

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

November 21, 2016

(This document is not meant to be a verbatim transcript)

Call to Order

Bill Dewey called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Present: Bill Dewey, Marilyn Vogler, Vicki Wilson, Deb Soper

Excused: Rob Drexler, James Thomas

Regular Business

Adoption of Agenda- Teri King asked if the rezones could go first due to the size of the other sections. Bill asked for a show of hands to see how many members of the public were in attendance for rezones. Due to a large number of people, Bill agreed to move the agenda around so the rezone on Davis Farm road would go first.

Approval of minutes-

September 19, 2016- Marilyn had one correction on page 7, paragraph 2. She then asked Barbara about the housing chapter of the Comprehensive Plan because it was originally scheduled for this meeting. Barbara notified the PAC that it has been rescheduled until the December meeting.

Marilyn made a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion carried.

October 17, 2016- Bill said there was a typo on page 5. No other amendments.

Deb made a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Marilyn. All in favor, motion carried.

Public Comment- Constance Ibsen spoke as a member of the public and also as co-chair of the Lower Hood Canal Watershed Coalition. She talked about a report prepared in regards to the Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARA) within Mason County, done in 2013. She suggested adding a sentence to Chapter III of the Comprehensive Plan, in section III-7 Water Quality and Quantity:

Mason County will use best available science to identify CARA's and update mapping to protect groundwater quality and quantity.

She handed out copies of her request to the PAC. Bill asked if they could revisit Chapter III to take the request into consideration. Barbara said yes.

Public Hearing – Proposed Rezone of parcel 12329-13-90091, located at 381 NE Davis Farm Road in Belfair, from Belfair Urban Growth Area Single Family Residential (R-4) to Mason County Rural Residential 5 (RR5)

Presenter: Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Services

Barbara began by discussing the map within the staff report. After clarification of the different zoning districts she explained the request. The owner would like to develop the parcel, however there is no sewer currently available. The sewer lines stop at Old Belfair Highway. There is no easement at this time, and Irene Creek is also in the way meaning they would need to go under the creek with sewer lines.

Bill questioned how this rezone changes the number of structures allowed on the property. Barbara explained that RR5 means one dwelling unit is allowed per 5 acres. The current zoning allows 4 dwelling units per acre, but because of the stream this is not possible.

Marilyn voiced concern over the fact that no easement was created when the lots were divided. Stan Davis, applicant, said there is an easement. Davis Farm Road is the original easement to the lot. Bill interrupted asking Mr. Davis to speak once public comment is open.

At 6:21 p.m., Bill opened the hearing to public comment.

Stan Davis spoke first and explained that he would like to build a home on the parcel for his daughter and son-in-law. He said that there is no necessity to build more than one home. Stan discussed the previous lay of the parcels and the changes that have occurred. He added that putting in sewer would be somewhat difficult.

Marilyn referred to a line in the staff report reading, *No easement was put into place at the time of the plan as there was no immediate need.* She asked why no easement was put into place when the parcels were originally split. Stan said that no easement was needed across the neighbor's property to this location because they have an easement to their property.

Ken Van Buskirk said he was there in support of his brother-in-law, Stan Davis, and asked if the PAC had any questions. He noted that he spoke with a consultant doing a buildable lands inventory along Old Belfair Highway and said the consultant told him there was a lot of wet land down that road. With this information he warned the PAC that larger amendments may be coming their way.

Marilyn said she read that if land is removed from the UGA, you have to compensate by adding land somewhere else to make up for it. Barbara said that is normally true when dealing with larger parcels.

At 6:29 p.m. public comment was closed.

Marilyn made a motion to approve the rezone. Motion seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion carried.

Continued Public Hearing from October 17, 2016 - Proposed amendments to the Mason County Capital Facilities plan, Chapter VI of the Comprehensive Plan, annual updates per RCW 36.70A.70

Presenter: Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Services

Bill asked which version was being used because another version had been handed out. Barbara said the version dated 11/17/16 is the most current. She noted that the only changes were in section 3, beginning on page 11. Barbara then quickly went through the changes.

Marilyn asked who the water use efficiency rule was governed by. Loretta Swanson said that came from the state level.

Barbara addressed a memo from Loretta Swanson regarding stormwater, dated November 4, 2016. It had not been sent, so copies were made and disbursed to PAC members at the meeting. Barbara noted that because of the memo, no further revisions were necessary to the stormwater section at this time.

Under section 8. Stormwater Management and Habitat Improvement, Marilyn read the following:

Mason County participated in a Hood Canal regional effort to select, rank, and prioritize sites for future stormwater retrofit projects. A prioritized list and preliminary designs for top projects was completed in 2014, including two Mason County sites. Project emphasis is on retrofits (those that address "legacy" problems)...

She said that the two Mason County sites need to be included in the Comprehensive Plan outside of Capital Facilities. Vicki agreed, and Barbara asked Loretta Swanson if that could be added. She agreed to do so. Loretta asked if they would like to see projects laid out individually within one table, or if they would like to see one table per project. Marilyn said she would like to see a list of projects within one table.

Bill addressed the stormwater memo item labeled "Why wasn't a stormwater utility rate established" and talked about the recommendations passed in 2009 when he was a member of the Stormwater Task Force. He said he would like to see the recommendations put in front of the current Board of County Commissioners (BOCC). He asked if the recommendation should be added to the document or be separate. Barbara advised that it should be separate because it could be easily missed. She suggested both making the recommendation in person and adding it to Capital Facilities to ensure it is addressed.

Marilyn made a motion to pass on to the BOCC the recommendations of the stormwater task force and urge them to reconsider it. Motion seconded by Deb. All in favor, motion carried.

Marilyn questioned outsourcing inmates in section 7. Police and Criminal Justice Facilities. She asked about the building of facilities and if that is something addressed within Capital Facilities. Specifically, she asked if approval in this capacity meant they would not have to go in front of the BOCC for approval. David Windom clarified that it would be a completely separate project and would still require commissioner approval.

Bill asked if they could look at pages 23 & 25, which discuss transfer stations. Page 23 shows Elles Hill Transfer Station and page 25 shows the Shelton Transfer Station. Bill questioned if they were different facilities. Melissa McFadden said they are the same and that station should always be referred to as Elles Hill.

Public comment opened at 7:01 p.m.

Jeff Carey took the podium and noted that he is not happy with Capital Facilities in general. He discussed connection fees for the sewer, saying that the fees are used for maintenance and operation instead of reserves, yet are not shown in Capital Facilities. Jeff went on to say that things need to be figured out before a rate hike is done in 2017. Bill questioned if Jeff was asking for better communication regarding the rates. He said that Capital Facilities was designed to let the public know what was coming, but Mason County isn't doing that.

Marilyn noted that the city of Shelton has a list of projects and when it is reviewed will project rate increases. She asked if the County does that, to which Jeff said no. Marilyn then asked if it was possible to add a column showing how much rates would increase for projects per year. There was no answer, so Jeff then asked if the parks information was lined up with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. Barbara said it was not.

Ken Van Buskirk asked the PAC if they received his comment letter about the sewer development and the North Bay sewer system. Bill responded that they did. Ken suggested an advisory committee for both the Belfair and Allyn UGA, that way people from the north end could be more involved.

Constance Ibsen talked about the recommendation made to revisit the stormwater task force. She said some consideration should be given to adding in what the recommendations were from that group. Bill said that was the intent of the motion. In moving on, she gave the PAC a handout in regards to biosolids. She read her handout, which touched on sewage sludge from county-owned facilities.

Marilyn asked Melissa McFadden how septage from individual septic tanks is being handled under the contract currently being negotiated with the city. Melissa clarified that the contract is between the County and the City so no private pumping would be addressed. Constance said this needs to be addressed for health reasons. She then handed out a copy of a letter from Roger Hickey regarding treatment plant deliveries.

Teri King noted that she has specifically been looking over the document for water quality and items that affect the environment. One main issue is the use of the Western Washington Stormwater Manual. She noted that the 2005 version is addressed, which should be updated to reflect the newest version. Marilyn asked if the 2005 version is still being used. Loretta said it is. The question of why the most current version (2014) is not used was asked. Loretta said that between the 2005 and the newest version of the manual there were not significant changes that would impact the county. Teri then addressed several issues in page order.

Page 7:

Teri said she would like to see the restoration plan called out since the SMP was recently updated. She then touched on retrofits asking if this is an important thing, and why grant funding would be applied for if it is not the main emphasis of the program.

Loretta responded that this document is addressing capital construction and previously the language was more focused on programmatic approaches. Marilyn suggested adding verbiage under Stormwater Management and Habitat Improvement to read:

*2.38 - Actively pursue grant funding to pay for **priority** stormwater retrofit and habitat improvement projects. Continue to investigate establishing a long-term, dedicated funding source to serve as grant match for capital projects.*

Page 20:

Teri voiced concern over the fact that medication take back and needle disposal are not discussed. Marilyn agreed. Melissa McFadden said that disposal is addressed in the Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan.

Page 28:

She noted that some parks are missing from the list on this page. She asked if facilities are important to have in the description of amenities available. Barbara answered that the list of parks are not county funded. The list can be an exhaustive list, but it would not impact capital facilities. Marilyn questioned what was missing. Teri said that Twanoh State Park has a boat pump out facility and Fudge Point is a new state park on Harstine Island. Marilyn agreed that Fudge Point State Park should be added. She said other parks were missing or had name changes also. Barbara asked if she could email her a list of corrections.

Page 45:

Teri said there is a need for invasive species control at Mason Lake, noting that homeowners have asked for this in the past.

Page 49:

It was noted that Walker Park has issues with beach access due to large boulders and other items.

Page 55:

Teri said that though it didn't deal with North Mason School District, adding a page for the Hood Canal School District facility upgrades would be helpful even though they are working on grants.

Page 87-88:

Stormwater treatment isn't addressed in this section. She said treatment is essential.

Page 89:

Under "Grants" a section reading:

Future grant availability is expected to diminish due to greater demand and competition, directing funds to jurisdictions under municipal NPDES permit requirements (Mason County is not a permittee)...

Teri said that Mason County could be a permittee if they wanted to opt in.

Page 90:

Teri noted that she would like to see the addition of the Hood Canal Stormwater Plan, and some of the SMP work.

Page 99:

Under Water and Wastewater systems there was a line that had been stricken reading: *The county also operates water treatment facilities for Rustlewood and Beard's Cove*. She said that the County also assists with the Rustlewood North Bay Sewage Treatment facilities.

She finished saying that biosolids and solid waste management is essential.

Deb asked Teri if the most current stormwater manual would have best available science that is different from the 2005 version. Teri said that in many of the elements, yes. Deb questioned why they would not be using the newest version. Loretta said it's a matter of adopting the new code requirements and finding differences. Deb questioned if the use of best available science was required for this update. Barbara said in updates to regulations, not necessarily this document, the best available science should be used.

Marilyn asked if the PAC could add a recommendation to meet the requirement of best available science found within the Western Washington Stormwater Manual. Bill suggested the following on page 4:

2.11 Stormwater management level of service standards for new development and redevelopment will generally be attained by meeting the requirements of the [most recent version of the Western Washington Stormwater Management Manual](#) and ...

Marilyn and Deb agreed that would work. Barbara stepped in and advised that if the most recent version is not adopted, it cannot be used. The language would have to say "most recently adopted". Loretta said that because this is the policy section, the PAC recommendation would work. She then suggested a recommendation be made at the same time they go forward with their request for the Stormwater Task Force information, they also see about moving forward with the code and the newest version of the stormwater management manual.

Marilyn made a motion that the PAC recommend to the BOCC to consider updating Mason County Code to be consistent with the 2014 Western Washington Stormwater Manual. Motion seconded by Deb. All in favor, motion carried.

Patricia Vandehey questioned best management practices. She said it is used quite a bit, but she has never seen a definition which therefore makes it a useless phrase. Bill asked if the phrase best management practices is used within capital facilities. Patricia was unsure.

Public comment closed at 7:50 p.m.

Bill went over comments received and suggested that Jeff Carey's comment regarding sewer fees be forwarded to the BOCC. He suggested that rate payers be contacted regarding increases separately from capital facilities. Bill made a motion.

Vicki asked if this document is beginning to take on a role it was not intended to do. Bill noted that he is not asking that Capital Facilities take on this issue, but instead wanted to address a public concern as a separate recommendation.

Melissa McFadden spoke, saying she did not believe they (the BOCC) could take unilateral rate increase action, because a public hearing would be needed.

Barbara asked for a repeat of the motion. Bill said the motion on the table is to recommend to the BOCC to adequately notify sewer and water rate payers when rate increases are being considered on capital improvements. Motion seconded by Deb. All in favor, motion carried.

The PAC addressed Ken Van Buskirk's letter about the North Bay sewer system. No recommendations were made.

In regards to Constance Ibsen's letter regarding biosolids, Melissa McFadden said that though it's an important item, there is no plan for a county facility at this time so there wouldn't be a place to add it. Bill said that both Constance and Teri addressed this issue and it is a valid concern. Marilyn questioned who would put this idea in motion. Loretta Swanson said utilities would. Marilyn asked Barbara what the proper path would be to start this. Barbara said that the PAC would make a recommendation to the BOCC. Bill said that he would entertain a motion to the BOCC based on comments raised relative to the Capital Facilities plan that the County consider whether additional capital facilities are needed to deal with biosolids in Mason County. Motion seconded by Marilyn. All in favor, motion carried.

Bill voiced concern in going through all of Teri King's comments due to time. Teri spoke up and said she would like to have them deal with the stormwater issues. Bill asked why there isn't a level of service standard for stormwater. Loretta Swanson said that at the beginning of this document, there is a section noting that stormwater does not have a level of service. It is presumed that you are meeting the level of service if you are implementing the requirements of the stormwater manual.

Marilyn asked Loretta if larger cities with a lot of impervious surfaces and traffic have a treatment system for stormwater. Dave Windom said that they do have treatment systems in place. Marilyn then asked if there was a threshold such as city size or population in which those systems were common. Dave was unsure. Erica Marbet said that most places are still in the past when it comes to stormwater. Loretta said that this issue is addressed nationwide through the national permit system. She said that the locations with the highest populations were taken care of in Phase I. Phase II were the next most populated, and Mason County is nowhere near the threshold of these phases. She added that City of Shelton may meet population requirements in the next phase which is just starting. Issuances are planned for 2018.

Vicki asked Barbara what would happen if they don't finish a decision on Capital Facilities. Barbara said that a special meeting would need to happen so it can get in front of the BOCC to be adopted before the end of the year. Because of this, Bill asked the PAC if perhaps County Staff be given the ability to incorporate the comments from Teri King.

Marilyn made a motion requesting that staff incorporate the comments made by Teri King into the draft recommended to the board. Motion seconded by Deb.

Vicki suggested staff work with Teri instead of just using her comments. The PAC agreed. Bill asked for a vote. All in favor, motion carried.

Deb questioned if best management practices needed a definition. Vicki asked if perhaps it is already defined within the Comprehensive Plan. Marilyn said that management practices differ by occupation, so it can't really be defined. Loretta clarified that in this case, best management practices refers to practices in the stormwater manual. Bill suggested the following on page 88:

Stormwater Retrofits

Most capital facility projects are considered "retrofits" meaning the project is undertaken to correct or improve conditions associated with past development. Retrofits are designed using best professional judgment to provide reasonable improvements in stormwater management, recognizing that site constraints frequently make strict application of the [Western Washington Stormwater Manual Best Management Practices \(BMPs\)](#) challenging.

Marilyn made a motion to recommend adoption of the Capital Facilities plan with amendments discussed at the PAC meeting and tasked to the staff to incorporate. Motion seconded by Deb.

Deb went back to Jeff Carey's comment about the 2013 Comprehensive Plan not being reconciled with this. Marilyn then addressed page 27 under Parks and Facilities, pointing out that a reference is made to the Parks and Recreation plan of 2013. Barbara said that document is handled by the parks committee, so it is not incorporated in this document, just used as reference. On page 51 under Trails Development Program, Marilyn asked if anything had been done because there was a 2016 column. Jeff Vrabel said that nothing had been done. Barbara asked Jeff if the 2016 column should be deleted, he said yes.

Bill returned to the previously made motion. All in favor, motion carried.

Continued Public Hearing from October 17, 2016 – Proposed amendments to Village Commercial District in Allyn Urban Growth Area and Festival Retail District of Belfair Urban Growth Area with respect to Residential Uses

Presenter: Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Services

Barbara reviewed the discussion from the October 17, 2016 hearing, noting that multifamily units were requested versus single family units. She then briefly went through her staff report to point out changes to language. Barbara added that a comment letter from Bill Isley and a letter from Bainbridge Lending Group were received earlier that day.

Marilyn voiced concern with building multiple units on one parcel. Barbara explained that a single parcel could only have a single unit with 4-10 dwelling units in it, no matter the size. She added that you cannot just build a bunch of duplexes on a parcel to meet dwelling unit requirements. Paul Vandehey suggested that you could if the duplexes were attached.

Public comment was opened at 8:43 p.m.

Bill Isley, applicant, first spoke about the history of the lots and how the financial crisis of 2008 has made his lands impossible to build on due to no financial assistance. He asked that residential and commercial be allowed in this area so people could have easy access to services. Bill Dewey asked if the changes proposed in the staff report would help. Bill Isley said he believes it would.

Marilyn said she would like to see that no maximum be added. She said she would like to see a minimum of 4 dwelling units per parcel. Marilyn suggested that a cap of 10, as shown in the staff report, would prevent building such as a complex with several studio apartments. Bill Isley suggested limiting residential building to 50%. The PAC agreed with this.

Jeff Carey handed the PAC a packet. He said he was in favor of changing the zoning, but the approach on the table is not the best option. Jeff noted that he wants to see development occur, but items such as the Comprehensive Plan and discussion with neighbors near the development need to be done. He referred to maps included within his packet which showed commercial and residential development. He added that mixed use in Allyn is separate from mixed use in Belfair, and then voiced concern regarding density issues. Marilyn asked if removing the maximum number would help the density issues. Jeff agreed that it would, adding that he would rather see this development be residential because there is too much space zoned for commercial.

Teri King questioned if there is a way to keep residential over commercial, but make it as flexible as possible.

At 9:13 p.m. Public comment was closed.

Bill looked to the PAC and said that this issue is complicated. He said he did not feel informed enough to make a decision on this topic. Marilyn said that there is a requirement for affordable housing, and this change would make that more possible. She added that she likes the idea of limiting residential to 50%. Vicki voiced concern with the potential for unintended consequences of making a quick fix. She agreed that she does not feel informed enough to make a decision, adding that treating Allyn and Belfair the same does not seem appropriate. Bill referenced Teri's comment about residential over commercial saying that options should be expanded versus constrained. Deb suggested tabling the hearing once more because the PAC was too uninformed.

Marilyn asked Barbara if they could just deal with Allyn and not Belfair. Barbara said yes.

Marilyn moved to limit changes to the Allyn UGA, and change wording in 17.12.120 item 29 to read Multifamily dwelling units with a minimum of 4 units per parcel and to add, where appropriate, residential units within this district will be limited to 50% of the district. Motion seconded by Vicki.

Bill asked Marilyn if her motion precluded someone from building residential over commercial. She answered no. Bill suggested a subsequent motion to address working with the community for input. Further talk was had by the PAC over the proposal.

In returning to the motion, Bill asked for a vote. 1 in favor, 2 opposed. Motion not carried.

Deb then made a motion to table the hearing until January. After some discussion with Bill Isley about a timeline, the motion was seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion carried.

Patricia Vandehey spoke at this time about the agenda and the length of it, saying it is too long and so many items should not be on one agenda.

Deb asked to table the Master Development hearing until January and asked Mike Pruett, applicant, if he could wait that long. He said he could wait if necessary, but suggested starting since people were present for the hearing and if it got too complicated, they could continue it. The PAC agreed.

BREAK
9:42-9:47

Public Hearing – Proposed amendments to Mason County Code, Chapter 17.70 – Master Development Plans (MDP)

Presenter: Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Services

Barbara explained that the Master Development Plans were originally adopted in 2006, and when revisiting the plans, it was discovered that there were places to allow more flexibility. She said that both she and Michael MacSems from the Planning Department reviewed the recommended changes from Green Diamond. Barbara introduced Mike Pruett from Green Diamond.

Mike Pruett spoke and reiterated that this ordinance is existing, and added that it has never been used. He said the goal is to develop a nice community such as a second home/vacation property on some of their lands. He said when looking through the current code to achieve this, there are performance subdivisions, which are clustered subdivisions, or the master development plan which allows for clustering, but allows for more creativity. As written, Mike said it is confusing so that is why changes are being suggested.

Marilyn talked about transportation, specifically not having regular transportation at some locations such as Lake Limerick, Mason Lake, and other far located neighborhoods. She asked if transportation is part of their planning process. Mike answered that if they were looking at adding an active adult community, then they would want to consider that. Marilyn then asked about (vi) on page 6 which reads:

The MDP's common open space plan shall identify the recreation areas and conservation areas. The plan shall also delineate areas that are open to the general public and areas that are accessible only to residents, guests, and employees of the MPD.

She said that the ordinance says a gated community should be avoided. Mike said that there may be a want for private community open space that the public may not be able to go to, yet if there is commercial space, the general public would be allowed.

Marilyn then asked about open space corridors and asked if Mike would be willing to work with the county on this topic. He said yes and added that in some of the larger developments, he wouldn't be surprised to see 75% open space. She then questioned how the tax structure will be effected if there is active forest inside an MDP. Mike answered that once inside a residential development, with density being transferred, it would become an open space tract. The tax revenues from the harvest could still come back to the County.

Marilyn referred to page 4, 17.70.015 saying that "cottage housing" is included under housing variety, but on page 11 of the ordinance (D), cottage housing is crossed out. Barbara stepped in and said that is because the County does not define it. A definition would have to be created. Marilyn said she would like to keep it in and have a definition created.

Deb questioned page 7, item ii of the staff report which reads:

Common open space must preserve important site features, ~~such-including as existing trees and clusters of trees,~~ unique geological features, and wildlife habitat.

She asked why the verbiage regarding trees had been stricken. Mike responded that it would only be stricken if a portion of the open space was still under forest management. He said that this would create an income source with the HOA, because an area would be under continued forest management. Deb asked if there are any requirements for buffers. Mike said yes, it is included within the MDP. Marilyn asked if that meant the working forest would be under the control of the HOA. Mike answered that it depends on who owns the trees and explained that the seller could potentially retain a timber deed.

Public comment opened at 10:10 p.m.

Constance Ibsen questioned if Green Diamond was planning to develop these MDP's themselves or if someone else would be doing the development. Mike Pruett said they would most likely sell to a developer. Constance discussed adequate water for these developments. She asked if they already have water rights. Mike said they have water right transfers in process.

Patricia Vandehey said in 2014 Green Diamond told the BOCC that they would like to have clustering removed and now they are revisiting this. She asked if some of the housing built will be affordable, or if that is just up to the developer once it is sold. In the SEPA, Patricia said there are 103 items answered with N/A. She added that some of the language seems to be written just to confuse people. Patricia addressed lot sizes and setbacks in the development regulations saying they seem to be ignored with this request. Regarding water rights, she said she wasn't sure how they are getting approval on this because the public does not know where the water is coming from and they should. She ended by saying that just because it's Green Diamond making the request doesn't mean it should be granted.

Paul Vandehey then spoke voicing concern over the concept of the common open space within the developments. He said that Green Diamond has a history of controlling access to its property. He said the provision for landscaping doesn't preclude forestry or agriculture uses within the conservation areas which is a big statement. He voiced concern that there is not a set definition for buffer. Paul said that if you have 100 or more units, you need to add storage lots and would not be able to park commercial use vehicles on the street. This, he said, keeps out the middle or working class.

Erica Marbet and Mike Pruett talked about the septic system options for the developments.

Constance Ibsen asked how long the MDP is good for. Mike answered that it is good for 12 years, so you can develop in multiple phases. She asked if an extension could be requested. Barbara answered that plans are actually good for 15 years and can have a 15 year extension.

Public comment closed at 10:32 p.m.

Marilyn brought up a previous request in 2014 by Green Diamond for clusters of homes and an equestrian trail. Mike said that there were inconsistencies in the clustering language that was discovered saying 8 units of clustering were the only allowance. He said with a 1000 acre project, you were only allowed 8 units which did not make sense. Marilyn then asked if there is any process to balance housing because the plan from Green Diamond is to build high class areas, leaving affordable housing out once again. Dave Windom said that will be discussed within the housing chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

In going back to Paul Vandehuey's testimony, Bill pointed out a section and suggested an amendment be made to page 6 of the ordinance:

(14) A conceptual common open space management plan. For MDPs outside of UGAs, the common open space management plan shall identify recreation areas and conservation areas, including areas open to general public and/or limited to MDP residents.;

Marilyn pointed out that page 6 of the staff report already shows:

The MDP's common open space plan shall identify the recreation areas and conservation areas. The plan shall also delineate areas that are open to the general public and areas that are accessible only to residents, guests, and employees of the MPD.

Deb asked Barbara about the rural lands development standards (RLDS). She said they seem to conflict with what the MDP is proposing. Mike said that standard subdivisions are under the RLDS, but more creative subdivisions fall under the MDP.

Marilyn made a motion to approve the proposal. Motion seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion carried.

Continued Public Hearing from October 17, 2016 – Proposed amendments to the Mason County Code regulating Medical Marijuana Cooperatives

Presenter: Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Services

Bill asked what was needed from the PAC. She said her changes were added to the draft and she needs approval to take it to the board.

Marilyn asked why the distance from schools is set at 1000 feet because the PAC agreed to reduce distance to 100 feet. Barbara clarified that the 1000 foot rule is set by the state when it comes to schools.

Bill asked if there were any public comments. None.

Vicki made a motion to pass the document to the BOCC. Motion seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion carried.

New Business- None

Adjournment

Bill adjourned the meeting at 10:51 p.m.