

Mason County
Planning Advisory Commission

December 1st, 2014

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

1. Call To Order

Rob Drexler called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members present: Rob Drexler, Kristy Buck, Tim Duffy, Vicki Wilson

Members excused: Steve Van Denover, Bill Dewey

Staff present: Rebecca Hersha

3. Regular Business

a. Adoption of Agenda

Due to the fact that members were absent, the decision was made to strike Draft Title 15 from the original agenda at this time. The agenda was adopted.

b. Schedule January meeting dates

January 5, 2015 and January 26, 2015

4. Shoreline Master Program Update- Workshop¹

a. Draft Cumulative Impact Analysis

Rebecca began addressing the Draft Cumulative Impact Analysis (CIA) with the Commission. Rob Drexler asked Rebecca why this document is necessary. She stated that it comes into use when the Shoreline Master Program is appealed due to no net loss.

Chapter 3: Future Development and effect on shorelines-

¹ This public meeting is a workshop for discussion purposes in a public forum. Unlike public hearings, public participation is not a requirement; however opportunities for public comment may be provided.

- *Section 3.1 What is the County's Shoreline Jurisdiction?*

Rebecca stated that currently, the County has chosen the minimum jurisdiction. This means the county will not use the option to increase the jurisdiction to include the 100-year floodplains and critical area buffers beyond the current jurisdiction.

- *Section 3.2 How will future development be managed along the County's shorelines?*

Vicki asked about page 3-3 where one of the bullets states:

Areas Designated Rural are shorelines located outside urban growth areas (UGA), rural activity centers (RAC), and Hamlets that are developed or partially developed; characterized by large lot sizes; designated Rural Residential 10, Rural Residential 20, Rural Multi-family, In-holding Lands, or Agricultural Resource Lands; and have one or more of the following quantities:...

She stated she had notes from a previous meeting that this was supposed to become a new section. Rebecca noted this change and said it would be updated. Vicki also asked if alongside the Citizen Committee, the PAC could be noted as well, since both groups do have a hand in this.

- *Section 3.3 How Will the Proposed Shoreline Designations Protect the Shores?*

No additions or changes.

- *Section 3.4 Where will Foreseeable Future Development Occur?*

In table 3-2 Vicki asked for the definition of Ineligible Property Type. Kristy clarified that it means the land is already developed and is ineligible for future build-out. Rebecca added that *Ineligible* also has various land use codes.

In the fifth paragraph, Vicki pointed out the last sentence reading:

The current draft allows the Mason County to do so, but it may be helpful for consistency of implementation as well as helpful for the assurance of no net loss if the County adds a written policy or regulation that requires a Statement of Exemption for all development (including those that don't trigger a section 10 or 404)

She and Rob stated they didn't feel this sentence was necessary. After a short discussion, Rebecca agreed to strike it.

- *Sections 3.5 What Effect Will Land Subdivision Have on the Shoreline?*

No additions or changes.

- *Section 3.6 How does Future development Typically Affect Shorelines?*

No additions or changes.

Chapter 4: Protective Provision of the County's SMP-

- *Section 4.1 How are Critical Areas Protected?*

Kristy voiced concern with the paragraph at the top of page 4-4 that states:

Both of the above allowances for tree removal could be strengthened. The County could reduce the potential impacts associated with the view corridor provision by reducing the percentage allowed for removal or by prohibiting the cutting of large diameter trees.

Rebecca said that when speaking to Tim, he suggested that many of the recommendations be removed. She said this might be removed.

C. Landslide Areas:

Kristy inquired about the figure in bullet two. She asked whether 2 percent is correct or if it should be 20 percent. Rebecca believes it should be 20 percent but stated that is how it was originally written and will likely not be changed.

- *Section 4.2 How do Use and Modification Regulations Protect Ecological Functions?*

B. Overwater Structures (piers, docks, buoys)

Vicki asked if the 2nd paragraph beginning: *Applicants for single-use docks and piers must demonstrate that their neighbors are not...* is only for single-family residence or if it could be applied to commercial as well. Rebecca said yes, it is directed towards a single-family residence. Kristy said that fact needs to be added for clarification. **Chapter 5: Other Existing Programs-**

- *Section 5.1 What Other County Programs Protect Shorelines?*

No additions or changes.

- *Section 5.2 What State and Federal Regulations Protect Shorelines?*

Vicki pointed out that the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act needs to be added to this list. She said it deals with critical habitat and was amended in 1996.

- *Section 5.3 What Role do Non-regulatory Programs Have in Protecting Shorelines?*

No additions or changes.

Chapter 6: General Assessment of No Net Loss-

No additions or changes.

Appendix A: High Priority Protection and High Value Aquatic Maps –

The map labeled Figure 3: High Value Aquatic Areas brought up a discussion regarding interpretation. Kristy said she is worried about how people will look at this map as being definitive regarding the area they live in. Vicki agreed with Kristy and asked Rebecca to speak with Tim and Rick to see if the map properly represents what was discussed at their recent meetings with CAC and JTAC. Rebecca said she would speak to them, and would find the actual definition of High Value Aquatic.

5. New Business-

Rebecca asked the PAC to discuss a comment letter received by Green Diamond Property Management regarding the Shoreline Environmental Designations map. They did not agree with the designations and asked for them to be redesignated for higher density. After a meeting with Ecology and the County, Green Diamond said they would be willing to go back to the original designation as long as a provision was added to the SMP that says if you apply for a performance subdivision, you are not restricted to the minimum lot width. She added that some residents at Lake Nahwatzel are concerned with having more lots along the north side of the lake.

A second comment letter was presented from Mr. Michael Rosevear.

Kristy and Vicki stated that they appreciate the letters and concern from the residents, but agreed, along with the other PAC members, that their decisions would stand.

6. Adjournment-

At 7:45 pm Rob adjourned the meeting.