

**Mason County
Planning Advisory Commission**

September 18, 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, Jason Bailey, and James Thomas

Excused: Vicki Wilson

Regular Business

Approval of minutes-

August 28, 2017- No changes mentioned. Deb made a motion to accept the minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Aaron, all in favor, motion carried.

Approval of Agenda – Paula mentioned that Todd Parker, Program Coordinator for Public Health, was present to talk about housing and homelessness at the beginning of the Comprehensive Plan Update section of the meeting.

Conflict of Interest – None.

Next Planning Commission Regular Meeting Date, October 16, 2017 and First BOCC Hearing on Comprehensive Plan, October 24, 2017

Committee/Staff Updates – None

Other – None

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items – Constance Ibsen asked the Commission to reserve time to listen to the residents in the area of the Webb Hill Bio-Recycling Treatment and Beneficial Use Facility and the residents who use the regional aquifer for their drinking water.

Public Comment Closed

Briefing – Bio-Recycling Treatment and Beneficial Use Facility at Webb Hill – Bio-Recycling Corporation/Parametrix

Presenter(s): Meeta Pannu and Kelsey Dunne, Southwest Regional Biosolids Coordinators for the Washington Department of Ecology. Brian Hickey, Operations Manager Bio-Recycling

Paula mentioned that she had invited Washington State Department of Ecology to talk about the technical aspects, as well as BioRecycling’s Operation Manager Brian Hickey to talk about the business aspects. The topic of biorecycling and the Webb Hill facility, which performs this

action, had come up on several occasions and she thought it would be helpful to set a framework for possible future Planning Advisory Commission involvement.

Meeta Pannu was the first presenter. She began a slide presentation on the basics of biosolids, what they are, where they come from, and where they go (i.e. flushing toilets, running sinks, etc.). There are Class A biosolids and Class B biosolids (more common and application permit required). Class A still requires a land application permit, but the restrictions on where you can apply are few in comparison to Class B. Class A can be used as a backyard fertilizer, but it should still be used according to application instructions. Class B cannot be applied in backyards.

James asked if Class A biosolids are sterilized. Meeta said that both classes are tested to different standards, they do test for fecal chloroform, pollutants, and Vector Standard (which is attraction by insects, birds, and animals).

Meeta explained the difference between biosolids and sewage sludge; biosolids are the treated solid product and sewage sludge is the untreated solid, even if it is treated it does not meet the quality for land application. Septage is the material that can be removed from septic tanks, portable toilets, or RVs, it can be treated to either septage land application standards or biosolid standards.

Marilyn asked if treated septage also included commercial/industrial septage. Kelsey interrupted to mention that it can be domestic in quality but can also include up to 25%, by volume, grease trappings from restaurants.

Meeta then provided the basic composition of biosolids:

- 60% - Organic matter (oxygen, carbon, and nitrogen)
- Inorganic matter (silt clay and sand)
- Dissolved Nutrients (magnesium, sodium, sulfur, molybdenum, and iron)
- Trace Metals (heavy metals or pollutants)

The trace metals are in small quantities and they have standards for their measurements within the biosolids. Meeta showed a picture of how biosolids are stored in the winter months in Eastern Washington.

The benefits of biosolids are that they are nutrient rich and provide a soil amendment. If they are applied according to plant or crop needs, the use of fertilizer becomes unnecessary. She explained that biosolids are here to stay and that the Department of Ecology has regulatory practices that ensure proper management of biosolids in regards to overuse. They have a two part job which involves regulation and technical support.

Kelsey introduced herself and explained that biosolids are regulated at two levels, the federal and state levels. The law mandates that biosolids are seen as a commodity and should be beneficially reused to the maximum extent possible. Biosolid facilities are managed under a General Permit, it is a five year permit. Waste water treatment plants that produce biosolids, land application facilities, facilities that compost biosolids, and septage facilities that treat and land apply biosolids are all required to apply for coverage under the Department of Ecology's permit.

They check for three main issues in regards to facilities treating their biosolids, pathogen reduction (within this reduction they can meet Class A or B standards), Class A is essentially 99% pathogen reduction from what it was on entrance to the waste water treatment plant and Class B is the equivalent of 98% reduced. Shelton Waste Water Treatment Plant is Class A and they do distribute to the public. Then there is the Vector Attraction Reduction Standard, there are several ways that facilities can meet this standard; odor and attraction to insects, mice, birds, dogs, etc. Pollutants is the third standard they look for, facilities are required to monitor for nine different pollutants. She mentioned that she rarely had facilities test above the threshold for pollutants, and when it has happened it usually is a lab error.

Kelsey talked about the permitting process, it tends to be complicated and time consuming but it provides for plenty of review, requests for resubmittal with additional information, and reapplication. She mentioned the point that the Biorecycling facility in Shelton was at in the permitting process; the Department of Ecology has drafted a final coverage letter, they have received public comments, and the responses to those comments should be sent out in the next couple of weeks. Marilyn asked if re-review of an application involved the examination of test results over the period that the facility had been in operation. Kelsey responded that the facility is required to submit the last two years of test data, but an annual report is always required interim. James asked if they can use their own internal lab or if a third party lab is required. Kelsey said that the facility can do the testing on their own, but the compliance samples are required to be tested by a lab accredited by the Department of Ecology to test not only the specific method, but also for the specific matrix. Most facilities are not equipped to do all the tests.

Public Comment Open

Steven Van Denover asked, based on the current Department of Ecology data, if the three waste water facilities serving 25% of Mason County had experienced any difficulty or issues based on biosolids or the disposition of those biosolids. Kelsey responded that the three facilities in Mason County, not including Shelton, which are Rustlewood, North Bay, and Belfair do not meet biosolid standards, they all produce sewage sludge.

Paula introduced Brian Hickey Operations Manager for Biorecycling at what they call the North Ranch (Webb Hill). Their facility in Shelton is both the treatment facility and the land application site. The biosolids they produce are Class B in Shelton. He went on to describe an operation overview of the Shelton Biorecycling facility. The Department of Ecology was requiring them to store and not apply biosolids this winter. Application in winter may be an attributing factor to high nitrite accumulation in a couple of their monitoring wells. The facility averages around 60,000 gallons of material per day, most of which comes from domestic septic tanks being pumped. Brian described how they filter and treat the product. Since 2014 they have been dewatering their product to pull the solids out of the material. They take those Class B solids off site. In 2016, they hauled off site 1130 dry tons of the material. Aaron asked how deep their monitoring wells were, Brian responded that they were down to the aquifer, 140-150 feet. Their domestic well is around 200 feet. James asked where the product that they haul off site goes to, Brian responded with Natural Selection Farms in Eastern

Washington, Goldendale, Wa and outside of Yakima to a Class B facility. They also haul to Tribeca Farms in Woodland, Wa in the summer.

Marilyn asked if Biorecycling was essentially applying what looked like water to their fields in Shelton. Brian said that it has a lot of ammonia and nitrogen still. She asked if they harvest from their land, Brian answered that they harvest hay and haylage.

Public Comment Opened

Steve Van Denver asked Brian if he produced round bales of hay and what the protein count was, Brian answered in the affirmative and said that they had some bales in the range of 18-20% protein.

Jack Johnson asked how the operation affected the deer population. Brian said that there were hundreds of deer in the area, they are very attracted to the growth in the fields. There is a fence around the fields. As per stipulation of the facility's permit, there is also no public access to the fields.

Deb asked Brian if he was currently operating with a permit and if it was hard to get. Brian answered that they are operating with a permit and that it hasn't been hard to get, but it is a lengthy process.

Public Hearing – Comprehensive Plan Update including Capital Facilities Element and Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Presenter(s): Paula Reeves, Planning Manager

Paula mentioned that the focus was any element in the Comprehensive Plan and that the public was invited to comment. The plan and amendments are all on the Mason County website, <http://www.co.mason.wa.us/community-services/planning/2036-comp-plan-update/index.php>.

She introduced Todd Parker as the housing expert in the Community Services Department.

Todd introduced himself as the Housing and Mental Health Program Coordinator for Mason County. He manages the consolidated homeless grants and recording fees to provide a lot of the programs and services that are available in the community with a focus on homelessness. Affordable housing is relative to income. Affordability includes not only a mortgage, but property tax, home owner's insurance, etc. Same idea is applied to renters when the term fair market rent was used. He defined what cost burden was, typically over 30% of income going toward housing costs, so everything related to housing is included. He mentioned that the Mason County Comp Plan states that those paying over 30% of their income are in the range of 30-35% of the County population.

He talked about incentivizing developers to build affordable housing, but also looking at the jobs in the County and what they pay. He stated that using information from the Economic Development Council about 67% of the jobs in the County are below 80% of the area median

income. He mentioned that the difficulty was matching home prices with the income that our jobs support.

He mentioned the Point in Time Homeless Count, changes to the definition of sheltered had been made by the Department of Commerce. He said that these changes had dropped their homeless count by about 25%. He explained what unsheltered referred to, where the shelters were in the County and their capacity, and the causes of homelessness. He talked about Coordinated Entry operated by Crossroad Housing. One of the problems within the County is not enough shelter space. He talked about the lack of housing in the County and housing types. James asked Todd if he was able to filter transients versus long time Mason residents. Todd said that last time he scanned the data most are residents and not transients.

Marilyn asked what happened to people within the category “structures lacking amenities”, which the Department of Commerce took off the list under homeless. Todd answered that they count as housed now. She asked how you separate out a structure that lacks amenities from an abandoned building that may have all the utilities turned off. Todd replied that essentially there isn’t a difference.

Jason asked how the County homeless count compares to surrounding counties. Todd answered that Thurston County had fewer homeless, but they also had a lot more shelter space than Mason County.

Public Comment Opened

Steve Van Denver asked for a copy of the handout and spoke about a homeless camp not too far away that he helped distribute bottled water to. Todd asked how many tents there were, Steve said there were 65-70 tents. Steve asked if they were included in the Point in Time Count, Todd said the count takes place in January, it is a nationally determined date. The count relies on camp liaisons to provide numbers.

Paula then returned to the podium to ask how the commission members wanted to run the rest of the meeting. James asked Paula to read a letter with concerns from Ken Van Buskirk.

Paula mentioned that she received comment from Ken earlier today, September 18, 2017. She had distributed copies to the commission members at the beginning of the meeting. James asked Paula to summarize his points. Paula said that Ken was concerned that the public was unaware of the amendments, could easily get the information on the Comprehensive Plan, also commented that the website was difficult to navigate, and concerned that it was not a transparent process in regards to the amendments but in particular the Public Benefit Rating System. He was concerned with the limited time to review various components of the Comprehensive Plan and then there were three or four specifics about various chapters. A copy of this letter was recorded with the clerk.

Paula responded to the concerns by saying that the various chapters of the Comprehensive Plan have been posted on the public website since April 2017. The PAC had gone through each one and had, at least, one public hearing on each chapter; the public always has the comment opportunity at each one of the meetings and the Joint BOCC/PAC Meeting. She explained that

what was new in comparison to how the meetings were run before, was a three step process for most items that the PAC hears or takes action on. This includes a briefing, worksession, and then a hearing. One or two hearings may happen before an item was voted on. In regards to the Comprehensive Plan, it might be taken as a package and a finding of fact and recorded motion performed by the Planning Commission. These processes are common in other jurisdictions across the state, but may not be historically how Mason County Planning Commission has heard and made actions in the past.

She talked about how the website was recently changed and revamped and if there were specific changes, she could look into including them on the site.

Marilyn said she did find that listing zoning changes as amendments was confusing to her as well. She would prefer if they were to get zoning requests that they were clearly labeled that way, rather than an amendment to the Comp Plan. Paula explained that a Comp Plan Amendment would be things like rezones or development regulation changes, they are grouped in packages of amendments and they are heard as a docket. Paula would like to reinstitute the process of having an annual docket of amendments. She mentioned that it was typical process. She is concerned about the confusion regarding the jargon and was open to the PAC's suggestions on how to make it clear. Marilyn was fine with the zoning changes coming in a docket, but would rather they be labeled as a zoning changes docket than comprehensive plan amendments.

Paula mentioned the August 28, 2017 meeting and the zoning changes on the agenda as briefing items only, the notification of residents will occur before an actual hearing.

Public Comment Opened

Sharon Haensly, lawyer for the Squaxin Island Tribe, talked about the Development Regulations aspect of the Comprehensive Plan. She talked about the Tribe's treaty fishing right and that having fish means having water in the streams for fish to return to. They are concerned about permit exempt wells and the drop in the stream level and the amount of wetted habitat that was available for fish. She said that the Tribe wants to make itself available to help in addressing these types of wells in the County and figuring out whether this water was legally available for development. She mentioned Chapter 6.68 Water Availability and that it was actually a development regulation but it hasn't been treated as such. She said it needed to be updated and fixed to comply with state law. She said that about four years ago the Tribe drafted, what they thought, a water adequacy regulation would look like. It was submitted in the record in the past, but she could submit again. She believed the current 6.68 was defective because it doesn't require that the County ask people, who want to drill wells, if that water was available without impact to senior water uses. Senior uses include older in-stream flows. She believed the County's water availability forms need to ask the same question from the County code. The Tribe also doesn't believe there should be exemptions from asking about water availability for modifications to buildings or when someone states an extreme hardship.

Marilyn and James asked Sharon to resubmit the Tribe's draft water adequacy regulations and comments.

Steve Van Denver wanted the public comments, including the Tribes on the website, so the public can comment further. He mentioned he had ten acres at the head of Deer Creek. His parcels are split in four, he was listed under one parcel number. Right now he has one well to supply all those and the facility there, he believed that without some kind of agreement on water he cannot divide and expand, nor sell, nor supply water to his parcels. Those are potential taxes that the County will lose. He said the best science needs to be considered when drafting a water adequacy plan.

Marilyn stated that she understood that Hirst did not say "you may not drill a well", it said "before you drill a well you must prove the water is legally available without impacting senior rights". She questioned how you proved water was available. Paula followed up by saying that there was a map now, online, in the Planning Map Library on the Comprehensive Plan page that shows these water mitigation planning areas, straight from the Department of Ecology. <https://gis.co.mason.wa.us/planning/>.

The County started to draft a framework to address this issue and they hope to address in more depth at their next Planning Advisory Commission meeting. One of the challenges in the County is the lack of in-stream flow data.

Lisa Klein, Land Planner with AHBL located in Tacoma, stated that she was at the meeting to talk about the Belfair Development Regulations and that she had previously been at the Joint Meeting on June 20, 2017. The intent of their amendment proposal was to improve the economic activity in that area, to provide a little more flexibility, to remove impediments, and to support good development in the Belfair Urban Growth Area. She said that the current regulations for that area are very similar to what is seen in Kirkland, Wa. She mentioned that many of the details seen in the current regulations are very restrictive and are usually seen in more densely populated areas, not in areas such as Belfair which is surrounded by a rural area.

Marilyn mentioned driveway width and impact to water; there should be accommodation for stormwater such as permeable surfaces and bioswales. Lisa noted that the amendments do not propose to get rid of low impact development and that the Belfair UGA low impact requirements are very unique, so much so that it will be hard to find a jurisdiction with the same. She said that they are proposing to replace the current requirements with the best available science promoted by the Department of Ecology, the most recent stormwater management manual. Most other jurisdictions that are required through the NPS Permit process have recently adopted this manual.

Lisa noted that the current regulations called for 50% of all driveways be shared, an aspect they were hoping to give developers more freedom with. James wondered where the idea of 50% shared had developed.

Jack Johnson stated he would like to address the driveway issue, as well as the overall Belfair Development Regulations. In regards to the parking, he said the originators of the regulations wanted 50% of the lots to be back fed garages and shared driveways, while the rest was parking

on the street. The product was not something developers were confident in. He said that the increase in driveway width was not adding more pavement because the original regulations already create alleyways and street parking. In regards to stormwater, the topography of Belfair was very unique; he described the soil types therein. He said the pervious pavement won't work very well on a 12% slope or hardpan. He mentioned that the Hirst decision won't have the impact in the UGA, as it would for the rural areas and the Belfair UGA was on a public water system.

In regards to the Capital Facilities Plan, Jeff Carey was afraid that infrastructure would be too expensive for residents to afford. Jeff stated that he believed the Capital Facilities Plan doesn't meet what the WAC sets forth for such a plan. He said the plan identifies infrastructure but doesn't specify the number of housing units the area can handle before it exceeds capacity on infrastructure.

Paula responded that over the years the County has used many private consultants, which gave the County little long term data, it doesn't build a data base. In regards to how many houses in Allyn that can be built before capacity of the sewer was reached, this data was known. This information was in consultant documents which are cross-referenced in the Comprehensive Plan. But if there are specific missing data points, Paula stated that she could pull them. The Capital Facilities Plan was a combination of things, the County regulations and our actual funding capacity. Projects 20 years out are not going to have project detail. Regarding the land use tables, the County was using two different data sources, GIS zoning data and Assessor data. They are two completely different sets of data and maintained for different purposes. They are put together in the Comp Plan in order to look at the topic from different angles and to be a validation mechanism.

End of Public Hearing. No motion took place, tabled till October 16, 2017 regular meeting.

Break

Worksession – Joint BOCC – PAC Meeting Preparation

Presenter(s): PAC Members and Paula Reeves

Paula suggested the idea of a Finding of Fact and Recorded Motion; an idea to present the BOCC with as an option regarding the Comprehensive Plan. She talked about the members each compiling a list of flaws that they think the Comp Plan and Development Regulations may contain. The commission does need to get the plan through to Commerce, it was already a year overdue. But this list of flaws presented to the BOCC and the public can be presented as issues that need to be addressed in their yearly update of the Comp Plan. Paula would start looking at what the framework for a recorded motion might look like and have it ready for the PAC to work on at the next PAC meeting.

James stated that the members need to forward their comments, flaws in the documents, onto Paula so she can populate a list. Paula mentioned having the flaws ready for the Joint meeting on September 27, 2017.

James asked Paula to take them through the plan for their upcoming discussion with the BOCC. Paula mentioned that the PAC members can talk to the Commissioners on an element of the Comprehensive Plan that they are most interested in, it is an informal dialogue. She discussed the plan for the meeting currently, which was already outlined in the agenda and had been posted online for a while. James mentioned that he may talk about the Economic Development Element in addition to an introduction and closing statement for the meeting. Marilyn stated that she thought the commission should take more ownership of the EDC document, if they are going to include it in the Comprehensive Plan. Paula said the element is now required in the plan. The commission talked about editable copies of the EDC and Transportation elements.

Paula mentioned that the EDC policies that relate to the Planning Advisory Commission were pulled into the Countywide Planning Policies chapter.

The PAC had a general discussion on what each member would be talking about at the next Joint Meeting, and in what order. Marilyn talked about her previous work with a cottage industry zoning overlay and including it in issues to address in the next Comp Plan update.

New Business – None

Adjournment

Adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m.