

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

November 10, 2014

(This Document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript)

1. Call To Order

Bill Dewey called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members present: Kristy Buck, Tim Duffy, Vicki Wilson, Bill Dewey

Excused: Steve Van Denover & Rob Drexler

Staff present: Rebecca Hersha

3. Regular Business

a) Adoption of agenda

4. Shoreline Master Program Update-Workshop

- a) **Industrial & Marine Terminals** Policies and Regulations (revisit)
(Draft Comp Plan Chapter IX-3.K) (Draft SMP 17.50.060.6)
- b) **Commercial** Policies and Regulations (revisit)
(Draft Comp Plan Chapter IX-3.D) (Draft SMP 17.050.060.4)

Rebecca began the meeting with the staff reports dated November 3, 2014 titled PAC's Revisit of Industrial & Marine Terminal Development (SMP) and PAC's Revisit of the Commercial Chapter. Rebecca noted [that after she prepared the 11/3 staff reports, she worked-spoke](#) with Brian McGinnis, President of North Forty Lodging, who was concerned about the language regarding non-water oriented uses. [Therefore Rebecca referred to a one page document where she provided changes to the 11/3/2014 staff reports \(titled "Modifications to the 11/3/20104 Staff Reports..."\). These changes are her attempts to resolve the concerns that Brian had recently raised, while retaining the intent of the Shoreline Management Act.](#)~~She said he was present for this meeting and available for questions.~~

PAC's Revisit of Industrial & Marine Terminal Development (SMP)

Rebecca read through and gave a quick overview of the changes requested by the PAC. Bill Dewey voiced concern over the wording used under Industrial & Marine Terminal Regulations section 2, regarding subordinate uses. His concern was:

c. The use is part of a mixed use project that includes, and is subordinate to, and associated water-dependent use, and it provides a significant public benefit with

respect to the shoreline Management Act's objectives such as providing public access and ecological restoration; or a use is subordinate if:

...

ii. It occupies a surface area smaller than the water dependent component.

Bill asked to change the verbiage. He felt that definition gave too much room for interpretation. Rebecca asked the PAC if there were any suggestions on the change. No suggestions or changes made.

Brian McGinnis spoke and showed the Commission the layout of Hood Canal Marina. He described the marina and also talked about how there is unoccupied space that is trying to be sold so more businesses can be brought to the area. Bill asked if there are any current plans to build anything new. Brian said not at this time. During a discussion between Brian and the PAC regarding non-water oriented industrial uses, Vicki spoke up saying this section seems to be getting more complicated as it goes on. Rebecca reminded the PAC that they asked for this clarification. Rebecca suggested moving ahead since many of the people in the audience were interested in the incentive portion of the meeting.

c.) Incentive Options Workshop

i. Overview of Shoreline Incentive Options- presented by Heather Trim of Futurewise

Reference Material: *"Practical Guide: Incentives to Help Meet Priority Shoreline Restoration and Protection Objectives"*

Heather began with the topic of shoreline parcel characteristics. She reported the parcels on Puget Sound were researched to find out how many of them were residential.

- 57% of the parcels are residential which breaks down to 45,000 parcels.
- Mason County has 5,500 residential parcels in the marine area.
- More than 50% of parcels in Mason County are armored meaning they are using bulkheads, wood walls, etc.
- 37% of the parcels have documented forged fish spawning.

Heather reported that part of the study done also looked into erosion potential from low to high. She stated that 3.9 miles of areas with homes would not need to be armored because they have little to no erosion potential. Heather shared more information gathered from a survey regarding house values, parcel size and age population in areas along the sound. Another portion of the survey referred to incentives, which were highly favored. Heather addressed potential incentives. The three categories discussed were:

- 1) Funding sources- Created from existing taxing programs such as a beach management district, which is similar to lake management. Management

programs wouldn't just deal with armor, but also with cleanliness of the waterfront.

- 2) Financial incentives- these come in the form of grants or awards. The example given is a county that will give residents a small amount of money towards a new septic system. Another option would be a low interest loan such as the ones currently offered for weatherization for residents living on Puget Sound.
- 3) Non-financial incentives- includes technical assistance and education.

Vicki asked how soft shore armory stays maintained since hard armor can last so long. Heather said the constant maintenance would more than likely be a concern. Heather admitted that soft shore armory does need to be taken care of every 5-10 years. She pointed out that the cost is significantly less and can be even less if you and a neighbor work together to split costs.

ii. 'Open Space Tax' and 'PBRS' Programs for Shoreline Homeowners and 'Green Shores for Homes'- presented by Nicole Faghin of Washington Sea Grant

Nicole Faghin of Washington Sea Grant talked about incentives and the Green Shores for Homes program. She discussed the Open Space Tax Act from 1970. In Mason County, this act is referred to as the Current Use Tax Act. This act can be applied to farmland, timberland and open space such as tidelands, and beaches. Vicki asked if this program would be applicable if a piece of property had hard armory and wanted to remove it. Nicole said no, because the bulkhead value is not part of the assessed property value. Melody Peterson, Mason County Auditor, joined in and said that at this time bulkheads are not valued on a property because it does not make a difference in the sale price. Bill voiced concern with tax shifting. Nicole said that within King County, that was a major concern but that it wasn't a big enough shift to cause a burden. She said this topic is something that would need to be discussed by the County because it is a sensitive issue. Nicole shifted to non-financial incentives beginning with the suggestion of breaking down the process so each step of the way has the possibility to earn credits. The credits would be verified by a neutral party and could go towards, perhaps, the permit fee or other fees related to the process. Nicole said the idea is to get homeowners to want to participate.

iii. Mason Conservation District's Nearshore Program- presented by Karin Strelief (MCD)

Karin Strelief from Mason Conservation District announced that the department received a grant from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Natural Resources. The funding is to help focus on shoreline management. The program created with this funding has various components, which includes targeted outreach to homeowners with low erosion possibility. She voiced the fact that they do not want to duplicate efforts that have been made, but would like to instead supplement them. On the other side, if someone is dealing with an issue such as a failed bulkhead or other serious

issues, she stated that they would have an engineer and a hydrogeologist on staff to assist. Funding would not be available for a project like that, but they could at least provide assistance and refer them to another agency if necessary. A small financial incentive program will be available in the form of mini grants to land owners interested in doing native plantings or improving storm water management. The grant period goes through September 2015. The conservation district hopes this is the launch of a long-term program. Karen said that they are planning on offering the incentive for several years even after the grant period expires. Kristy asked if this grant is salt water specific and Karen said yes.

Break
8:03-8:16

Bill called the meeting back to order and revisited the staff reports discussed at the beginning of the meeting. He began with PAC's revisit of the Commercial Chapter (SMP). Discussion was held regarding Commercial Regulations (Draft SMP 17.050.060) Section 4:

Replacing one non-water oriented use with another non-water oriented use does not require a Conditional Use Permit, unless there is an increase in the total area occupied by the non-water oriented use (including parking and storage).

There was concern that this section is not needed due to the fact that the verbiage is close to canceling out another sub section.

The Commission was not able to come to an agreement and Vicki suggested that both sections are left as is because there is still time for public comment and also because the SMP still has to go through to the County Commissioners for final approval. Vicki said she would like to make a motion that for the commercial [policies and](#) regulations, they accept staffs recommended changes with one amendment in Section 3, and leave section 4 as is. Kristy seconds the motion and none oppose. Vicki suggested one more change in section 10. She asks that aquaculture operations be re-added to so it would read:

Commercial developments adjacent to aquaculture operations or shellfish beds shall practice strict pollution control procedures.

Rebecca stated that [this-the revisions to the Commercial Chapter authorized by the PAC](#) will carry over into the Industrial & Marine Terminal Development section.

5. New Business

Bill asked about a handout that was given to them at the beginning of the meeting. Rebecca said it was about incentives and would be discussed on the December 1, 2014 meeting.

Terri Jeffreys announced Mason County Association of Realtors has an upcoming meeting regarding the housing market within the community and invited all members of the Commission to attend. She informed the PAC that they had an applicant for the open spot on the PAC from district 2, and he should be attending the meeting soon to make sure that spot is filled.

Bill stated that Nicole is going to be sending him some more details regarding incentive options that can be discussed later. He added that he believes this particular topic taking so much time because it has the ability to make the most impact. Vicki agreed^{ds} that this area does need to be discussed again at a later time after they have had time to look through the information. She also discussed^{ds} her uncertainty due to the fact that many of the shoreline owners in Mason County are elderly and are most likely receiving a senior property tax break. She said she is trying to figure out how to best target the most people. Kristy agreed saying she has the same concerns. Bill asked if Rebecca could follow up with both Nicole and Heather to share the language they have been considering so they can see what has been discussed.

6. Adjournment-

Bill moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:11 pm. None oppose.