

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

June 19, 2017

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

Call to Order

James Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

Roll Call

Present: Marilyn Vogler, Deb Soper, Vicki Wilson, Aaron Cleveland, James Thomas, and Jason Bailey

Regular Business

Adoption of Agenda- Marilyn made a motion to adopt the agenda as amended. Motion seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion carried.

Approval of minutes-

May 15, 2017- Marilyn had some corrections to the minutes. On the first page, third line from the bottom, change to reflect “~~having~~ revisiting”. On Page 3, second paragraph “Marilyn mentioned the commission opinion...”, change to “Marilyn mentioned the Planning Advisory Commission opinion...”. On page 5, two-thirds of the way down, within the paragraph “Dave mentioned he might have a few code...”, change “layout” to “lay out”.

Vicki mentioned page 2, “Mason County EDC department” should be “Economic Development Council of Mason County”. Further down on page 2, “Sultan County” should be “City of Sultan”. On page 4, fourth paragraph from bottom “finaled” should be “finalized”.

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

Conflict of Interest – None. James Thomas did mention that he is the chair for the Economic Development Council of Mason County.

Next Planning Commission Regular Meeting Date, July 17, 2017 – James Thomas mentioned tomorrow’s joint meeting at 6pm between the Planning Advisory Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. Marilyn asked Paula if the City of Shelton had been invited to the meeting, Paula answered yes, but that she had not received confirmation. PAC asked Paula to let them know if she receives confirmation before the meeting.

Committee/Staff Updates – Dave Windom presents the PAC with a Population Pyramid for Mason County, Wa. The data was gathered from the 2010 Census, shown in five year increments, the highest bulk of the population is currently in the 55-60 year range, and currently average age of death is 73.2 years in Mason County. Dave mentioned that this life expectancy is one of the highest in the state. The planning perspective would focus on those below the current pyramid bulge of the 55-60 year old range. Dave would like the PAC to keep this chart in the back of their minds when they are planning for the near and far term.

Briefing – Economic Development Element of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan 2036

Presenter: Lynn Longan, Economic Development Council of Mason County & Chris Mefford, Community Attributes Inc.

Lynn mentioned that the EDC attained the services of Community Attributes Inc. to help them rewrite and update the Economic element of the Comprehensive Plan. She then handed the presentation over to Chris Mefford, Economic Development Consultant at CAI.

Chris outlined the Economic element as a strategy to explain the visions and goals of the County in regards to economic growth, while pointing back to other chapters in the COMP Plan. He explained that he had some slides which pointed out data they had gathered, but his main agenda was to gather what the PAC's hopes were for economic growth. The comments that he acquired tonight would go into a draft Economic element that they would send to Lynn at the EDC.

He mentioned the handout that he brought to the meeting, which describes the purpose of the Economic Development Element Update and a website, <http://masoncounty.cai-engage.com>. The purpose of the website was to gather input from the public on economic growth.

Chris started the slide presentation (complete outline below):

- Agenda
- Introduction
- Background: Economic Development Element
- About the Profile
- Profile Findings
 - Mason Count Inflow-Outflow
 - Top Commute Destinations
 - Components of Population Change
 - Educational Attainment for Adults over 25
 - Covered Employment in Mason County
 - Total and Industry Employment Growth Comparisons
 - Industry Average Wages
 - Income from Outside Mason County
 - Taxable Retail Sales Trends in Mason County
- Draft Element Overview
 - Infrastructure and Capital Improvements
 - Development and Permitting
 - Education, Training, and Business Development
 - Community Development and Quality of Life
 - Industry
- Underway
 - Full element draft
 - Public comment tool

Marilyn brought up the topic of “bedroom communities” as possibly not a bad direction to lean toward. Chris explained what the general criteria was for a “job center” versus a “bedroom community” and that becoming one or the other really depended on the fiscal health of the county. The community has to ask themselves if they are able to pay for infrastructure services

and how does the county's abilities to garner revenue measure up in regards to paying for these desired services. He pointed out that whether bedroom community or job center, it was really a decision on how the community sees themselves; both types have positive qualities.

Marilyn questioned whether bedroom communities were more expensive. Chris noted that tax revenue was driven by the investment in property and homes, thus the county has more revenue to invest in roads, infrastructure, etc., positive aspects of bedroom communities.

Vicki mentioned that it would be interesting to understand more fully how bedroom communities worked within the goals of the Growth Management Act.

Chris mentioned the job to housing unit ratio, in Washington State it is roughly 1.2 jobs per housing unit; in most towns in Washington it is 1.3. For bedroom communities it was not uncommon for that ratio to be 0.3, 0.4, or 0.5. Marilyn and James would like Chris to calculate the job to housing unit ratio for Mason County.

Chris noted that population growth in Mason County has not been as strong in the past few years as earlier in the decade, births and deaths have continued to balance each other out, but net migration has really gone down. This point is surprising to Chris because there has been strong growth in Thurston, Pierce, and Kitsap County.

Jason asked what a healthy net migration would look like for a county of Mason's size. Chris answered that communities are always growing and shrinking, but it is always good to expect positive growth.

Marilyn talked about the Office of Financial Management's projections and that they have charted where this projected growth will occur, but it would be good to chart what part of this growth will occur in regards to time. Chris believed that this was an aspect of the data that they had gathered and may be in one of the slides.

Chris explained the Education Attainment slide, he pointed out that for Mason County the amount of people with a Bachelor's degree or higher is lower than the state average. This statistic is indicative that most industries in Mason County have not required a bachelor's degree or higher to sustain them. The County may have to look at different growth opportunities, if they want to attract more people with those higher degrees.

Chris explained the Covered Employment in Mason County and that most were geared toward service. James asked what generally fell into the service industry. Chris answered, Insurance, Personal Services, Consumer Services, and Private Sector Services. He noted that not a lot of dramatic changes have occurred in the last few years, in the distribution of employment.

In the Employment Growth Comparisons for the 2010-2015 period, Thurston and Kitsap have been growing at a higher rate overall, while Mason County's positive growth mainly resides in the retail sector.

Chris went over the breakout of Industry Average Wage. Income earned outside of Mason County shows Mason as earning more outside of the County than within.

Taxable retail sales are important for the fiscal well-being of the County. James wanted the PAC to notice that Accommodations and Performing Arts' revenue have gone down a considerable amount in the last few years. These are industries that draw people into the community.

Lynn asked if those numbers have gone down due to the Skokomish tribe buying several of the County's hotels. Chris said that could be a possibility and he could look into it. Marilyn asked if Airbnb's were included in the taxable portion of accommodations. Teri King said that according to the Mason County Tourism Task Force, the Airbnb's are supposed to be paying taxes. James asked Paula if the County knew of the Airbnb situation, such as how many and location. She replied that it was substantial and as they presented the Utilities Chapter they might have a better idea, she did mention that it was an area they needed to track better.

Chris asked the PAC what was missing from the economic data. Deb asked what marijuana fell under, in regards to industry. The answer was that it could show up in several categories such as agriculture, retail, and manufacturing.

Public Comment

Jeff Carey would like to see a comparison of the County sales tax averages and the State's averages. He is interested in what percentage of the industries in Mason County actually make up the worker's paycheck. For example he was surprised to learn that forestry only makes up 4% of the paychecks earned by workers in Mason County, yet Forestry is supposed to be one of our main industries.

End Public Comment

Deb asked why agriculture is not included in the data. Chris replied that they separate Ag data and non-Ag data because Ag data tends to include only seasonal workers and thus is captured differently; there is an Ag census which he can include if the PAC wishes. James asked how brush picker data would be captured. Chris replied that they may be under services since it becomes a marketed product. Chris will separate marijuana, brush picking, organic farming, and self-pick farms into the possible industry categories.

Vicki talked about the Sanderson Field Airport as a resource opportunity. James interrupted to mention that the EDC and the Port of Shelton are working to develop an aviation service area where the old fair grounds use to be.

Aaron noted that the planes still land without the aid of a control tower, it is not a full IFR. Chris said it was still an economic benefit with possible opportunity.

Vicki mentioned the Self-Sufficiency Study would be a good addition to the economic data that they were looking at.

Chris then went on to talk about the following five policy areas: Infrastructure and Capital Improvements, Development and Permitting, Education, Training, and Business Development,

Community Development and Quality of Life, and Industry. He asked the PAC what policy area presented issues that they wanted to address. Marilyn mentioned the Infrastructure portion and telecommuting and needing to build a better fiber optic network. Lynn talked about the availability of fiber in the core of Shelton, as well as the outlying areas. Marilyn interjected that there was room for improvement.

James told Chris, in regards to these policy areas, the EDC round table discussions would be of use.

James reiterated that there should be a telecommuting section, especially if they are becoming a bedroom community more and more. Aaron mentioned that a lot of businesses are moving toward telecommuting to the point where they are taking desks away and just providing stations that employees can use.

Marilyn mentioned that tourism needed to be addressed. Chris agreed that even though Mason County had a natural abundance of assets, which could be leveraged toward tourism, it would take a lot of effort to turn those into attractions. Tourism in this respect could be accomplished, again it falls to the goals of the community and the investment of interested parties.

Chris finished the presentation by again mentioning the public comment tool on the web, the address of which was provided earlier in the minutes. Deb and Aaron shared their last thoughts on wanting to see more opportunity focused in education through internships and apprenticeships. James credited Lynn Longan with working on these very topics.

Work Session – Capital Facilities and Utilities Element of Mason County Comprehensive Plan

Presenter: Paula Reeves, Planning Manager, Mason County Community Services

Paula introduced Joel Meyer, Public Information and Government Relations Manager from PUD 3. She had been including him in the discussions regarding the Utility Chapter, as well as getting data and input from him. She mentioned the Utilities Chapter as a draft with key themes that keep presenting themselves, such as Enhance Economic Opportunity, Promote Housing Choices, Value Communities and Neighborhoods, and Protect Water Quality and Quantity.

She started a slide presentation that featured a revised population projection for the County. The direction from the PAC and County Commissioners was to use the Office of Financial Management's Mid-Range Projections for growth. She also showed a map that depicted the UGA's as making up 2% of Mason County's land area.

James asked about the Shelton UGA population number, he was skeptical about the population in this area doubling in the next 20 years. Paula responded that they were using the City of Shelton's forecast numbers and that there was a memo explaining why they are using these numbers in regards to construction, expansion, and infrastructure. She explained that the County

and the City of Shelton have come to a middle ground on the Shelton UGA population numbers. For the County overall, we are looking at 32-34% growth over the 20 year period.

Turning to a housing slide, Paula told the PAC there was an error on a table on page 18 of the Housing Chapter. She went back to the slide mentioned that these were about 16,000 buildable lots in the County that they knew of, invested with development rights.

James asked Paula if the Shelton UGA has enough buildable lots to support the growth that the City of Shelton is forecasting. Paula believes there is substantial room for development, especially with the proposed expansion into the Dayton Airport Road area and the Shelton Hills area.

Dave explained Group A and B wells, which are governed by Ecology, water rights are associated with these. He mentioned the Hirst decision and hoping to have an answer to this question on Wednesday. Marilyn asked if the County had any community wide infrastructure distribution systems for grey water. Dave answered that they didn't have anything community wide. But interest in putting in "purple pipe" (grey water pipe) was being voiced in the community.

Joel mentioned that rural communities are mainly serviced through public utility districts or co-ops, much more so than municipalities or private companies, therefore the fuel mix is much cleaner, only 3% is carbon emitting resources. All the electricity that is sold on PUD 1 and PUD 3 is at cost, giving the community an economic benefit in terms of energy costs. Wind may eventually shift the percent of hydro energy used, but the tax incentive for utilizing wind energy may go away and there is resistance from the public power community to spend money to decrement wind when it produces more energy than hydro at certain times of the year.

Marilyn asked about the presence of solar in the utility data. Joel answered that there wasn't enough to show up in the chart. He mentioned that it could supplement the energy needs of residential homes, thus the less energy that PUD has to buy off the market, keeping consumer rates lower. They call this use "distributed energy generation".

Paula noted that there might be room in the Development Regulations to support more solar energy in the residential area. The average customer of PUD 1 and PUD 3, in Mason County, uses 1300 kWh, but with electricity being the primary heating source in the County the projected energy needs may need to be adjusted higher.

Paula advanced to the next slide which depicted natural gas lines, electricity conductors, solar intersection lighting, cell towers, and what was available on marine antennas. The alignment of these elements begin to show where the population centers are. Marilyn would like to see fiber optic lines depicted in the map. Paula mentioned that they have 467 miles of fiber optic cable in Mason County and that with Joel's help they are trying to gather more data on this topic. Joel mentioned that in December of 2016, PUD 3 did a survey to try to determine what type of broadband people had, their satisfaction, and where they wanted fiber services to go. They also had about 4,000 people on a list who wanted to have some type of broadband service. Joel mentioned they would be having a workshop that discusses neighborhood type builds using

broadband. There are needs in bedroom communities to have high speed connection services. Getting to those areas that branch far into the County, situations where there is a 1000ft driveway, become a problem as well as very expensive.

Paula brought up the Capital Facilities slide, she wanted to get the new PAC members up to speed on what was occurring in that chapter. The PUD is planning up to five new substations within this plan. Under the GMA they are also going to have to identify electric vehicle charging stations, something that will be included in the Development Regulations. Joel interjected to say PUD 3 is working with Mason County Transit to put charging stations in downtown Shelton. PUD 1 is working to put stations in Hoodsport.

Paula continued to point out elements listed in the slide about Capital Facilities. Joel brought up the extensive number of seasonal customers that both PUD 1 & PUD 3 have. PUD 3 has 25% seasonal customers which is pretty high, 18-20% for PUD 1. His guess is that many of these homes could become permanent homes. Paula noted they may need to reconcile the county's "occupied house" data and PUD's "seasonal house" data. Having the correct numbers on seasonal homes is important to calculating the housing need in the County.

Marilyn mentioned page 5 of the Utility Chapter, at the top, growth in LAMIRDS supporting infrastructure and thus creating more jobs. Paula replied that LAMIRDS would be in the Rural Development element and that it may be something to expand on within that discussion. Marilyn also mentioned storm water data as being old, from 2007. Paula replied that there was a storm water utility advisory group that had made additional changes to the Development Regulations, from Paula's understanding this group was an implementation body. She did highlight that there were some goals in their plan that the County hadn't achieved yet. Marilyn would like to revisit this topic. Paula said that reviewing the Development Regulations according to what is required by LID may help storm water issues.

Paula wrapped up the Utilities presentation and asked the PAC members to have their comments for this Utility draft sent by email by the end of the month.

Public Comment

Jeff Carey was concerned that building more PUD substations was not substantiated by the utility data concerning the County conserving more energy.

End of Comment

Public Hearing – Title 17, Chapter 17.03 Development Requirements, amending Section 17.03.030 to permit on-site sewage disposal systems and prohibit holding tanks within the Belfair and Allyn Urban Growth Areas.

Presenter: David Windom, Director, Mason County Community Services

Dave started his presentation on the Belfair sewer. He noted that the Belfair UGA did not have a moratorium. He stated that we have holding tanks that are not serviced by the sewer which violates the WAC and the County has no ability to pump it. A three bedroom home with a 1200 gallon tank at 150 gals/ a day is going to need to be pumped once a week, since you have to

leave a third of the tank as reserve. He went through the County code, Title 17 and Chapter 13. He went through WAC 24.627.28.240 but there wasn't much wiggle room; there were only a couple of instances where you can have a holding tank. Dave directed the PAC to a bill that was passed on May 16, 2017, Substitute House Bill 1683. On page four of the bill he read out loud, "...nothing in this chapter obligates counties, cities, or utilities to install sanitary sewer systems to properties within urban growth areas designated under subsection (2) of this section by the end of the twenty-year planning period when those properties: (i) have an existing, functioning, nonpolluting on-site sewage systems, (ii) have a periodic inspection program by a public agency to verify the on-site sewage systems function properly and do not pollute surface or groundwater, (iii) have no redevelopment capacity; or Do not require sewer service because development densities are limited due to wetlands, flood plains, fish and wildlife habitats, or geological hazards."

Belfair is a technical challenge to get services to, as well as a lot of area not being developable due to critical areas. The document he had brought to the PAC tonight has also been briefed with the Commissioners and the Commissioners wanted the PAC to review it. In Title 17.03.030 Dave has worked with the language under "New Lots". Much of the language stayed the same except when the following circumstances apply:

- (i) *Use of on-site sewer systems as a transitional strategy where there is a development phasing plan in place (see WAC 365-195-330 [WAC 365-196-330]);*
or
- (ii) *To serve isolated pockets of urban land difficult to serve due to terrain, critical areas or where the benefit of providing an urban level of service is cost-prohibitive; or*
- (iii) *Where on-site systems are the best available technology for the circumstances and are designed to serve urban densities.*

James was concerned with who decides what is "cost-prohibitive". Dave replied that the criteria for that section still needs to be decided. Vicki asked for clarification on which sections of the document that Dave revised applied to which UGA. Dave explained the lay out and application of the document sections.

Dave directed the PAC to look at number 7 on page 2 of 17.03.030. He received a letter from the North Mason Chamber of Commerce on sub-section (i), which reads:

Should sewer connections not become available within 500 feet over a period of 10 years from initial installation of the septic system, the customer is entitled to a refund of CFC.

The Chamber would like to see 500 feet change to 200 feet. Dave believes this desire is because 200 feet matches WAC 246 under failing systems, which states that if there is sewer within 200 feet then that person is required to connect to sewer rather than repair the failing septic system.

James mentioned number 8 on page 2, "*The developer of an extension may collect latecomer's fees for offsite improvements.*" James would like to add "reasonable" between "collect" and "latecomer's".

Dave discussed number 9 on page 2 as developing from conversation with Public Works Director Jerry Hauth.

If a Large Onsite Septic System (LOSS) is constructed in the Belfair UGA to serve development prior to sewer becoming available, the County shall be designated at the operator

of the LOSS in order to establish a billing relationship with those served properties and to enable components of the LOSS to be repurposed as a lift component for connection to sewer.

Aaron noted that “designated at the operator” should be “designated as the operator”.

James mentioned adding “development” to section b on page 2, after “All residential, industrial, and commercial development”. Dave also mentioned using the word “structures”.

Aaron mentioned consistency in numbering sections.

Vicki asked where the greatest push back would occur. Dave answered that the distance portion regarding feet from sewer connection would be the point of concern for most.

Marilyn was worried why the County wasn’t red flagging or posting do not occupy on houses with failing septic systems. Dave replied that they were, but the trouble was finding these failing systems and with better reporting standards they would be finding more of these systems.

Jason asked what the County was requiring in regards to routine inspection and maintenance for septic systems. Dave replied that they require inspection and maintenance every 3 years for gravity and every year for pump/pressure systems. Jason was worried about requiring and enforcing. Dave mentioned that they have had over 8,000 pumper reports in the last year which is significantly greater than the past. Jason added that maybe they could leave the hook up distance at 200ft but put a stipulation in the document that anyone within that 200ft to 500ft have an annual inspection.

Marilyn asked about holding tanks, if we had any in the County. Dave replied there are some in certain commercial and RV sites, but they are not allowed as a method of residential waste disposal.

Public Comment

Jeff Carey asked if residences in the north Belfair area, within the discussed range of the sewer will be paying hookup fees even though the sewer is not there presently. Dave answered yes, but he is trying to set it up in a way that if the sewer didn’t arrive in an area in 10 years the home owner could get those fees back or keep them in the fund for the future. Jeff mentioned number 10 on page 2 of 17.03.030, he was curious if it also pertained to the Plat of Allyn as it exists. Dave answered no and that it pertained to this point, moving forward. He also mentioned section 3 of 17.03.030, removing it and letting code dictate this portion or just removing Allyn from this section altogether. He also suggested changing 8000 sq. ft. to 9600 sq. ft., currently the lots are around 4800 sq. ft. and the current stipulation of section 3 on page 3 of 17.03.030 only allows for consolidation of existing residential lots to form a single lot no greater than 8000 sq. ft, thus consolidating two lots in the Plat of Allyn becomes impossible. James asked Dave if changing the square footage to 9600 would conflict with code. Dave replied that he would research that question.

Constance asked for clarification on the Capital Facilities Chapter, Dave and Paula replied that the chapter had been approved by Commerce. She also wanted clarification on who would be required to hook up to the sewer. Dave answered that the sewer hookup requirement applied to everyone in the UGA, where infrastructure supports the process.

Teri King mentioned that the Mason County on site sewer management plan states that within a 1000ft of any sensitive waters and within the Belfair UGA, all water sheds draining into the Hood Canal are considered sensitive areas. This is in accordance to what Mason County has adopted, as well as what the Commissioners' have agreed upon. The 500ft distance hook up maybe a good idea, but she also thought there needed to be annual management included in the plan.

Jason stated that he believes the County needed to do a better job of mandating as well as penalizing those who are not pumping and doing their inspections as required. He also stated that he knows affordability comes into play. Dave replied that the County does have a program to reimburse up to \$200.00 for pumping if the residence is considered low income.

Marilyn made a motion to recommend acceptance of the changes to Title 17 as proposed, as well as a hearing with the Board of Commissioners. Jason seconded the motion, all in favor, motion carried.

Vicki would like it to be noted that she desired Jeff Carey's issue with section 3 of 17.03.030, changing 8000sq. ft. to 9600sq. ft, be discussed at another PAC meeting.

New Business - None

Adjournment

Jason made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:52 p.m.