

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

August 28, 2017

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

Call to Order

James called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

Roll Call

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

Excused: Jason Bailey

Regular Business

Approval of minutes-

July 17, 2017- Aaron made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, Vicki seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

Approval of Agenda – No additions or changes to the agenda

Conflict of Interest – None.

Next Planning Commission Regular Meeting Date, September 18, 2017 and Joint PAC/BOCC Meeting September 27, 2017 – Paula confirmed that the time scheduled for the Joint Meeting is 6pm. Vicki mentioned that she will not be able to attend the September 18th PAC Meeting.

Committee/Staff Updates – Paula mentioned that on October 19th the American Planning Association is hosting a planner's forum in the Shelton area, specific location to be determined and the topic is Utilities with a focus on stormwater, water, and waste water. Paula will check if registration is necessary.

Other – None

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items – Julianne Andrewski was interested in building a tiny home on wheels, after doing some research she had discovered she didn't have a place in the County to put it. She wants to be in compliance with County and State regulations. James asked Ms. Andrewski if she had looked at plans approved by different municipalities. Paula stated that the best agency to get information from would be Labor and Industries. Ms. Andrewski mentioned that the design would be custom and would be submitted to L & I for approval. She talked about the L & I literature and that if a tiny home is on wheels they consider it a Recreational Vehicle, which you cannot live in year round. She talked about categorizing them as their own entity due to the growing interest. James asked Ms. Andrewski to leave her contact information with the clerk.

Public Comment Period Closed.

Briefing – Solid Waste Plan

Presenter(s): Bart Stepp, Deputy Director of Utilities Waste Management for Public Works

Bart mentioned that the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, for the last two years, had been working on revisions to the Comprehensive Solid Waste Plan. A draft had been completed, a copy submitted to Mason County Planning for SEPA review, and review at this meeting for comments from the PAC. Next week they have a public hearing with the Commission to take public comment.

He then presented an outline of the Mason County existing solid waste system utility. A transfer facility is located at Eels Hill, and three rural stations located at Union, Hoodsport, and Belfair. The material at the rural stations gets transferred to Eels Hill, then it is transferred to a landfill in Roosevelt in Eastern Washington. Mason County has solid waste, recycling, and household hazardous waste services. Recycling is taken through Mason County Garbage, they have their own process for getting rid of it or providing to buyers. Mason County has various vendors who take and dispose or recycle household hazardous waste. Mason County Garbage is a private company not part of the county system and is the only certified hauler in the County. They provide all the curbside services in the County and the City.

The plan has to be approved by the County and the City of Shelton, costs are consolidated by including both jurisdictions. The plan makes them eligible for state funding. Bart talked about different funding options and how the non-funding of the state capital budget will affect maintenance, operations, and recycling of household hazardous waste. An improved plan equals better funding options.

He also talked about project outlooks in the short term (6 year) and long term (20 year), these looked at how much waste they would take in and whether they have the capacity or not. He talked about the Means Assessment that was compiled by consultant company Parametrix. This assessment was included in the plan.

He talked about high priority projects they were beginning and their funding through the landfill fund. The Eels Hill facility, as it currently stands, may not be able to meet the incoming waste needs of the County.

He mentioned the tipping fee per ton for Mason County, it is comparable to other nearby counties. Kitsap County is a lot lower but that is because they are subsidized by the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

Bart talked about the closed landfill at Eels Hill and noted that they have at least two more years of ground water monitoring before finalizing the closure process. There is a reserve fund for the landfill in case monitoring results show that improvements need to be made, but after the two years of monitoring, if results are good and ecology signs off, the funding could go towards other improvements.

The lack of CPG funding will necessitate that tipping fees pay for recycling and household hazardous waste.

He mentioned that the County's long haul contract with Republic and their recycling contract with Mason County Garbage both expire in August of 2020. It is getting close to the time to renegotiated or request for bid on new contracts.

Marilyn doesn't believe expanding garbage or landfill facilities is the best use of funding and that alternative recycling and technologies would be a better path to take. She asked about composting facilities and addressing the fact that we have too much waste.

Bart talked about Mason County Garbage's role in curbside pick-up and that the County doesn't have any say in what they pick up. The recycling that Mason County Utilities and Waste Management provides is the blue box recycling bins at their drop box locations and their transfer locations, these boxes do accept glass.

Mason County Garbage and Recycling curbside service is regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.

Delroy Cox explained the certification process for Washington State rural haulers. There is only one hauler per area, so Mason County has one hauler for curbside services. Due to the hauler having the advantage of being the only service in a county, they are highly scrutinized and regulated for increases and service standards. He did mention that the solid waste plan does discuss alternative recycling possibilities.

In regards to the food composting topic, Bart mentioned the plan does discuss it but it is a very labor intensive process. Delroy stated that a food composting program would have more success if it was a regional program this would ensure an adequate facility was created to take care of the high volumes and labor intensity.

In regards to roadside garbage pickup, the sheriff has a litter program and environmental health responds to dumping if it is a code enforcement problem, but Utilities and Waste Management does not have a program providing that service. Marilyn mentioned the idea of adding a service fee to be collected from county residents that could be used to clean up the roadside.

Vicki asked Bart if there was a timeline that he needed the PAC comments by. He mentioned that comments would be desired before the SEPA process is closed, he did not know the exact date but believed it was several weeks.

Paula was wondering if the PAC members knew of non-profit organizations that might get involved in the education part of littering and recycling within the community.

Work Session – Capital Improvement Plan, Comprehensive Plan Amendments, and Development Regulations

Presenter(s): Paula Reeves, Planning Manager

Capital Facilities Improvement Plan-

Paula went through a power-point that reiterated key points of the work on the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that there are current revised versions of all eight elements of the Comprehensive Plan on the website, she has continually been taking public comment, the Countywide Policies were reviewed, and an extra public engagement survey done.

She talked about the policies and how there was a general consensus that they should be consolidated in one document, though the Housing Element does require the housing policies also reside in the Housing Chapter.

Public Priorities with additions:

1. Enhance Economic Opportunities
2. Promote Housing Choices
3. Value Communities and Neighborhoods
4. Protect Water Quality and Quantity
5. Desire to maintain Quality of Life
6. Convenient Access to Goods and Services

She mentioned the population data and the allocation of the population to Urban Growth Areas. Housing demands in the next 20 years will be met with land capacity available in Mason County. Transportation system has 620 miles of arterials in the County and 64 bridges that the County is responsible for, all above standards for maintenance. In regards to water and wastewater, consumption and opportunities for mitigation planning are being discussed with possible mapping stormwater management planning and mitigation.

In regards to the Capital Facilities Improvement Plan, people may be confused; this plan is not a budget, it is a coordination process among County departments and divisions, as well as non-county organizations such as schools. Essentially it acts as a coordination and prioritization tool in which gaps can be identified.

Key improvements in the next cycle, 2018-2023, and beyond into the 20 year range include improvements, to the sewer in Belfair, solid waste facilities, county jails, and campus facilities. It also looks at County growth and the additional services that may be needed.

Paula expressed that she would like to have dialog and comment during this work session and then produce a first draft that updates what is on the Mason County website now, under the 2016-2036 Comp Plan Update section title. The Capital Facilities Plan Chapter on the website was adopted in 2017, went through the full public comment process, the Board of County Commissioners, and Commerce adoption. If the public wants to make comments, the 2017 Capital Facilities Element is available online and is the version being updated.

Marilyn asked if culverts have to be replaced for salmon access and is it in this Capital Facilities Chapter. Aaron answered that it would be within Public Works and Road Funds. Marilyn asked if it had to be approached proactively. Aaron responded that it depended on the stream and the bridge and if they have been identified as priority bridges that have to be done now. He wasn't

sure if Mason County had bridges identified as priority by the state. There are a few on WSDOT owned roads that will be worked on soon in the area.

Paula mentioned that staff were in the process of completing more mapping of these Capital Facilities. She noted the amount of parks in Mason County and the projects on the books for improvement, as well as the resources taken in through state and federal sources to support the parks.

Marilyn asked about Reet 2 funding and if it had shifted from parks to the Belfair Sewer completely. Bart Stepp answered that part of the Reet 2 goes to Belfair, but believed not all of it. With the lack of customers to fund the Belfair Sewer, Reet 2 funding has been necessary.

Paula and PAC members discussed the public's issues with the Capital Facilities Plan and encouraged the public to send in written comment. This Capital Facilities Plan update will include projects for both six and 20 year planning periods.

Vicki and James mentioned that the public may see disconnect between what they would like to see and the funds that are realistically available. Marilyn mentioned that the plan should possibly have a section where it looks back at what was done in 2012, 2013, and so forth.

Comprehensive Plan Amendments –

James Paddon Rezone (Puget Sound Evergreen) - DDR2017-00074

Paula noted that the application for amendment to the Comprehensive Plan future land use map or development regulations process is open all year, starting on August 1st and ending on July 31st. This year three formal Comp Plan amendments were received.

The James Paddon parcel has been a non-conforming commercial use. The business on the parcel, Puget Sound Evergreen, provides greenery to florists. The owner has done a boundary line adjustment in order to expand his business.

Paula mentioned that when boundary line adjustments are made, the code encourages re-examining the zoning to make non-conforming, conforming. She pointed out the parcel in question on the tv screen, the parcel currently has two zones, rural residential 5 and low density residential. Paddon would like to rezone to general commercial/business industrial. This parcel is in the Belfair Urban Growth Area.

Concerns mentioned from the PAC were the following: would expansion affect surrounding community in the future, how will different owners use that new zoning, and would a different area for the business be more appropriate.

Marilyn read the following section from the Mason County Code on non-conforming uses:

“All legal non-conforming uses shall be encouraged to convert to a conforming use whenever possible.”

Paula noted that the parcel is in the UGA, the place they desire this type of zoning, general commercial/business industrial, to be located.

James would like information on the road frontage for this parcel, he was concerned that additional business would result in a lot of traffic.

Paula clarified that these amendments were only being reviewed tonight, this was not a hearing.

Marilyn asked what the limit of area to be rezoned per year was and if these amendments contributed to that number. Paula said she would get back to Marilyn with an answer. Deb was interested in the zoning across from the parcel in question, Paula believed it was rural residential, she will provide the PAC with further details for the next meeting.

Jeffrey and Stephanie Neil BLA and Rezone – DDR2017-00085

The request is for a boundary line adjustment to take the approximately 1 acre parcel out of the Urban Growth Area and a rezone from Rural Residential 4 to Rural Residential 5.

Stephanie Neil testified on the request. She handed out a map that County GIS put together showing the parcel and what she said were the issues with Irene Creek and a wetland across the highway. When the Urban Growth Boundary was drawn, Irene Creek was not shown on the map, they didn't have the location. She believed that if the County had that information they wouldn't have drawn the boundary as is. With the creek there and the buffer needed, she didn't think it would support Rural Residential 4 development. She would like to take this parcel out of the Belfair UGA.

Neil mentioned the 70 acres across the road, how it was bought as mitigation for highway 3, that the parcel is owned by the Greater Peninsula Conservancy, and according to Neil is under a permanent conservation easement. She pointed out the wetland on the tv screen and mentioned how it feed the creek which runs along the bottom of the property.

Neil talked about how she believed she could not develop the parcel at RR4 levels and currently she would have to pay taxes as if she could develop at that level.

Marilyn asked if the sewer was up to the parcel. Neil answered no, it stopped at Irene Creek; a pumping station would have to be installed in that area to bring it, the sewer, up the hill.

Marilyn asked if removing this acre from the UGA would require compensation of the UGA by adding somewhere else. Paula noted that changing the boundary line of the UGA at an arterial would have to be considered carefully.

Revisions to the Belfair UGA Development Regulations –

Paula mentioned the Revisions to the Belfair UGA Development Regulations packet that the PAC had received tonight, she mentioned that they would be available on the website soon. These packets were for members to take and review.

Marilyn asked if they had received the Capital Facilities Plan Chapter Update, the answer was no. Paula said that based on tonight's discussion and public comment, the chapter will get revised and posted on the website.

Regarding the revisions to Belfair, Paula pointed out the piece requesting the adoption of the 2012 Stormwater Management Plan for Western Washington. Also, revisions on transportation to meet current national standards. She noted that she walked through these revisions with the proposer and they are all in line with the PAC goals, the GMA (Growth Management Act) and the Comprehensive Plan. She said they would discuss these further at the September 18th meeting. She mentioned they had the option of forwarding on the Development Regulations and the Comprehensive Plan as a package or they could be dealt with separately.

Paula will provide the name of the land use consultant that provided the Belfair Development Regulation revisions, this was a private citizen submission through the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process. The forms for this type of request can be found on the Mason County Website under the Planning Land Use Permits section.

State Revisions to the Development Regulations -

Paula noted that she had a clearer idea of how these revisions would look in the Mason County Code. She mentioned that they updated the required revisions to the Critical Areas Ordinance to meet state law, in April of 2017.

1. *Public Benefit Rating System to incentivize conservation and preservation of public space and resources (MCC 3.25)*

This Development Regulation is not required by law, but has been on the books for years, originally passed in 2003. It enables a property owner to seek a tax abatement, credit, for dedicating open space. The bulk of the document defines eligible lands. They are all defined and consistent with state law. It has a scoring process that is similar to what many other counties have implemented. This document helps to establish a framework for this process which is already open to people by state law. Those currently using this tax credit can use this revised process to reapply.

2. *Limit non-agricultural uses to agricultural lands less suited for agricultural purposes (RCW 36.70A.177 (3))*

Paula mentioned that those non-supporting soil types are well defined, but whether there are many areas in the County with non-supporting soils is unknown. There is a soil map for Mason County that is USGS standard and could possibly act as justification for identification purposes.

3. *Public Involvement in the Comprehensive Plan including annual and emergency amendments (RCW 36.70A.130(2))*

When the County has emergency revisions to the Comp Plan, there still has to be public notice and opportunity to comment that precedes the adoption of the amendments. It would apply to Title 15 under Notice of Public Meetings and Public Hearings.

4. *Permit Electric Vehicle Infrastructure*

Paula mentioned that she updated these regulations with the comments she received from the PAC since the last meeting.

Marilyn wanted clarification on whether charging stations would be allowed in residential zones. Paula replied that the lower level stations are safe for residential, higher level/rapid charging stations are found in commercial or industrial areas.

James asked if members were content with the revisions made to the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure.

Marilyn asked if they could vote on the Regulations separately, the answer was yes.

*Marilyn made a motion to accept the Electrical Vehicle Infrastructure Ordinance as presented. Vicki seconded the motion, all in favor, motion carried.

Deb wanted to make sure the low intensity charging stations would still get reviewed for buffers and siting when in a residential area. Paula replied that site planning tools would be used with locating these stations. Deb was concerned with level 3 stations on residential parcels. Aaron and James noted that they were basically white boxes, like a transformer with a plug in that you would see at a Costco.

Vicki asked what the permitting process was for these stations. Paula replied that the County would review these stations when development proposals were submitted, it would be part of the building and site permitting plan submittal. Building permits, siting, and possibly Mason Environmental permits may be required.

*Marilyn made a motion to pass the Notice of Public Meetings and Public Hearings Amendment as presented. Aaron seconded the motion, all in favor, motion carried.

In regards to the Agricultural Development Regulations revisions, Vicki asked if there was anything in the Agricultural Resource Lands Section of 17.02 that had to be updated as well. Paula replied that in discussing this issue for the rural area, the resource ordinance Agricultural Lands sections was found to be the right place to make those revisions.

Aaron asked if people applying for the Public Benefit Rating System tax break get a checklist. Paula mentioned that there is an application to file and fee.

Paula noted that the Public Benefit Rating System document was put together using the best pieces from other counties, she tried to make it as concise as possible without losing the necessary elements. The strikethroughs within the document were from the Assessor and the Attorneys revisions.

Marilyn has some comments on the Resource and Rural Agricultural Lands section of the Public Benefit Rating System document that she will email Paula.

Paula pointed out page 16 of the Benefit Rating System, no 3.25.240 Duties of the Planning Commission. This section states that the PAC will review the first 1000 acres that come into the program or will make a review of the program after the first 2 years.

Briefing – Countywide Planning Policies and Public Outreach Update

Presenter(s): Paula Reeves, Planning Manager.

Paula noted that they started reviewing Planning Policies in April 2017, there were over 1300 policies within the document. This new draft includes collecting public input, and removing redundancies and completed objectives. Over time many policies had been codified or added to code, or were stated in State law, thus not necessary to restate. Three items within the chapter are Policies, Objectives, and Procedures. She also mentioned the public surveys that were attached to the packet.

Marilyn found the inclusion of goals specifically to Harstine Island, Allyn, or Belfair area as disconnected from “Countywide” policies. Aaron and James don’t mind the callout of specific areas because some items, such as ball fields and play grounds are little to none in Allyn for example.

Vicki mentioned that her understanding was that policies were countywide, while objectives and procedures were not necessarily. Vicki and Marilyn agreed that maybe labeling the source of the objective or procedure may help in clarification.

Marilyn asked if Table 1 on page 5 came from the Washington GMA, she thought the table should be renamed “Washington GMA Policy Statements”.

On page 9, Marilyn mentioned the following line:

“...fewer restrictions and more privacy than in an urban area; the easy operation of resource based industries...”

She would like to remove the word “easy” or replace with “responsible”.

Vicki asked if changing the vision statement put together by another group was acceptable. James agreed that “responsible” was a good replacement. Aaron noted that the permitting process, in regard to these industries, is not an “easy” process.

Vicki and Marilyn had comments and additions that they will send on to Paula.

Vicki asked about the highlighted text in the Countywide Policies chapter. Paula mention no. 145 that was highlighted on page 31, titled Citizen Participation. She wanted to know if the PAC wanted to remove it from this chapter because it will now be codified in the Development Regulations. Marilyn would like to see something specific to forming citizen groups to review and revise the sub-area plans. Paula mentioned no. 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 on page 21, these were provisions that were in the last Comprehensive Plan related to the sewer; she questioned whether they were in sync with today’s Capital Facilities Plan and objectives. Vicki was curious if they were consistent with 17.03.030 concerning onsite sewage disposal systems. Paula will confirm with Dave on this item.

Aaron mentioned getting rid of the redundancy in 6.1, 8.1, 10.1, and so forth. In most cases these restate the policy above them.

Marilyn had some additional wording and/or changes under the Policy headings of Housing and Environment that will also be sent to Paula.

New Business – James would like a review of the most recent Economic Development Chapter. He would like a half hour to discuss it and have Lynn Longan back in October. Paula stated the intent to adopt the Comprehensive Plan was set for November 13, 2017. She reminded the PAC of the Joint Meeting on September 27, 2017. She said she would be happy to compile any presentation material the members might want to use for that meeting.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

*Indicates Motions

Indicates material to follow up on