

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

December 19, 2016

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

Call to Order

Rob Drexler called the meeting to order at 5:57 p.m.

Roll Call

Present: Marilyn Vogler, Deb Soper, Vicki Wilson, James Thomas, Rob Drexler

Regular Business

Adoption of Agenda- Marilyn Vogler had two procedural items she wanted added to New Business. Jason Dose with the City of Shelton explains that he is in attendance to give a quick presentation on their Shelton UGA proposal. He asks the commission if he might move the workshop from number six on the agenda, to number four, before the Public Hearings. The PAC agrees to move the workshop up and recess the Public Hearing until afterwards.

Approval of minutes-

November 21, 2016- Marilyn questioned if the language regarding Stormwater Retrofits, on page 8 of the minutes, was the actual language that they voted on. It was mentioned that this piece of writing is in italics and was transcribed from audio. Vicki Wilson, also agreed that this italicized piece was wording from the original Capital Facilities chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. Vicki noted that they inserted “Western Washington Stormwater Manual”. James Thomas made a motion to adopt the minutes. Motion seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion carried.

Public Comment- Marilyn asks if there is any other Public Comment. None.

Workshop – Consider a proposal for expansion of the Shelton Urban Growth Area – Population Allocations, and Capacity

Presenter: City of Shelton

Jason Dose introduces himself as a Senior Planner with the City of Shelton. He and others at the City of Shelton have been working on an update to their Comprehensive Plan, similar to Mason County. One of their proposals involves a couple of UGA expansion areas. Jason mentions that the County and City Commission would weigh in on a UGA expansion. He wants to update the PAC on where the City is with this proposal, what those proposals are exactly, and discuss some of the housing allocation numbers they have been given by the County.

Jason then introduces Erica Rhett with BERK Consulting. She is helping them draft the DEIS (Draft Environmental Impact Statement), which they are hoping to release early January. He then goes on to say that the City of Shelton would be coming back to the PAC for a formal Public Hearing.

Erica Rhett explains that in considering the Mason County COMP Plan, the Shelton UGA must be taken into consideration, as well as the growth and capacity of Shelton and how that works for the overall strategy of the County. The expansions that the city is considering for the UGA are to accommodate new residential, industrial, and commercial growth within the city. An Environmental Impact Statement will be used in the review. Erica references page 3 from the memo by BERK, which shows a map of the city. The map shows the two expansion areas that have been proposed, Dayton-Airport Road Commercial Industrial Center and Goldsborough Heights. The Goldsborough Heights area would be conceived as an extension of the Shelton Hills development that has already gone through a planned action.

The public was notified and a scoping meeting was held to discuss the expansion proposals. The scoping period was held March 24, 2016 – April 15, 2016. There was a public meeting on April 6, 2016. They asked the public, as well as state agencies, what kind of environmental issues should be addressed, how the alternatives in the EIS should be framed, concerns with probable adverse impacts, and suggested mitigation measures. A number of comments were received in the scoping process. Erica mentions that the categories found in the SEPA were covered.

The public was interested in the following:

- The presence of wetlands; what would happen to wetlands and would they be preserved.
- Water resources (CARAs); there is a discrepancy between the way the County maps those areas and the way the City maps and designates those areas. The Squaxin Island Tribe had done some research into how those areas should be mapped. As part of the EIS work, a specialist was brought on to try and make sense of the recharge areas.
- The effects on Goldsborough Creek. Goldsborough Heights is proposed to sit on a bluff above the Creek.
- In terms of land use, would the proposed land uses, in the expansion, be compatible, compatible with the plan for the city and also compatible with the change in land use from rural areas to urban areas.
- In terms of plans and policies, there was discussion about employment.
- The conversion of forested lands, in regards to aesthetics.
- New development impact on transportation and roads.
- Financial impacts of the extension of public services and utilities in areas where there aren't very many people.

James Thomas asks what the punitive employment impacts are.

Erica says that the purpose of the EIS is also to discuss some of the positive impacts as well, in terms of increased employment and opportunity. Erica reiterates that these are issues that people asked them to consider while they are writing the EIS. The public asked them to consider, *“what is the benefit of employment, so that decision makers can weigh, for example, employment versus environment.”*

Jason Dose talks about the commercial industrial area and a study that was commissioned by the Economic Development Council of Mason County in 2014, as well as an Industrial Means

Analysis. In general, the study stated that we have a lot of industrial lands. What was lacking, according to that study, was flat, developable land; land that can be owned, feasibly, and that is close to utilities and highway access. He explains that the Dayton-Airport Road Commercial-Industrial Center (DARCI) is close to utilities, flat, feasible, and right on a highway. The Goldsborough Heights study area is a Green Diamond initiated UGA expansion to retire some of the development potential on some of their lots. Jason talks about Green Diamond's plans to retire the large lot development in several locations around the County in favor of a permanent, he believes, long term commercial forest plan designation that could be developed with houses. Currently he believes most of Green Diamond land is RR20, RR15, RR10, RR5, and so forth. They would consolidate that into development areas, one of which is the Goldsborough Height proposal.

Erica talks about the alternatives that they will study, explains whenever a SEPA action is studied, a no action alternative is studied. There are some assumptions based on growth projections about how much Shelton will grow and how that growth will be accommodated within its existing city limits, this is Alternative One (no action alternative).

Alternative two and three involve expanding the UGA area by 325 acres into what would become the Goldsborough Heights residential area. About 200 acres of which are the steep slopes and areas south. These would be set aside in permanent conservation. In Alternative Two for Goldsborough Heights, there would be an expansion of what has already been proposed in the Shelton Hills Master Plan. Small extension of the commercial, the village green, a variety of single family housing types in smaller and larger lot versions. In Alternative Three of the Goldsborough Heights, a different type of development is proposed for the top of the bluff. Part of the bluff would be developed as a golf course, with two different options for the course and club facilities. Around the village green there would be medium intensity housing that would possibly be townhouses or apartments. Single family housing would make up the remainder of the area.

Erica says in Alternative Two of the DARCI area, the proposal is being called the primary business activity center. One of the proposed amendments of the Shelton Comprehensive Plan, is to define this primary business activity center as an area that would support the following industries: tourism and hospitality, information technology, life sciences, food production, and wood products. It would be a variety of commercial and industrial uses and the intent would be to get a cluster of those uses out in the DARCI area.

Erica said there was the need for a small hotel with the Ridge Motorsports Park nearby. The general consensus at the expansion meetings was that Shelton was low on places to stay. In Alternative Three for the DARCI area, a broader mix of industrial and commercial uses is sought. North of the highway there would be a mix of commercial and industrial that would allow some big box development or warehouse development. Industrial use would be located south of the highway. Alternative three uses would be broader and less defined than Alternative Two.

She talked about whether or not the city will adopt a planned action. The planned action would allow a stream lined environmental review process.

So essentially, if a project comes in for consideration and it's within the adopted planned action area, that project would be reviewed to see if it fits within the alternatives that were studied in the EIS. If it does, then there is not a need to do additional environmental review. Without a planned action, any development that comes in would go through a regular environmental check list and determination. They could pull information from the environmental impact statement but it wouldn't necessarily be an automatic system.

Erica mentions, at the County level, no decision has been made regarding this system. Asks if there are any questions about the EIS before they move onto the Growth and Capacity section.

Marilyn asks what the PAC's role is regarding the expansion proposal. She has a few pages of questions and comments.

Erica says that the PAC will be the body that recommends, in full or part, to the County Commissioners in order to approve it. The EIS is not published yet, so they would have to return to hold a public hearing. Comments or questions could be submitted, integrated into the work of the EIS, some may have to wait until after the comment period for the public opens.

In regards to the Growth and Capacity section, Erica talks about The Mason County Draft Population Allocation within the Urban Growth Area; these allocations have to be enough to account for 20 years of growth in the UGA. They looked at the following:

- Would Shelton be able to accommodate these allocations within its UGA, as it exists now? Or would they need to expand their growth area to accommodate?
- How many acres are left in the city that can be redeveloped? They multiplied those acres by the assumed rate of future growth and that tells them what the population capacity is.
- Adjustments for different kinds of measures.
- Various types of lands, vacant, with little development, critical areas, and added factors of performance.
- Assumed development of Shelton Hills; how dense does development happen in Shelton and the UGA.

She mentioned that they tested some different assumptions to figure out what is a conservative assumption, as well as looked at average residential density across the board of 4 units per acre in Shelton and the UGA. The Draft Population Allocation was used to reinforce the growth management idea, that instead of low level development happening in the rural area you would concentrate development in and around the city, to keep the rural area more rural. These tests led to a slightly higher level of urbanization than Shelton has right now. Under this assumption Shelton still does not have enough space to accommodate the level of growth. We would show a capacity of 8600 people in Shelton. It falls short at about 9%. Alternative One (no action) we have a deficit capacity of about 800 people, under Alternative Two and Three with anticipated growth a surplus, under Two 185 people and Three 57 people.

Erica discusses the current situation within the City of Shelton and the number of jobs per household, 1.21 jobs per household in Shelton. Shelton has half of the jobs in the County, which includes the UGA. If Shelton is expected to be the job center moving forward, we would expect that it would have 50% of the job growth. Alternatives Two and Three, with the opportunities for job growth in the DARCI area, provide more opportunities to grow employment in the city.

Deb asked if they could access the information gathered by the specialist studying the recharge areas. Erica said it would be available in the EIS. Also, inquired about the Industrial Means Analysis availability, Erica mentioned it was an ECONorthwest study.

Public Comment open at 6:38pm

Ken Van Buskirk asks if the EIS statement addressed the impact on the UGAs of Belfair and Allyn. Erica responds that it does not address those UGAs. Ken asks if the other UGAs might be included and that there has been desire to reduce the size of the Belfair UGA. According to Erica because the scoping was done in the Spring and the EIS is almost completed, that would not necessarily be something they would write in, right now. She mentioned that the environmental impact statement may get comments regarding the other UGAs and that they would be able to respond before any final decisions.

Workshop closes at 6:40pm

Rob reopened public comment to address anything not on the agenda. None.

Public Hearing – Revisions to Chapter IV (Land Use) of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan

Presenter: David Windom, Department of Community Services

David introduces new planner, Ronald Buckholt, who will be assisting him with long range planning.

Introduces the staff report which goes over Land Use, Chapter IV of the Comprehensive Plan and the 2nd half being Housing, Chapter V of the COMP Plan. Both are a part of the COMP Plan update. David goes over the basics of identifying edits and that Land Use will be first to be discussed. Reads through the staff report addressing Chapter IV. He mentions these edits are meant to bring the chapter up to date with the Department of Commerce checklist.

David summarizes the points under the Periodic Checklist Update on page 2 and 3 regarding the Land Use chapter. Points out that a lot of statistical changes have been made.

Marilyn mentions page 3 of the Land Use Chapter, up at the top. She asks if Watershed Management Plans are being made for those that don't currently have them. David replied that those would have to be addressed in a study, based on the Hurst Water Decision. Discussions have been made between the County and the Squaxin Tribe to address water issues, especially the closed basin issues.

It was mentioned that formatting of tables will occur later.

Page 14 and 15:

Marilyn questioned why seasonal residents are not included in the county's population statistics. Talked about how another statistic showed that 23% of our single family residents are seasonal.

Therefore, when we look at the projections from Commerce those do not include the seasonal residents. David agreed and mentioned that the county has a seasonal influx of about 20,000 people.

Tables on page 14:

Tables concerning projected growth and lot retirement do not seem to match and it becomes confusing which tables we should be concentrating on. David mentioned that if a segment is retired, more land will be forced into the UGA. Figures are based on a segment going into retirement or not.

David talks about the different projection of the Shelton UGA at 33%, straying more of the UGA growth into the Allyn and Belfair area, rather than just the Shelton area. He mentioned the City projecting 51% in the Shelton UGA and that the County projected more of a spread to take into account some of the traffic from Belfair to Bremerton and the influenced growth.

James Thomas wants to know if all the seasonal changes are just in the summer time. Dave concurs that it is the summer and they look at traffic number increases.

Marilyn mentions a table with housing units and whether they include the houses that are not occupied in the winter. Dave answers that the housing units are based on what is actually on the ground.

Page 19:

The definitions of land use categories on residential and improvement value, if less than \$20,000 it is considered vacant. Marilyn talks about a provision in the Housing unit for tiny and micro homes and that people can build them for less than \$20,000. She mentioned adjusting the value to consider a lot with a tiny house on it.

Rob Drexler asked who decided on the \$20,000 or less value, was it set by the state? David mentions that the legislature may be addressing tiny homes soon. Marilyn adds that the appendix in the 2018 IRC for tiny homes has been approved. Mason County just adopted the 2015 IRC in August of 2016.

Page 22 and 23:

Table at the bottom of page 22. Question concerning what is being compared in 2005 to the rest of the table was asked. Dave explains that the last column in those tables is the difference. And that the total comes from the second to last column divided by the fourth column.

Page 26:

Comment at the top of page, *Mason County recently identified Belfair as an Urban Growth Area (UGA) of approximately 2,500 acres.* Marilyn stated that she would like to see the year. Dave mentioned dropping the word “recently”, no objection made.

Page 40:

In regards to the following: *In 1992, the City of Shelton and Mason County adopted the Countywide Planning Policies to cooperatively guide each agency's GMA Planning processes.*

Marilyn mentioned that Barbara Adkins at one time crossed off the City of Shelton. Dave mentioned that the GMA requires us to deal with the county issue but the City deals with their own issue on their own planning processes, and the County cannot be held to what the City does in the County COMP Plan. Dave mentioned that we still work with the City on something like the Shelton UGA, not necessarily the whole County.

Page 41:

Item number 5, *Encouraging affordable housing*. Marilyn would like to see “encouraging” change to “ensuring”; describing the lack of this type of housing in so many of our districts. Dave mentioned that we have no way to “ensure”. Rob mentioned tax breaks for multi-family low income.

Page 42:

Items 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15. Marilyn would like to know where these items came from. She reads an item from the Order of Western Washington Growth Management Board, *We congratulate Mason County for the progress made toward bringing its Comprehensive Plan into compliance with the GMA, etc, etc. The County has improved some performance standards, reduced its market factor for UGAs from 50% to 25%, and abandoned the Working Rural Area*. She mentions that this helped the county comply with GMA and now it is found in this chapter. Marilyn would like to delete them, until they know where they came from. Vicki mentions it would be good to compare the current version, with this one.

Page 49:

Item 1. Marilyn asks if a Critical Areas Ordinance has been adopted. Dave replies that there is a Critical Area Ordinance on the books. Marilyn asks if it has been implemented. Dave replies that he will have to check when it was signed off on.

Page 52:

Agriculture wetlands and isolated wetlands under one acre in size are exempt from most of the regulatory requirements of the Mason County Critical Area Ordinance. Dave mentioned that if you have any kind of wetlands on your land, you have to mitigate them.

Page 53:

At the top of the page. Marilyn asks if regulations for wetland protection are being enforced. Dave answers yes, and that the County now has two Code Enforcement Officers on staff. Regulations are in place and being enforced, they were reassessed and the County was found in compliance.

Page 64:

Marilyn states that the first table included Butterflies, Echinoderms, Crustaceans, and Habitat and doesn't seem to be listed in the new table. Dave mentioned that he will have to get back to the PAC on the reasoning for leaving some items out of the new list. His first guess is that the new list was an ecology approach and that there were some areas that did not exist in Mason County, such as Prairies or Steppes.

Vicki Wilson talks about getting lost in the statistics in the front of the document. Dave mentions that it is one of the Department of Commerce requirements to have those statistics in the front. She talks about the necessity of the tables, but the text often just repeats the information in the table. Mentions engaging the reader if we want them to understand the story. Might not be practical to change the text portion in this document, but in the future it might be helpful to tell more of the story rather than repeat the data in the tables. Rob mentions that this isn't casual reading and it is very technical.

Page 69:

Deb Soper asks if the Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas map is available online. Dave doesn't believe that particular one is online and that it would have to be pulled at Public Works. Vicki mentions the GIS section of the Mason County website.

At 7:15pm Public Comment was opened.

Ken Van Buskirk speaks about his work with the original scope of 2015 COMP Plan. Doesn't think the public outreach met its objectives. Talked about UGA boundaries, transportation element, talked about lack of levels of service for the roads. By not having levels of service established we can't meet the concurrencies requirements of GMA.

Page 26:

Ken mentions the Belfair UGA, points out current population in the UGA was 900 and it was crossed out and changed to 1000. Grant applications are being submitted with 900 as the population. Pacific Northwest Salmon Center not in the Belfair UGA, thinks it should be eliminated. Also, made comments on the consistency of the tables.

Page 40:

Land Capacity Summary table seems confusing.

Page 41:

Item 4. Under Level of Service standards for the Urban Growth Areas and Rural Lands, Ken questions why it is worded this way if this document addresses the Shelton UGA only. Dave mentions the other UGAs are mentioned in the Capital Facilities chapter.

Page 42:

No. 20 and 21. Ken believes establishing levels of service is important.

Page 97:

Figure 4.10.1. Ken mentions that this figure is outdated, and R3 should be R4.

Public comment closed at 7:27pm

Marilyn wants to know more about the Working Rural Areas that she mentioned earlier.

Rob asks if they are voting on each chapter, or going through the whole COMP Plan first. It was mentioned that the plan in the past was to go through all the chapters, make changes, and then

vote on the whole thing. The PAC further discussed this and the fact that the Capital Facilities Chapter was an annual update and it had to be voted on, at the time of the last meeting.

Vicki mentioned the table titles, and keeping the consistency throughout in order not to be confusing.

Public Hearing – Revisions to Chapter V (Housing) of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan.

Presenter: David Windom, Department of Community Services

David presents a summary of the staff report on the Housing Chapter.

Page 1:

Marilyn mentions item 4, wants to add “*all*” before *economic segments of the community*. Item 3. She wants to know how we identify those particular lands listed. David mentions the zoning in the Belfair UGA allowing for four residences per an acre rather than a single residence. The more intensive land use is singled out by zoning. Item 3 components are not disallowed. He mentioned that the goal of the UGAs is to have those higher density build outs.

Page 3:

Marilyn noted the dire situation of the affordable housing situation.

Page 10:

Item 4. Housing Condition. A housing survey from 2002 is mentioned as being too old to cite. Marilyn thinks that number 4 should be deleted and simply say, *Mason County has not assessed the condition and adequacy of its housing stock recently enough to be able to include data regarding housing condition.*

Rob asks if number 4 on page 10 is required. Vicki mentions that if you put the tables on page 18 and 19 together, it is apparent that there haven’t been many new structures built since 2002. Dave speaks up to say the definition is still valid. Marilyn suggests, simply saying, *a 2002 study defined five categories to evaluate the condition of housing stock.* Then include the definitions and then the statement *Mason County has not assessed the condition and adequacy of its housing stock recently enough to be able to assess our current housing stock within this framework.* Agreed they need to drop the associated table.

The next discussion was over page 10 and the following statement: *A recent housing study shows the geographical location of population and households in Mason County for 2000. According to this study, the highest concentrations of population are in the Shelton and along the Hood Canal and inland waterways.* The consensus was to use David’s rewording, *The highest concentration of populations are in Shelton and along the Hood Canal and waterways.* It was agreed to delete the reference to the study.

Page 11:

Change from *Just over 11%* to *More than 11%*. Marilyn added that she would like to see the increase in percentage (22%), since the last set of data was added. Where does the original 9% data come from, source needs to be cited.

Page 14:

Spelling in first paragraph, *fluctuated* to *fluctuate*.

Page 19:

Housing Demand. *Using those calculations, the County's current housing stock already exceeds the amount necessary to accommodate growth.* Marilyn made a point concerning the 23% of seasonal population and whether or not those figures were taken into consideration in this section. The seasonal housing units need to be subtracted from the total housing units in the county, if the population numbers do not include the seasonal as well.

Vicki talked about the September 19, 2016 meeting and Rick Calvin's (HPC) request to add a policy. The policy, *rebuilding and refurbishing of old homes*, may work in the Housing Chapter of the COMP Plan. Rick's suggestions may fit well under 1.8 or 2.5 of policies on page 5 and 6. *Mason County will encourage the preservation of existing historic structures for use or conversion to single or multi-family houses.* Vicki says it fits best under 2.5. It was mentioned that 2.5 already starts to talk about the above. Dave mentioned adding it as a separate clause, *Facilitate restoration of existing structures, historic structures, and rehabilitation.* Vicki asked if Rick Calvin be contacted with this information.

Page 3:

Deb Soper found grammatical error, *youth people* change to *young people*.

No Public to comment at 8:16pm

New Business- Marilyn had two procedural items she wanted addressed in New Business. One being the resolution of different pagination with the packets that are available on the night of the meeting and the packet that was mailed to the PAC members previously. Marilyn asked that if changes are made to a packet, that a page could be put together noting where those changes were made.

Secondly, she would like the PAC to be carbon copied on the recommendations made to the BOCC when they are forwarded by staff.

Adjournment

Rob adjourned the meeting at 8:19 p.m.