

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
December 4, 2006

(Note audio tape (#3) dated December 4, 2006
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, Tim Wing, Diane Edgin, Wendy Ervin. Terri Jeffreys and Jay Hupp were excused.

Staff Present: Steve Goins, Barbara Adkins, Allan Borden, Susie Ellingson, and T.J. Martin.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0025) Bill Dewey opened the meeting up stated there are four public hearing this evening. First, we'll have the public hearing on the Shaw Family Rezone request.

(#0055) Allan Borden of the Department of Community Development opened the hearing. This is a rezone request by the Shaw Family LLC. It is a 97.8 acre parcel and the request is not a change in zoning but a change in Comprehensive Plan designation from Long Term Commercial Resource Land to Inholding Lands, which is also a Resource Land designation. The purpose of the request,

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

according to the applicant, is possible land division in the future to create residential lots. The property is located along Matlock-Brady Road approximately 7.5 miles south of Matlock. The properties to the east and south are Inholding Lands already, and lands to the north and west are Long Term Commercial Forest. Single family residences exist along the county road in the vicinity. The subject property was considered during the Growth Management Comprehensive Plan review in 1993 and 1994 for resource lands designations and the subject property was found to meet the Long Term Commercial Forest designation when it's included in the block of lands to the north and west that are under continued management. Lands surrounded by Long Term Commercial Forest are designated as Inholding Lands and that's why the 35 acre parcel to the south is designated as Inholding Lands. (*Allan indicates location on map*). Allan discussed a wetland feature that comes down and connects with Decker Creek. The representative of the applicant, Mr. Whitehouse, provided me some information to say that DNR found that was an untyped stream, even though in my staff report I state it is a Type 4 stream. I looked on the county maps and it shows it's a wetland. That's a feature that will affect development in the future.

My staff report goes through the rezone criteria and how the request meets those criteria that have to do with public safety, whether it's a consistent designation, does it encourage rural sprawl, does it affect demand of urban services in the rural area, or does it affect the provision of urban services in urban areas? Does it affect open space and critical area protection that the GMA provides for? Does the request increase the pressure for further redesignations in the future? Those were reviewed and I summarized my findings, which are listed on page 6 of the staff report. I talk about each criteria and if it was met based upon the evaluation. Criterion 1 is not met because of the concern of available water rights to develop at this potential intensity. In criterion 2 there's an error. It should say it is not met because the staff evaluation is not on RR 5 but that Long Term Commercial Forest is the most applicable designation. (*Allan illustrates on map*). There's no reason presented by the application that this land doesn't still meet the Long Term Commercial Forest designation. Criterion 3 is not met as this change in designation would cause sprawling low density development in an area where it currently does not exist. Criterion 4 is met as there would be no increase of demand for urban services in the rural area. Criterion 5 is met as it wouldn't interfere with GMA goal of encourage development in urban areas. Criterion 6 is not met as it would be difficult to retain open space and protect critical areas. Criterion 7 is not met as there is a greater pressure for further requests for designation in this vicinity and elsewhere.

The original request was to go to Inholding Lands or RR 10. Even the consideration of RR 10 is not possible as it would actually create an island of a different designation. It would be hard for the average person to know that land designation is different than the land next door. Your choices are to recommend approval of the proposal as the applicant has requested; recommend denial of the proposal; or recommend modification of the proposal following public comment.

(#0600) Wendy Ervin inquired if Inholding Lands was an automatic 1 to 5 density.

(#0610) Allan Borden responded that it was.

(#0650) Bill Dewey stated Allan mentioned that this isn't a rezone but a change in designation. Bill inquired if it is still appropriate to apply the rezone criteria if it is a change in designation.

(#0690) Allan Borden responded that it was.

(#0705) Bill Dewey continued on saying that logically the criteria should apply but from a code standpoint legally do they need to apply for a redesignation?

(#0735) Allan Borden responded that the only relevant designation criteria would be #2. The other six criteria would evaluate what would happen under that Inholding designation. Inholding doesn't

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

have a resource land purpose to it; it's just protecting the actually adjacent resource lands and making sure that activities on Inholding Lands do not interfere with Long Term Commercial Forest operations.

(#775) Bill Dewey inquired about the text on page 1 of the staff report and if it should say 'not met' instead of 'met'.

(#0800) Allan Borden stated that was an error.

(#0810) Tim Wing inquired if someone is in Inholding Lands and wanted to subdivide the property into 5's or 10's or 20's could they get a total rezone at that point.

(#0835) Allan Borden responded that they could not because the development standard in the RO for Inholding Lands is at a 1 to 5 density. They could then come to the county and divide it into 5 acre densities.

(#0850) Tim Wing inquired if there were any dwellings on the site right now.

(#0865) Allan Borden responded that there was a house, a couple of out buildings, and a large barn. It is currently occupied.

(#0875) Tim Wing inquired how they could be Long Term Commercial Forest if there's a house on there.

(#08900) Allan Borden responded that you can have one residence per 80 acres on Long Term Commercial Forest property.

(#0895) Tim Wing inquired if the residents that own it and live there today asked to be zoned Long Term Commercial Forest.

(#0900) Allan Borden stated that he did not review the records from 13 or 14 years ago.

(#0920) Tim Wing inquired if they would have had a choice at the time.

(#0930) Allan Borden responded that they would have had a choice. They would have been notified that their property was being considered for Long Term Commercial Forest designation.

(#0935) Tim Wing inquired if they had said they would rather be Inholding Lands would they have been allowed to do that.

(#0945) Wendy Ervin inquired if they had said no to Long Term Commercial Forest what would they then have been assigned.

(#0960) Allan Borden stated probably Inholding Lands.

(#0970) Miscellaneous discussion regarding adjacent land sizes and uses.

(#1000) Tim Wing stated that in that area of the county there are very few people living there and inquired if the intention of the county is that there would never be very many people living there; that it would always be forest land.

(#1015) Allan Borden stated for the most part it would be forest land.

(#1050) Bill Dewey noted an error on page 4. The sentence should read 'The subject parcel could

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

continue to operate some level of timber management and be more appropriately designated as the requested Inholding Lands, *rather* than the current Long Term Commercial Forest designation'. You could also drop the last part of the sentence after the comma and it would still make sense.

(#1100) Wendy Ervin inquired about the taxes and if their taxes will go up in Inholding Lands designation.

(#1125) Allan Borden stated the Assessor's office would evaluate the zoning of it but these lands are typically in designated timber lands so they have a fairly low tax rate already. The Comprehensive Plan designation is a commitment to keep it in timber management for 100 years. The taxation is an agreement between the property owner and the Assessor's office to tax at a certain rate with the understanding that if it no longer is in timber management back taxes will have to be paid. If they change over to Inholding Lands designation and still retain the low tax rate as long as they continue timber management.

(#1175) Bill Dewey open the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#1200) Steve Whitehouse, representing the applicant, testified first. He stated he submitted the application on behalf of the Shaw Family LLC. This is a parcel of property that's been in the Shaw Family for about 95 years. We tried to show in our application how this parcel is really in line with a sequence of parcels in both directions along Matlock-Brady Road. There are two things that help indicate that. (*Steve Whitehead shows property and adjacent parcels on map*). What we're asking for is to simply keep the designations consistent with existing ones. Steve stated that he calculated within one mile of this property there are 59 parcels that are either Inholding Lands or qualified for it. All we're asking for is that this parcel be designated consistent with that. The GMA talks about the goals. Some of the perceptions is that there shouldn't be any development at all and that's not what it's supposed to do. There are going to be some changes like this, and we're simply trying to manage it and make it consistent with an overall plan. RCW 367A.020 talks about a number of criteria. Steve referenced three of those. 'Number 1 is to 'encourage development in urban areas where adequate public services and facilities exist or can be provided in an efficient manner'. The second one is housing; 'encouraging the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population in the state and promote a variety of residential densities and housing types'. The next one is property rights. 'Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property rights of the landowner shall be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions'. Steve added they will present some information later about what type of an economic impact the current designation has on the Shaw Family. It's very significant. There were some questions asked about some of the criteria and whether or not the criteria that Allan went through are the ones to be applied or the criteria from RE-207. It's unclear. As I read Allan's report, it's my understanding that if the 35 acres to the north were set aside that the staff would recommend that this be converted to Inholding. That would not necessarily be an unsatisfactory result to us. We would like to see the entire parcel be designated Inholding. (*Steve hands out document showing change of typing for the stream that goes into Decker Creek*). They took a look at this creek and it is a seasonal creek. It is dry a portion of the year. On the east side of the road there's a place where it goes underground and it disappears. It was examined and agreed upon this should be a nontyped stream. If the PAC feel something less is appropriate we don't have any objection to that. There are some possible limitations with regard to the availability of water. At least right now that's an issue that would have to be dealt with. Regarding taxes, I figured out that the increase in revenue for the county, if it were able to be developed with some residences, would be about \$50,000.00 a year, which is quite substantial. A lot of this property doesn't really generate much in taxes right now at all. Steve talked about the criteria. When they talk about #1 they focus on a really identifiable harm. Having a few new homes is not going to create damage to public health. So to say it's not met is incorrect. Is it going to be consistent with the Comp Plan? I believe it is. I don't think the idea is to necessarily leave everything out there as

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

Long Term Commercial Forest. Where we're talking along a major access route I believe it is anticipated that is going to change. Cumulative impacts is a subjective criteria in terms of the fact that anytime you build a house there's potential for cumulative impact, but in this case, it's something to be anticipated. Is there going to be a demand for public services? There are likely to be a few more school children, an occasional additional fire call, but if they were to live somewhere else in the county you would have the same sort of impact. Next, would it interfere with the goals of GMA? The criteria talks about preservation of open space and to conserve F & W habitat and to generally protect the environment. I don't think anybody has made an argument that this would hurt the environment. The goals of GMA are broader than what that criteria says. I've gone through that. You could argue that any development at all could have some minor impacts. One property per five acres is going to leave a lot of open space. Increasing the pressure for surrounding land owners to pursue new designations, a good deal of the adjacent property is already in some more intensive designation. Mr. Conklin is here and he will talk to you about the financial impact of this. We hope you will consider this request and are happy to discuss a mitigation plan with you if that is appropriate. (*Miscellaneous discussion of the creek and where it flows and empties*).

(#2000) Jeff Conklin, local real estate broker in Mason County, testified that he has been asked by the Shaw Family to take a look at the property to determine a couple of things. First off, what the value of the property might be in its present configuration under its current zoning, and then what the value of the property might be if we could have freely subdivided the property prior to GMA, and thirdly, to take a look at the value of the property if it were to be reclassified as Inholding. (*Jeff handed out valuation documentation*). On the cover sheet, my estimate in terms of the value of the property as it exists today is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500,000. If we were able to subdivide it prior to GMA, the value today would be somewhere between \$2.5 and \$2.8 million dollars. In the case of rezoning it to Inholding with a 1 to 5 density, we'd have values between \$1.2 and \$1.5 million dollars. So the impact of this property being placed in a Long Term Commercial Forest designation is significant to the family. One of the things we know now by experience that GMA is doing is actually not providing affordable housing and doing just the opposite. In a free market society when scarcity is in place, costs go up, and that's exactly what our experience in the real estate market has been in the last three or four years. We're simply pricing younger families out of their ability to buy land and build housing. We believe this property fits the criteria of being placed in Inholding.

(#2315) Steve Whitehouse mentioned that there were some inquiries made about what people would have done had they known about what was going on with GMA and when GMA was put into affect individual property owners were never notified of what was happening. The Shaw Family was never notified individually about what was going to be done with their property. The Shaw Family would never have agreed to that. It was something that essentially was imposed upon them.

(#2300) Bill Dewey inquired if there was any more public testimony. There was no one else wishing to testify so Bill closed the public comment period of the hearing. Bill opened up the PAC discussion.

(#2375) Tim Wing mentioned Criteria #6 where apparently there is an effort to protect slopes and open space and erosion through the use of the zoning. He stated he doesn't see the need to do that as there are other rules associated with all of those issues that require setbacks and engineering studies. That appears to be a double layer in attempt to protect issues like that.

(#2440) Wendy Ervin noted that Mr. Whitehouse felt that GMA was not intended to stifle development and drive young people out of their ability to buy housing in the county. I think he's wrong and that's the deliberate intent of it and it's working.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

(#2460) Tim Wing talked about Criteria #1 regarding the adequate water supply. Zoning is not the way we need to deal with that issue. If there's adequate water to create an appropriate number of lots then there's adequate water. If there isn't adequate water, the county's rules and regulations won't let you create more lots than there's water for. They won't let you create a lot if there's no water.

(#2550) Wendy Ervin discussed Criteria #1, matching the characteristics of the area to be rezoned, and that there is already an Inholding zone there. That section of the county isn't in any danger of being over run by Inholding lands or runaway residential development.

(#2650) Tim Wing stated the issue of density is something we should focus on and we should not provide for enormous development out there but this is no where close to that. If you have five kids and you can't subdivide a piece of property and there's no lots to buy then four of them would have to move into quarter acre lots inside a UGA. That's not what the people of Mason County ever moved here for. There aren't enough five acre pieces near the UGA's now to satisfy the need for people who want to live out in the rural area. The five acre pieces in the North Mason area are selling for over \$100,000 and most Mason County children are not going to be able to live where they grew up. Tim continued on stating he did not have a problem with creating this relatively small number of lots that this potentially could have.

(#2725) Wendy Ervin stated the Shelton UGA has not been developed as it should have been so the growth is being pushed back into the rural area and if that's not the way GMA was supposed to operate, shame on somebody. Somebody needs to do something because the UGA is not being developed so you don't have the option.

(#2800) Bill Dewey stated one of the arguments presented was the concept of affordable housing. Bill noted that Mr. Conklin's handout showed these properties with a house on them are going to be between \$315,000 and \$325,00 and how does that compare to a place in the UGA? Is the argument that we're creating affordable housing?

(#2850) Tim Wing stated it depends on what you call affordable housing. Affordable housing living in the rural area, yes it is. At today's market, yes it is. In terms of an entry level homeowner being able to buy a house, probably not. They're going to have to go for those small lots inside the UGA's. That's not why people live in Mason County. Shelton in the last census lost two people. It's why there's only 900 residents inside the UGA of Belfair. No one ever came to Mason County to live in a city.

(#2900) Wendy Ervin stated the handout shows that the 36 sites would sell for \$50,000, which is affordable compared to what has been in the past and other areas of the county, that's a small estimate.

(#2975) Bill Dewey pointed out that number of 36 was prior to GMA. They can only get 18 now. Bill stated that he senses Tim is going through a disagreeing with staff's conclusions on the criteria where it's said 'not met'.

(#3010) Tim Wing stated that was correct. Regarding Criteria #7, one has to look at the rationale that was presented that there are Inholding Lands along the roads and while it might create some pressure, we will have to deal with it. Otherwise we just say we're not doing anything because we don't dare create any pressure. I just don't think that's the right thing to do. Tim stated that somebody could come before this board in a year or two and say that we did this for them and therefore you have to do it for us. I don't have a problem with that because I do think we're going to need to go into the rural areas and in places allow for some development because if we don't we're just saying that whoever is there now can stay but everybody else has to leave as they grow

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

up.

(#3100) Bill Dewey stated that recent reports have indicated that the majority of the growth in Mason County was still happening outside of the UGA's, and that we weren't being effective in getting our growth to happen in our UGA's.

(#3200) Wendy Ervin stated we have the growth in the Belfair and Allyn UGA's, just not in the Shelton UGA. Shelton doesn't have available services to the UGA because nobody wants to pay for them.

(#3250) Tim Wing noted that if the roads, sewers, and water were in Belfair three years ago there would probably be another two or three hundred homes in Belfair. There really isn't any property available for sale in Belfair.

(#3300) Bill Dewey inquired if the PAC is interested in the compromise option.

(#3350) Allan Borden added the configuration of the property lends itself to retaining some portion of the property in Long Term Commercial Forest because the part of the property that already has the farm operation on it. Allan stated he was proposing a halfway point.

(#3400) Wendy Ervin stated if the entire property is zoned Inholding Lands and if they don't subdivide the property in three years, it switches back to Long Term Commercial Forest.

(#3500) Tim Wing stated he would like to propose that we accept the proposal as it was proposed by the applicant. I take seriously my own thoughts that all this land should be Inholding.

(#3550) Wendy Ervin stated that you're going to have growth along the roadway and this is not asking for growth into the non-serviced area of Long Term Commercial Forest. This is an appropriate inclusion rather than an extension. You've already got small lots and Inholding all along there and this just gives it unity. My feeling is accept the whole property as Inholding.

(#3600) Tim Wing made a motion that we accept the proposed designation change to Inholding Lands for Rezone Request No. 06-08.

(#3650) Wendy Ervin seconded the motion.

(#3675) Tim Wing stated he also is in support of this as this family really didn't know this was happening at the time. Had they understood that, probably they would have asked for it to be Inholding from the start and not having to come before this group at all.

(#3700) Bill Dewey asked for further discussion on the motion. The question was called for and the motion passed.

(#0150) Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development, opened the public hearing on the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan. She explained that there was a public hearing on October 30, 2006 that was continued until tonight to allow John Keates and myself to go over the PAC's suggested edits. The Parks and Recreation Plan has now been revised and is being furnished to you in two formats. The Compare DOC shows where the edits were made for easy reference, and the complete document in a clean revised copy. The only thing we didn't do was part of Terri's suggestion last time was a reorganization and that would have taken a lot of time so we didn't do that but we did the best we could to address all the comments that were made. John Keates is here for any questions you may have.

(#0175) Bill Dewey thanked the staff for addressing his concerns regarding pet waste disposal as

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

part of the goals in the parks and facilities. Bill stated he also suggested taking advantage of the Oakland Bay Park to do water quality education and kiosks and our industry would be happy to participate in trying to convey that education.

(#0205) John Keates noted that there were general comments added on page 14 saying 'The county will provide educational and interpretative information concerning environmental impacts of park property and adjoining park property'. This would apply to more than just one site.

(#0215) Bill Dewey added that he would like to see that specific to the Oakland Bay site.

(#0225) John Keates stated he will note that.

(#0245) Wendy Ervin inquired if the Fairgrounds was noted anywhere in the document.

(#0250) Barbara Adkins responded that was under a different jurisdiction.

(#0255) Bill Dewey stated there was a typo on page 7. It should be changed to Totten-Little Skookum'.

(#0275) Wendy Ervin inquired if there is anything necessary to include dogs in some areas as far as an improvement.

(#0292) John Keates replied there's a reference in the plan as to the need for an off-leash dog facility. It says at this point we don't have any recommendation other than at some point to discuss it further with the Parks Advisory Committee.

(#0320) Diane Edgin inquired about the Harstine Island Park. The facility that the Theater Foundation is planning is underway. She inquired how fast can they move toward something like that?

(#0345) John Keates explained they just did an RFP (Request For Proposals) for that property so we're waiting on them.

(#0360) Wendy Ervin stated the acronym for Level of Service (LOS) on page 62 should be spelled out. There's too much text between the two references. Maybe at least spell it out in the heading. Wendy continued on stating that staff has incorporated everything having been said or commented on.

(#0425) Bill Dewey stated he would entertain a motion to forward this on to the BOCC along with a commendation to the Parks Advisory Committee and staff for their hard work on this document.

(#0435) Tim Wing made the motion. Diane Edgin seconded the motion. There was no further discussion to the vote was called for. Motion passes.

(#0450) Break in meeting.

(#0500) Steve Goins, Planning Manager with DCD, opened the public hearing on the Stormwater Policies. The staff report gives you an overview of what the materials consist of. We are in a long process of updating our Storm Management Policies and Regulations countywide and trying to integrate some newer regulations as well as adopt some other regulations regarding LID standards. This project will take several months. The portion that we're considering tonight is a review of the county's Comp Plan policies that relate to stormwater management. We have a consultant that was hired to help us with a large share of this work. Joe Simmler from OTAK is here tonight and he

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

will be addressing, you as well as Charlie Butros, our Public Works Director. The analysis that is provided in the Appendices that are the attachments provide a way of analyzing our current policies to determine how well they do the job we'd like them to do. We found they're doing a pretty good job. Our policies are fairly comprehensive and cover a lot of the areas that we were hoping they would cover as we move into this new century of stormwater management. The areas that we had shortfalls we have tried to address in Appendix C, which has the proposed text. Those policies are in part a consolidation of policies that maybe the wording was moved around or changed or maybe a similar policy was stated two or three times in the Comp Plan. This has been a way of compiling those policies in a cleaner, easier to understand fashion and it covers some of the areas where we had shortfalls. What we will do in 2007 is a number of items. We're embarking on stormwater management plans for Belfair, for the Hoodspout area, and for the Allyn UGA. We are also contemplating regulatory changes such as LID. This is the framework that allows us to move forward to do that work. The changes we're proposing are relatively minor and is more of a clean up of that chapter of the Comp Plan. There are policies in that chapter related to onsite septic systems and other policies that aren't directly related to the topic of stormwater management. We're not proposing that those be taken out of the document. Our recommendation would be that next year the county take on the task of cleaning up the other side of this chapter. These policies are simply for the stormwater management component.

(#0625) Joe Simmler with OTAK spoke next. He stated their charge was to take a look at the existing policies from a stormwater / water quality point of view and to see if they were adequate for the new regulations. We took the Code and went through it and we found policies throughout every section that had to do with stormwater, water quality, environment enhancement, protection, and education and it was all good. A lot of what we did was bring it out and organize it better.

Appendix A. This covers an overview of what we found throughout the Code document itself. This a gap analysis of existing Comprehensive Plan policies and a broad array of resource management objectives. This was looking at anything that was related to stormwater or surface water and we noted it with an 'X' and noted where that policy was located. The Mason County Comprehensive Plan policies are references in the left column, with various objectives categorized in groups and individually listed by a statement of key objectives across the top rows. The gap analysis provides a means to quickly determine whether all the resource management objectives are addressed by various stormwater and water quality policies contained in the adopted Plan.

Appendix B. This is a summary of existing water quality and quantity policies. In the table, various Comprehensive Plan objectives were grouped into five major objectives; environment and natural systems, development and land use, economic development and tourism, open space, recreation and quality of life, and water supply. The resource management objectives were summarized in one of four implementation approaches; preserve/protect/regulate/mitigate/enforce, educate/coordinate, and control strategy/guidance. This matrix more clearly shows the abundance of land use objectives, and the absence of policies and objectives regarding open space, recreation, quality of life in current policies of Section III-7.

The general policies, we tried to keep almost exactly the same. We added two new ones. When we went to the sub-area plans, we saw a another level of detail that we did not see in other sections of the Comp Plan document. It actually applied countywide, so rather than leave it in a sub-area plan we brought it up and created a section called Technical Policies. We added some definitions by the creation of these Technical Policies. We didn't come up with something new and different that wasn't already there or stated as a goal or an intent, but we did modify a few of them by tailoring some of the language in the Technical Policies to make sure they were consistent with the Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan and consistent with the new requirements under the MPDS stormwater permit and also consistent with goals and objectives with Hood Canal Water Quality and Fish Enhancement.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

Appendix C. This is a draft of proposed Comprehensive Plan Water Resource Policies. In this draft, all water resource policies are contained in one location within the Comprehensive Plan, and categorized within the five areas used in Appendix B. This draft also includes policies and objectives addressing the policy gaps identified in the gap analysis. Most of these policies and objectives are within the Technical Policies section of the five Comp Plan categories.

Appendix D. This table is a summary of the objectives of the proposed Comp Plan Policies. Using the five comprehensive plan major objectives categories from Appendix B, the proposed policies are identified with the specific technical policies addressed.

(#0825) Wendy Ervin stated she was confused with these documents and in just a very few words you have made this very clear to me.

(#0875) Bill Dewey discussed W-4, 'The Salmon Center and local schools may provide excellent opportunities to initiate educational programs'. State Parks has just got a big chunk of money to upgrade all their septic systems in the parks, but also to try to make their bulkheading and stormwater management of the parks model programs so they will have public education centers for people using the parks. Bill inquired if that was something we wanted to capture here. That could help educate homeowners learn how to go home and do it right.

(#0950) Joe Simmler responded that under the Educate / Coordinate title under Technical Policies, there's a whole series of things related to education. For example, under Environment and Natural Systems, it says 'Recognize and support citizen group efforts toward public involvement and education on water quality issues; and promote community monitoring and spill reporting'.

(#0975) Bill Dewey continued on stating there should be a policy in here that would encourage the county, both through its own facilities and the parks facilities, to do demonstrations on stormwater projects so that if we're building county facilities, we think about using that opportunity. Pierce County has done a fantastic job out at Chambers Creek. It is a green building and the whole complex is designed to be an education for people on how to do it right.

(#1010) Charlie Butros, Director of Public Works, added they are intending to do the same thing with a new Public Works facility. It will be a green building and we're looking at rain gardens scattered through the parking lot, infiltration features in the new facility so we can use them and model them. We had applied for an LID grant and were unsuccessful in getting one because we wanted to expand beyond the things that we could cost effectively apply. Your examples are well cited. We need to take every opportunity we can to put those types of features into new development whether it be parks or a new Public Works Facility or the Fairgrounds.

(#1040) Bill Dewey stated that it would be helpful for you if we identified that in the goals so next time you're applying for a grant you can cite that goal to help you be successful with a grant.

(#1050) Wendy Ervin inquired if when these were installed would there be labels indicating what feature does what function.

(#1060) Charlie Butros responded that they haven't gotten far enough into the implementation part of the plan but our hope is to be able to use that for education and part of that education could be the labels and ongoing tours through the facilities, or workshops using the facility to cite the examples that we've applied there.

(#1075) Bill Dewey inquired of Joe Simmler where it would be appropriate to try to insert a goal along those lines.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

(#1085) Joe Simmler stated that under Development and Land Use, Educate/Coordinate, might have the verbiage there. We could add a separate goal there to include the county, in developing facilities, parks or otherwise, should incorporate LID or other features.

(#1125) Charlie Butros added BMP's. We will apply what we can with the budgets we have available to us. We were looking at pervious pavement to replace impervious pavement. We were also looking at other features and those are the types of things that take us a step beyond what we're able to normally afford. The words need to reflect the funding constraints. Obviously we don't want to put in pervious pavement if it costs us three times as much if our budgets are limited already.

(#1150) Miscellaneous discussion.

(#1225) Bill Dewey stated it was acknowledged in the beginning of the staff report one of the reasons for trying to do stormwater policies is to protect shellfish aquiculture. It was enlightening to me to have it pulled together in a comprehensive chapter and realize that we still don't, in my opinion, acknowledge the significance of the shellfish culture industry to this county. Timber stands out there; forestry stands out there, but aquiculture is unrecognized. The EDC has documented that we're the second largest private employer in Mason County. It seems like we ought to have a policy calling out that there's a reason we need to take the extra precautions when it comes to stormwater. It's also one of the major tourist draws to the county, as well. I would propose that it be a general policy saying 'Commercial shellfish culture is a crucial provider of employment in Mason County and recreational shellfish harvest is a major tourist draw, and as such, stormwater should be managed to protect shellfish resources from contamination'.

(#1300) Steve Goins noted we have a policy something like that in the Economic Development Element already.

(#1325) Wendy Ervin noted on page 5 of Appendix C under Regulate/Mitigate/Enforce says that you should use management practices that minimize the hydrological impacts of erosion and sedimentation. On page 1 it says stormwater management and surface drainage systems should be designed to enhance open space, wildlife and fisheries. A lot of this says 'dredge the Skok'. That's what I think. The Skok takes care of runoff for that entire watershed. If it is not at a rapid enough rate the water does not carry out of that river what it should carry out. The water quality would be better if it ran faster. There could be salmon enhancement project there.

(#1380) Tim Wing added that the whole issue of what's on your beach has a big impact on quality. I have relocated people from the South Shore Hood Canal over to Treasure Island and the big question is are there clams and oysters on those beaches? My daughter says she won't go to Treasure Island if she can't get down to get oysters and clams. It's a huge draw and a big issue. It's not just recreation or tourism but also quality of life on those beaches and has an impact on the value of those beaches which has an impact on the sale price which has an impact on the taxes the county collects.

(#1420) Wendy Ervin stated that it also has an impact of the affordability of living on those properties because there are a number of people who have their clams or oysters harvested and they use that money to pay their property taxes. The value of the clams and oysters is roughly equivalent to your property taxes.

(#1444) Joe Simmler stated they will come back with a couple of new policy statements and ideas.

(#1475) Bill Dewey stated that's all he was going to suggest. The broader goals as far as county facilities and then the shellfish issue I'd like to see incorporated.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

(#1500) Tim Wing made a motion that we pass these policies onto the BOCC asking staff to insert those two changes that we've outlined.

(#1520) Diane Edgin seconded the motion. The question was called for. The motion passes.

(#1550) Steve Goins opened the hearing on the Capital Facilities Plan. The county had envisioned redrafting this entire plan and starting over reformatting. Our good intentions were no match for our limited staff and ability to take that on. In the end you have a 64-page Capital Facilities Plan that is essentially an annual update of the plan we had passed last year. There is a number of Capital Facilities Projects the county is in the midst of taking on that aren't reflected in the version you have before you. The reason for that is those plans are either not at a point where we were able to take action on them, or in some cases, were under a court mandate to bring those back through the process in 2007. We have every intention of doing that. I would like to take some time to discuss in some detail one of those projects with you tonight in part because that will be on the agenda for your next meeting.

I will go through this with you to give you an overview of what the differences between this Capital Facilities Plan and the Capital Facilities Plan passed from last year. There is one item worth mentioning right now. This plan will integrate the Capital Facilities Plan with a number of the school districts in Mason County. They went through a process themselves of developing their own Capital Facilities Plans. What the county would like to do is integrate their efforts with ours. The objective would be to have the background material that's necessary for the county to be able to enact school impact fees next year. We're not asking any action on that particular piece of this tonight. That's the intent as we're moving forward.

Starting on page 5 is the Policy documents. We did not propose any changes in those policies here.

On page 12 regarding water and wastewater utilities. The Water section does include a number of small projects that are related to county operated water facilities, Rustlewood and Harstine. Those projects are rather small in scale and are related to projects that were already contemplated last year and it offers a further refinement and up to date indicator of where those projects are from a financial standpoint. The Wastewater projects are more complicated. The county operates North Bay, Harstine Point and Rustlewood and there's the contemplation of providing sewer in the Belfair UGA and studying the Hoodspout area. Our intention was to simply discuss the Belfair plan in the narrative on Page 13. There is also some discussion on the Hoodspout /Skokomish area planning that's ongoing. The project sheets in here are showing what has been contemplated to date. We need to bring that back to you with the finalized plans. We're not contemplating what the county is proposing in 2007 and beyond as part of this. That's why there's a limited discussion here as to what we're contemplating. Those large projects that do need some significant review are not what we're considering tonight. We will start to discuss the Belfair sewer project in two weeks at your next meeting. One of the elements that has been contemplated with that plan is to serve the North Shore area. That area is currently designated rural and our proposal would be to create a LAMIRD for the North Shore and redesignate that land as part of a RAC that has residential primary designated properties. We have created a boundary that largely reflects the development pattern of the current GMA. It will create two zones and one of those zones would be part of the sewer project that comes before you. The other portions of that area are not being sewered as part of the initial phase of the project and they may never be. We would propose to study and monitor water quality in Lynch Cove to see how well the system works over time. Based on what we found out, there would be a process where we determine whether Beards Cove and Lynch Cove and the rest of the LAMIRD would need to be sewered. This plan does not contemplate that process. It is simply a placeholder for where we are.

The plan also discusses some of the other wastewater facilities in the county. We're not talking about drastic changes in North Bay or Harstine Point or Rustlewood. These are projects that were in

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

the plan last year and we're just continuing on with them in the current plan. There's a number of project sheets that describe the funding. On page 28 is the Solid Waste Utility section. We're largely relying on work that was done through a different body, which Wendy sits on. A different committee analyzed and updated the county's solid waste management plan. This is a summary of that plan that incorporates the financial aspects of what's being proposed in that plan. We aren't asking this body to review or rewrite that. On page 34 is the Parks and Recreation Facilities plan. The plan is being recommended for adoption. There is a detailed analysis of our needs and a six-year plan that identifies projects for the county. This plan simply reflects what that plan states and identifies the funding needs for the project needs that were identified in that plan. Most of that work is paid through REET fund, approximately 75% to 80%. There is a shortfall between the amount of money we intend to collect and the park projects that are identified. Largely we anticipate that there are going to be grants available now that we have a plan. For the first time in six years, Mason County is going to be able to compete for some of the grant money out there. On page 46 is the County and Administrative Buildings sections. There aren't a lot of changes here. There are a number of projects in the county; the Fairgrounds is one of those. The remodeling of the Courthouse is another. My understanding the county would like to move forward with the plan as it is proposed here and be able to sort out the other issues as more detail is brought into the picture.

On page 53 is the Stormwater Management Facilities section. We discussed some of the components of that earlier. This is another area where we anticipate bringing more plans back before this body in 2007. We're in the process of finalizing the stormwater management plan for the Allyn, Belfair UGA's, and the Hoodspout area. We have grant funding that has helped facilitate developing LID standards, for example. It's all part of understanding the size and scale of which we need to address stormwater management in the county.

Charlie Butros updated the Public Works Facilities section. This is very thorough. This provides a very clear understanding of what the direction is for some Public Works Facilities. The narrative describes the current facility up on Johns Prairie Road. It is an outdated facility and the Public Works Department is building a new facility that will house all of the department in one place. That information is an extension of what was put in the plan last year and does contemplate what the county plans are for Public Works Facilities.

The last chapter is the Finance Plan where all this comes together. There are three tables that summarize all of the different activities. These tables were in last years plan and they are modified to best address our current state of affairs.

Our plan is also to integrate as an appendix the Capital Facilities from the various school districts. They have taken a lot of time to do some very hard work and they have a very good plan that we would like to use to help us establish impact fees countywide.

(#2235) Tim Wing inquired about a common refueling spot in the north end that the school would share with the county as part of changing the location and what the status of that was.

(#2245) Charlie Butros responded that we were going to relocate our central maintenance facility and then we were going to expand beyond that to satellite facilities in the north part of the county around the Belfair area to replace the Belfair shop that we have that would also include some kind of a refueling or maintenance shop. We would also have a facility near Matlock that would also provide us for a satellite facility there. As far as refueling, we explored with the schools a potential for using a joint maintenance facility and we found that not to be compatible. Different needs and different locations were the issues. Our preference is to be farther to the northwest of Belfair and since the majority of our roadwork is on the Tahuya Peninsula, it would help us avoid trafficking our equipment and materials through Belfair. We deviated from that plan and are currently discussing a potential piece of property for that new facility on Sand Hill across from the elementary school.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

(#2322) Bill Dewey inquired about the impact fees and how we should deal with them.

(#2330) Steve Goins responded that Donn Fountain is here tonight and he could speak to that issue. It is to allow the ability of establishing impact fees for school facilities. We're not proposing that tonight. We're simply integrating into our plan so that the pieces we need to determine what those fees should be is included in our plan. We've adopted their plans into our plan so that when we establish those fees we have the background material in our plan to do that.

(#2375) Bill Dewey inquired what staff's recommendation for the PAC was for this tonight.

(#2400) Steve Goins responded is that you recommend adoption of this plan as well as accepting the Capital Facilities Plans from the school districts.

(#2425) Bill Dewey stated that he is frustrated by just receiving these documents tonight and it's not been available to the public for their review. Bill stated there are a lot of materials here to digest and did thank Steve for the good job of summarizing them.

(#2475) Steve Goins responded that looking back on how this project went last year and it's a bad cycle that we're in. There are a lot of projects that get into this critical state this time of year. We have a number of things like the rezones, a lot of state mandated issues that we need to address as the calendar closes. This is part of an annual update that we're doing to our Comp Plan and it seems that the time it takes staff to really do this job adequately get short changed in that time crunch process. Last year when I brought this before you I look back on the staff report and how the process went and I didn't have a complete Capital Facilities Plan the first public hearing because it still wasn't available. We held the first hearing with an incomplete plan. Twelve months later we're just about in the same position. You have the plan before you but you literally got it about an hour ago. Most of the work here is simply an update to get us to 2007.

(#2575) Tim Wing inquired how the question of impact fees fits into what you're recommending we do.

(#2585) Steve Goins stated by adopting this Capital Facilities Plan allows us the ability of contemplating establishing impact fees next year.

(#2590) Tim Wing inquired if this action would establish impact fees.

(#2600) Steve Goins responded not at all. There will be a public process that we will go through before we get to that point.

(#2610) Tim Wing stated that he shares Bill's concern about getting this tonight and consider passing it. He stated he has a much higher level of concern about the impact fees in terms of the public wanting to have discussion about that. There's actually two members who are not here tonight that may have strong opinions about it.

(#2615) Steve Goins responded that Terri Jeffreys is well aware of the discussion we've had regarding the school impact fees. We've talked about a process where who should be at the table when that discussion occurs. That is not something that we're even entertaining at all at this time. We're simply allowing us the ability to have that discussion in 2007.

(#2635) Tim Wing inquired what is the impact if we don't pass this tonight.

(#2655) Steve Goins responded that he would need to go to the BOCC with this later this month with

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

whatever recommendation you have or don't have. I don't have the ability of making changes or addressing comments and coming back before you.

(#2685) Diane Edgin stated that we've already passed on the Parks and all the other groups have passed on their so now they've just ended up with this document. I don't think it's going to pose any problems to pass it.

(#2700) Tim Wing stated that he tends to agree with that but he just doesn't like the process.

(#2710) Steve Goins stated he apologizes for how this ended up. I wish we weren't doing it this way. There's a lot of material here to adjust accurately and there's a lot of people involved in assembling this information. It just takes longer than you think it's going to take. It's frustrating for everybody.

(#2735) Allan Borden stated that the transportation projects are addressed in the six year plan by Public Works. They just included their revised table in this document as actions they wish to accomplish. I also image that the school districts have done their own public process on their budget and program for 2007. It's more of a courtesy but it is relevant to seeing the scope of what's being done throughout the county on capital facilities.

(#2775) Bill Dewey stated they will open up the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#2800) Donn Fountain first testified first. Tom Kelly and Matt Charleton are here from the North Mason School District. Joan Zook had planned on being here from Shelton but is out of town. Donn stated he is a former school district business official, retired with 30 years in the business. In 1991, I was an Assistant School Superintendent, which was immediately after GMA was passed. In King County we formed a coalition of school districts and after considerable effort, we were able to have an impact fee established in King County. Similarly, Mason County School Districts have formed a coalition and Shelton, North Mason, Grapeview, Hood Canal, Pioneer and Southside school districts are participating. Here we are 15 years later and by this time components of the Capital Facilities have been developed. Each of the six districts' plans are in exactly the same format and other districts have the same components. At the very end of it is a calculation for an impact fee. It's complicated and we have invented nothing new. It is a well established program and if you look at school districts in Thurston, Pierce, Snohomish and King Counties you will see the same calculations. Why impact fees? There are three intents that the legislature had. One is to ensure that adequate facilities are available to serve new growth and development. There's a principal call concurrency, which simply means when a student knocks on the schoolhouse door, there should be a place for that student to sit. The second is to promote orderly growth and development by establishing, by ordinance, that new growth and development pay it's proportionate share of the costs of new facilities needed to serve new growth and development. This is a separate ordinance; this is not something that you are being asked to approve. The other criteria is that the fee established not be arbitrary or duplicative. The ordinance provides for that. I'm not here to lobby for impact fees. I do believe they're a legitiment element in school funding. If you take the 600 homes that are being built right now, mostly in Shelton, times \$3,000, that's pushing \$2,000,000. It won't build a school but it certainly will help. Regarding state funding, there is sometimes a misconception that when a new student enrolls in a district the district puts it on their enrollment and it goes to the state and then money comes back from the state to help build schools. Of the amount that the state funds when enrollment is reported none of that is for the construction of schools. It is all for current operating costs. The state does provide some funding for schools; it's called a state match and it comes after a pattern of growth has already been established. The state funding only comes when the project is well underway and actually getting towards completion. The school districts in Mason County are anticipating growth and there are plans to build now in Shelton and North Mason. We're looking ahead ten years. We feel this is an

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

important element for school districts being able to provide the schools needed for housing. There's a discussion of quality of life. If you have a quarter or a third of a school built by state funding you're doing extremely well. The impact fee does relieve the existing community of some burden on their property taxes by having that proportional share of pay by growth. The plans that we have submitted established that there is going to be a deficiency of school space. That's the key thing we're doing in our capital facilities plan. Growth is coming and we're going to be out of space in the future and we need some help. One way of doing that is through the impact fee.

(#3200) Tim Wing inquired if there were impact fees throughout the state.

(#3220) Donn Fountain responded that it is mostly a Puget Sound phenomenon. Any place you see growth you'll see impact fees. The fees we have calculated range from about \$1,000 up to \$3,500. It depends on how deficient you are on space.

(#3275) Tim Wing inquired about the formula that would establish the fee.

(#3300) Donn Fountain responded the fee is different for each district and it is based on how deficient the school district is in its space. If you could not demonstrate that you were going to be out of seats for students then you would not be able to have a fee.

(#3350) Tim Wing noted that as we get into further discussions it will be important to be able to answer certain questions. You're going to be proposing a formula and the district isn't going to be establishing their own fee. That way all of the county would have the same formula applied to their district and that results in a fee given their particular situation.

(#3385) Don Fountain stated that is correct and very well put. The fee is a product of land cost, school constructions, portable costs, and contains a deduction for the state funding for schools. It also contains a deduction for the amount of property tax that the new house will pay for existing bonds. It doesn't duplicate the tax payments that the house will already be making. The fee applies to all houses irrespective of the value of the house within the district. The ordinance states that the point at which it's collected is at the time of the building permit.

(#3500) Wendy Ervin noted that the intent of the forest harvest years ago was to pay for the schools. That seemed to be the plan and that it would go on forever. We then had an unnatural jolt to the forest industry created by owls and other factors. The second thought is the Governor is going to ask the WASL test be dropped or delayed because our 10th graders can't pass it and not going to graduate. I'm frustrated because the schools aren't doing their job anyway. It's frustrating to think about charging people paying more and more. In the end we're still not accomplishing the mission and it's costing more.

(#3600) Tom Kelly, Superintendent of North Mason School District, responded that it's an unfair characterization to say on the basis of the fact that the WASL test scores in math aren't what we'd like them to be and because of that the public school system is a failure. That's an overstatement.

(#3700) Bill Dewey closed the public testimony portion of the hearing on the Capital Facilities Plan.

(#3750) Tim Wing made a motion to adopt the Mason County Capital Facilities Plan as presented along with the Grapeview, Hood Canal, North Mason, Pioneer, Shelton and Southside School District Capital Facilities Plan.

(#3775) Diane Edgin seconded the motion. Further discussion was called for. Motion passes.

(#0070) Tim Wing noted that the Grapeview School District was in the top 10 in the state on the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 4, 2006

WASL score and they received a \$25,000 grant as a result of that.

(#0090) Bill Dewey noted we need to set up some new meeting schedules for January and February.

(#0095) Steve Goins noted that the meeting on December 18th is a discussion of the amendment to the Belfair / North Shore wastewater facilities plan and includes the consideration of establishing a LAMIRD. There is, on the county website, the supplemental amendment, which is a very large document. There is a hard copy available in three locations in the county. There's one in the Planning Department, Timberland Library in North Mason, as well as our North Mason annex. The Environmental document is also on the website. I will have a staff report out later this week, which will include the summary of information. We're asking the PAC to take public testimony and consider the plan at that meeting. Don't take action, and our consideration would be a recommendation on the following meeting on January 8th. The regular meeting would be on the 22nd.

(#0165) Bill Dewey noted in February, the third Monday is also a holiday. The PAC scheduled the meeting in February on the 12th.

Meeting adjourned.