey: I'm Jeff Carey. If this is not mandated, while I think it's important to have, and we have all

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

these other things, if we get hung up for time, I just don't see why we should push to get this before trying to get all the other things done. The stats are interesting but the stats are meaningless in the sense that you've got some other issues in play. The reason I say they're meaningless is that you can draw some false conclusions by these stats. You have an older population versus the state. That may explain some of the things. You have more government workers per capita in this county than you do in other counties. Just by having the stats the way that they are it's very hard to conclude what it is. If we're going to down this route there needs to be a major education effort because somehow we're screwing up more per thousand than most other counties. Health care; this county is never going to compete with any of the other counties. You talk to anybody that has anything of any serious nature and nobody gives this county a second thought. They go to Seattle. From 1990 to 2000 you had roughly 11,000 transplants here. They have all their medical things already happening with the doctors they've known for years. They're not going to switch. I didn't switch mine until mine retired. You've got to be careful where you're focusing. In my mind, there's no way this county can compete in trying to bring all the different services that they would like to have here in this area. Better yet, where we can't, figure out how to get our people there quickly and efficiently.

(#1835) Bill Dewey: Any other public comment? We'll go ahead and continue that hearing and move on to Harstine Island.

(#1845) Bob Fink: This is a pretty straight forward amendment which is to delete this one policy. The only reason it's being delayed is because in our public notice we said it would be available on our website and it wasn't put on the website and so we had a concern that people didn't have a fair chance to review it. That's why we are requesting you continue it for another week.

(#1880) Terri Jeffreys: Is there communication happening with the Harstine Point community and all the things we've dealt with at Harstine Island this year?

(#1888) Diane Edgin: The only person out there that probably cares ... there's not that many people out there that would have a fuss about this.

*Break in meeting.*

(#1945) Bill Dewey: We'll take up the updated Housing Element.

(#1948) Barbara Adkins: I'm Barbara Adkins, planner with the Department of Community Development. The Housing and Land Use; you had a workshop on these back in May. This is not new; it's just time to bring it back and do the public hearing on it. It's been on the web for several months. The Housing was just an updated based on the change of the timeline. There was also some information taken from the Housing Needs Assessment done in 2000. I want to bring to your attention that I sent you the draft that you were given at that time dated April 18. Steve brought to my attention that he had made comments at that time and we went through them and agreed we had no problem with them and I made those changes, but that version did not get out to you. What I handed you today is two versions of the changes. One is the marked up version. There were only a couple of changes that Steve gave me and they were highlighted and put in there.

(#2095) Wendy Ervin: I have a question about really laid back language like 'encourage the availability of' and 'define and establish the need' but not necessarily what to do with it. 'Encourage affordable housing through innovative land use techniques' ... 'as part of the Comp program to address the affordability issue' ... you would not have an affordability issue for you what call affordable housing if there was a strong economic base to our county so that people had jobs that made them enough money to afford whatever house they want. It's just a wrong slant that we need to address an affordability issue instead of saying we need to build the economy. When you are making some of these policies and designing places for supposed low income people and tighter accommodations, there's an increased need for police and fire and social services that goes into the price of that housing but it's a silent factor. It may look like cheap housing but in the end it becomes very expensive housing if people are pushed into a social situation that aggravates the problem.

(#2255) Bill Dewey: I had a comment on the multifamily units. It says 'According to 2000 census information, the % of multifamily units in several surrounding counties, as well as the state, is more than double that of

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

Mason County'. We also have a high percentage of mobile homes and trailers. It seems like, if I interpret this right, that we would allow people that might be interested in living in multifamily units maybe in the UGA's where it's efficient to provide infrastructure and services to those people, because we don't have those multifamily units available are doing the next most affordable thing which is to go put a trailer or a mobile home on a lot out in the rural area where it costs the county more to provide services to those people. Since our multifamily unit inventory is far less than other counties, it seems like we should have a policy to try to increase that.

(#2300) Tim Wing: I can tell you that multifamily housing units, at least in the north end where we have not had sewers, don't pencil out very well because of the cost of putting septic systems in. You have to buy too big a piece of ground because of the septic system, and it's expensive to put the septic system in and maintain it.

(#2340) Bill Dewey: I appreciate that, and I understand that, but we do have UGA's with sewers ultimately designated so it seems like we should have policies of getting multifamily units into those UGA's.

(#2355) Jay Hupp: It doesn't pencil out in Shelton. We've had a number of builders who have looked at that, and simply because of the permitting process that they have to wade through with the time and expense, so it just does not make sense for a builder to build multifamily units.

(#2375) Bill Dewey: Is that specific to Mason County?

(#2378) Jay Hupp: The argument that I hear is that it is peculiar to Mason County.

(#2385) Wendy Ervin: There's a difference between someone who buys a manufactured home and puts it on a piece of property and they own it and the person who rents an apartment, and those are not necessarily the same person. I don't think you're going to move a person off their own property into an apartment easily.

(#2400) Bill Dewey: I'm not suggesting that. I'm suggesting that if that multifamily was available, a certain percentage of the people that are now buying trailers or modulars might opt for that instead. I'm also saying from a growth management standpoint it makes a lot more sense from the standpoint of providing infrastructure is if they're willing, we should have that choice available.

(#2430) Jay Hupp: From the big picture standpoint, there's a opportunity to really look at one of the mandatory planning elements of the Comp Plan and really ask ourselves the question of are we supporting the objective of affordable housing in all of the other things we're doing in the rest of the implementation. Could you make a policy that would facilitate the development of multifamily structures? You bet. You could create financial incentives to builders that would make it sensible for them to pencil out.

(#2460) Wendy Ervin: Could we insert some kind of a statement or goal that the permitting and the groundwork made less onerous if somebody is building multifamily?

(#2575) Allan Borden: It's not the regulations; it's the infrastructure. You can't build in the Shelton UGA because more than half of it is in the aquifer recharge area, which requires special septic systems. If it was on sewer, it wouldn't matter.

(#2495) Wendy Ervin: But the comment was made that the permitting for these things was a serious problem even in the ...

(#2500) Jay Hupp: It's the whole difficulty of the regulatory environment, the permitting environment; what a builder has to wade through in order to get the sticks going up in the air just doesn't pencil out.

(#2515) Steve Clayton: We approved the Belfair plan this year. Prior to that the UGA was entirely mixed use with a maximum density of 6 units an acre, and now we have strips that are 5 and 10 and literally unlimited density along the corridor that is new this year. Allyn has an interim zoning for their area with densities. Jeff, what's your maximum density in Allyn?



## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

(#2542) Jeff Carey: It's 20.

(#2545) Steve Clayton: It's a brand new ordinance that's on an interim basis and last year or two years ago a developer who wanted to do multifamily wouldn't be able to do it in Belfair or Allyn. As of this year the zoning is there to do it in places in Belfair and Allyn.

(#2555) Bill Dewey: So you're saying that once the sewer infrastructure is there that we'll likely see those multifamily units.

(#2570) Jay Hupp: Sewer is available in Shelton and it still doesn't pencil out here.

(#2580) Tim Wing: The other issue, in my opinion, is that nobody ever moved to Mason County to live in an apartment, or even live in a city. I think that principle is going to continue to be the case. People who live in apartments tend to like to live in urban areas. They're often temporary places and then they move on. I've never felt like we're going to see a tremendous amount of apartments, but know we're going to see multifamily housing, townhouses, in Allyn.

(#2600) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#2800) Bill Dewey: Is there any kind of guidance within the GMA as far as provision for multifamily units?

(#2805) Bob Fink: Nothing specific.

(#2810) Barbara Adkins: We didn't address the policies in this. The work program just directs that we update the timeline. So all the policies in here are the same as they've always been. In order for us to change them, I think we need to get together a group of people consisting of Habitat for Humanity, and the Mason County Housing Coalition, and really redo these policies the right way. All we're going tonight is just looking at the numbers and the new information that came from the Housing Assessment. We can't really do much with policies at this point.

(#2840) Bob Fink: We are going to revisit housing next year.

(#2860) Terri Jeffreys: I see an awful lot of information in here that could lead to policies to be developed, but they aren't in here now. I will reserve my comments under the promise that this is actually on the work program, otherwise, I will personally volunteer to rewrite this myself. There's a lot of good info but it's not leading anywhere. It's also not coordinated with the Land Use Element. You use 1.94 persons per dwelling unit to determine how many housing units are needed, and you use 2.5 in your Land Use demand, so we need to coordinate that. Your housing demand is very flat lined. You're basing it on what people currently are sitting on; it has nothing to do with what people may want that doesn't exist. I think we need to rework a lot of this and I would volunteer my time to do such a thing. Just to let you know, the medium priced house is \$160,000 in this county and just talking to a realtor and mortgage broker, that takes about an income of \$52,000 a year to afford that on zero down, and that's not including an extra \$150.00 for mortgage insurance. We do have an affordability issue.

(#3000) Tim Wing: If you look under the column that says 'building permits'. Mason county is up to 8.9%. I've been harping that we need to pay attention to what's happening in our neighboring counties. Kitsap County, which had a huge demand, was down almost 30%, and it's because they ran out of lots. Thurston County; there's a moratorium there that you can't develop any new plats and you can't do any cluster plats; they're down 20%. Pierce County; huge growth there, but they're only up 2.2%. We grew, to a large degree, because of what happened outside of our county, and as long as we continue to only look at our own numbers, we're not seeing the whole picture.

(#3080) Bill Dewey: Do we have any public testimony? We'll open up the public hearing portion.

(#3100) Jeff Carey: Jeff Carey here. We need to get these documents in balance. Table V.3-8, Year Structure Built. This is where I'm telling you that you're 70's and 80's are totally out of sync. You're talking 20% difference in number of structures. If you look at 80's through '88, you're looking at almost 5,800 and

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

then look at the '80 through '89 below and you only have 4,800. Same occurs in 1970 -1979. There's no way you could lose those homes.

(#3200) Barbara Adkins: I see that. I'll have to go back and look at the census data.

(#3205) Bob Fink: There are a lot of seasonal homes.

(#3210) Jeff Carey: I'll wait until Land Use because there's things going back and forth here between Land Use and Housing and just don't make any sense. On 4.2, where you say you need roughly 13,754 homes in 20 years. You're basing in on population going in, but you're got to remember this county has built all kinds of homes with nobody going into them. So theoretically that should be 15,000 - 16,000 homes, not 13,754. You've got a vacancy rate. You're talking about population coming into the county, which is whatever number you want to use. That's people coming here. I'm saying you've been building forever houses beyond what people have been coming here. So instead of 13,754, it should be 15,000 - 16,000 homes.

(#3330) Tim Wing: Most of those places where you can build that summer home are already built on and there's not a lot of new ones going in.

(#3340) Jeff Carey: I understand that's if other lots don't open up. We have all kinds of people in our area that have a house that also have a house in Phoenix. Their full time residence is there; not here. It's not 13,754 homes if this population is correct. It's something more. Just get it in balance.

(#3400) Bill Dewey: So we'll close the public hearing on the Housing Element. Let's move on to the Land Use Element.

(#3500) Barbara Adkins: Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development. Land Use. We went over this in May. All those changes have been there for quite some time. There's two things that got changed recently. One is on page 26 of your clean copy. It was 50% and it's been changed to 25% greater than projected. I added information starting on page 20. Table 3-7 shows the acreage of Improved, Unimproved, Timber. This table was already in there. Underneath that is the Land Capacity / Build Out Analysis and that's new. This is what I've been working on for several months, taking the Assessor's parcel data, separating out all the parcels of the UGA's so I'm just left with pure, rural county parcel data. Taking that and breaking it down by its existing land use and finding out what its zoning is. The purpose of that is to determine parcel by parcel what the land is being used for, how big that piece of land is, what zoning district its in, and what its residential potential could be. What we're trying to accomplish is to determine should each parcel be developed to its maximum potential as a residential parcel, how many more people could be added to the rural areas.

(#3800) Jay Hupp: One of the great difficulties we ran into in the business demographics study, in determining where businesses were and what the size of them was, was that the Assessor's Office doesn't really know what land is currently being used for, particularly as it pertains to commercial use. People have a tendency not to tell the Assessor that they're running a business on that property because it will jack the taxes up. So that gives you a very distorted picture if that's your data base. Particularly when you try to find out what the land is being used for.

(#0080) Barbara Adkins: That was the data base that we used and I don't know of any other way of getting that amount of data with that kind of information without actually visiting the sites.

(#0095) Jay Hupp: You can get it from both the Department of Revenue and the Department of Employment Security, which will give it to you in a GPS form. It will depict where these businesses are.

(#0105) Barbara Adkins: Will it tell me the land use of every single parcel in the county?

(#0110) Jay Hupp: No. From the Department of Revenue it will tell you where the businesses are located that have a business license. From Employment Security it will tell you where the businesses are located that have employees.

(#0115) Bob Fink: That's not really what's being investigated here. This analysis is focused a little differently.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

(#0140) Diane Edgin: On page 21, on this table, you're saying there's 18,809 parcels. Existing dwellings on the same parcel is 18,787. Are those the same parcels?

(#0150) Barbara Adkins: Yes.

(#0152) Diane Edgin: It seems like there are very few vacant parcels out there.

(#0155) Barbara Adkins: Those aren't vacant; those are just residential parcels that don't have a dwelling unit.

(#0165) Wendy Ervin: So there's 42,035 residential parcels?

(#0175) Barbara Adkins: Yes, outside the UGA's.

(#0185) Tim Wing: So you're saying there's almost 19,000 empty lots that are buildable that are worth over \$20,000?

(#0188) Barbara Adkins: Yes.

(#0198) Bob Fink: That's one of the difficulties of using the Assessor data. They'll call a lot residential, but there won't be a house on it. There may be a garage, or an outbuilding, and they'll class it as residential. So we screen that by putting in a \$20,000 building value on it. We may get some expensive garages, and we may miss some inexpensive houses, but the numbers balance pretty well with the numbers you expect to see countywide with the census numbers.

(#0275) Tim Wing: In the first column it says there's almost 19,000 vacant parcels. Was there any screening in terms value of those parcels?

(#0282) Bob Fink: No, I don't think so.

(#0285) Tim Wing: Is your report suggesting those are buildable parcels?

(#0288) Barbara Adkins: Yes.

(#0290) Tim Wing: But there was no screening in terms of the value of the parcels, or the size?

(#0292) Barbara Adkins: They had to be a certain acreage for whatever the septic requirement is for how big a lot has to be.

(#0302) Wendy Ervin: So there wasn't any calculation as to how much it sat on a slope or anything like that?

(#0308) Barbara Adkins: No. Just minimum lot size for septic.

(#0315) Tim Wing: I know in the past people have said we don't need any more lots because there's already 20,000 lots out there that haven't been built on and until we use all those up you don't need to create any more. If this is every lot that's a third of an acre or bigger, a certain percentage of them are useless. They're either land locked or under a swamp or on a hill or on a gravel road. So I'm concerned about having a number in there that isn't at least qualified. There's no guarantee that all of these can be built on.

(#0340) Bob Fink: The total number of critical areas in the county is approximately 16%. Here we were dealing a lot with acreage and the redivision of land, and our experience in acreage is that people will find a building site. There were some subdivisions done that were either 90% wetland buffer or stream buffer, and they still managed to find the full number of building sites they were allowed under the regulations. With regard to the lot size, under current regulations, people use BLA's to enlarge an existing parcel all the time to make it buildable. They could create lots where they couldn't if they didn't change the boundary.

(#0410) Tim Wing: I know all about that, but I'd be more comfortable with a qualifying statement with an

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

asterisk on it that says in no way does this mean that these are all buildable lots. That number is thrown around as justification for not being allowed to do subdivisions, because you've got 20,000 lots why do you need any more? If you factor in the gravel roads, and the swamps, and the steep slopes, etc., I can tell you that I would estimate at least a third of those are not a piece of property anyone would buy.

(#0440) Jay Hupp: I completely agree with Tim. I think those numbers have been more than just thrown around. I think they've been jammed down our throats.

(#0444) Bob Fink: We certainly should have adequate disclaimers on this analysis, but it does give you an order of magnitude of what is possible in the rural area under current zoning, and that was the intent of it.

(#0450) Bill Dewey: Yes, you have to start somewhere.

(#0452) Wendy Ervin: It gives an analysis and it represents an enormous body of work. If you went through every parcel, you deserve to be applauded.

(#0495) Tim Wing: Can we develop a footnote on that one number, Barbara?

(#0500) Barbara Adkins: Yes, I understand what you're saying.

(#0502) Terri Jeffreys: And you're going to include in your methodology the .3 acre lot sizes?

(#0505) Barbara Adkins: Yes.

(#0510) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#0555) Terri Jeffreys: How many persons per dwelling unit is the county going to be using as planning as a solid number?

(#0560) Barbara Adkins: It's using 2.5.

(#0562) Bob Fink: That's the census number. The number we've been using consistently for the last five years is 2.5.

(#0600) Terri Jeffreys: I just want to put in the record that I don't agree that 2.5 is an accurate number for this county, especially if you go out 20 years.

(#0612) Wendy Ervin: What do you think it is?

(#0615) Terri Jeffreys: OFM has it lower, and it seems like a small percentage, but when you're talking about acres of land needed, it really starts adding up. I think we need to take a better look at that number.

(#0630) Wendy Ervin: Towards the back of the document it talks about Countywide Planning policies and Mason County Planning Policies. To me it's the same thing.

(#0650) Terri Jeffreys: Countywide means it was done in conjunction with the City of Shelton. It's intergovernmental.

(#0700) Jay Hupp: Under Aquatic Management Areas, one of the things that I know a lot of people have wrestled with over the years is the different types of streams and waters. I know that's covered and we give reference to the WAC's they're defined under, but when people go through a document like this and try to get an understanding of what the types mean, it becomes very difficult to try to search out another document. Those definitions of water types are very frequently misunderstood and there needs to be a ready source of information so people can grasp the meaning of types 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. If we could put it in here just in a couple of paragraphs.

(#0700) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

(#1100) Jay Hupp: Under Rural Character, there is a list of bullet items, and we make no mention of the glaring rural character of this community, which is the majority of businesses in this county are located outside the UGA's. It defines the economic character.

(#1150) Tim Wing: Let's put it in there.

(#1170) Jay Hupp: Okay.

(#1200) Bill Dewey: We'll go ahead and open up the public testimony portion.

(#1220) Jeff Carey: I'm Jeff Carey. My message is simply. We need to match up the numbers between the different documents. On page 7, when you start breaking out the incorporated Shelton and unincorporated areas, because those have UGA's with their own population counts, you should be slipping those in at some point in time. Wherever it references that Allyn is 1,400 acres, it's 1,167. It affects what you're trying to allocate for population. When we make the statement of 5,500 acres, is that just the UGA's outside the City of Shelton?

(#1300) Barbara Adkins: It appears that it doesn't include it.

(#1320) Jeff Carey: On housing where it shows 25,515 total structures. First of all, I have a definition problem. You have improved and partially improved and ... what's a partially improved residential structure?

(#1365) Bob Fink: It's the improved acreage and so you have parcels with improved acreage and then you have ... partially improved means the entire parcel is not improved.

(#1375) Jeff Carey: I missed the acreage part. So on page 15 of the Land Use, we have 19,564 for residential and then the vacant 4,400; is that vacant structures?

(#1395) Barbara Adkins: Those are parcels. They're classified by the Assessor's Office as vacant.

(#1400) Jeff Carey: Tell me how we get to 25,000, or does this not include ... is that missing link the City of Shelton? Even that wouldn't make sense.

(#1410) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#1485) Emmett Dobey: I'd like to make a suggestion. I'd like to clearly understand what Jeff's concerns are, so I'd like to suggest that you come in and sit down with us and we'll go through it together. Then we'll bring it back next week. We'll look at the discrepancies and try to resolve those for you.

(#1500) Bill Dewey: That's a good suggestion, Emmett. Thank you. So we'll continue the public hearing on the Land Use Element until next week.

(#1525) Wendy Ervin: Under the Planning Policies, there's a great deal here about where to put ... this is intended to guide future land use and capital facility investment decisions. There's a lot of stuff about where to put people, etc., but nothing about economics or business, developing places to put industry, nothing about where those people are going to work. I just want to keep from designing us as a totally bedroom county. The more we ignore business and industry the more bedroomy we get. There should be something in that policy dealing with the land use issue that we're encouraging industry.

(#1575) Tim Wing: Is it possible to refer them to the Economic Development Element?

(#1585) Wendy Ervin: You had asked if I would sit down with her and go through this and do some editing and maybe I can put in a recommendation and then it's going to come back to you.

(#1592) Jay Hupp: I think it's important for it to be in this element because this is part of bringing that step child into the picture.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 7, 2005

(#1600) Bill Dewey: Wendy, is that something you'd be willing to do between now and next week?

(#1602) Wendy Ervin: Yes. Can I make an appointment and come in and meet with you?

(#1605) Barbara Adkins: Yes. Bob, are we adding policies?

(#1620) Bob Fink: The intent is not to revisit these issues, but if there's something that needs finer modification there's still time to do that. We will need to make sure the public is aware of the changes proposed so they have a chance to review them.

(#1665) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second to continue the Population Projections, Health and Human Services, and Land Use Element public hearings are continued to next week. Motion passes. We closed the public hearing on the Housing Element. The Transportation Element discussion will be continued until next week, also.

*Meeting adjourned.*