

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes**  
**April 18, 2005**

(Note audio tape (#2) dated April 18, 2005  
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

*(This document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript)*

=====

## **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Dewey at 6:00 p.m.

## **2. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** Bill Dewey, Steve Clayton, Wendy Ervin, Tim Wing, Mark Drain, Terri Jeffreys and Diane Edgin.

**Staff Present:** Bob Fink, Darren Nienaber, Allan Borden, Emmett Dobey, Barbara Adkins, Steve Goins and Susie Ellingson.

## **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the November 15, 2004, December 14, 2004, January 24, 2005 and February 17, 2005 were approved as presented with the following changes:

November 15, 2004:

On page 5 under (0825) it should read ...'fresh water systems are phosphate limited and marine waters are nitrogen limited' ...

On page 17 under (#0825) it should read ...'well more than' ...

On page 17 under (#0855) it should read ...'through the tube' ...

December 14, 2004:

On page 2 under (#0430) it should read ...'the 21<sup>st</sup>' ...

On page 8 at the top it should read ... 'yet what you're doing' ...

On page 8 under (#2660) it should read ...'character to the area than would' ...

On page 14 under (#1035) it should read ...'I have my own idea' ..

February 17, 2005:

On page 6 under (#1275) it should read ...'You would probably have to have some' ...

On page 12 under (#2725) it should read ...'either by incorporation' ...

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

### 4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0255) Bill Dewey: The main purpose of our meeting tonight is to have a workshop to discuss the 2005 update process and strategy for the Mason County Comprehensive Plan.

(#0262) Bob Fink: My name is Bob Fink and I'm the Planning Manager with the Department of Community Development. Tonight I was planning on having an informal workshop where we can tell you about some of the issues we've identified that we think need to be updated or reviewed this year and also let you know what has happened so far in our process and we have some information on some of these elements that staff will present to you. First I want to make sure you know all the staff that we currently have working on it. Barbara Adkins is here and she's a planner and she's the main point of contact with the department if you have questions or to send comments to. Allan Borden you already know. Steve Goins is here and he's been working on the economic development element and on the urban areas of Allyn and Belfair and to some degree Shelton. What we've had is a couple of open house to date and although they were fairly attended we were a little bit disappointed in the turnout. So we're going to try to reach out more into the community to try to get people involved. We want to make sure we're not missing things that we should be addressing or that people that have concerns are coming forward with them so we can get them involved in the process and come up with the proper responses to them. Barbara will give you the comments we've received so far in writing. We will be starting to feed you the information that's going to come to you over the next couple of months leading up to your recommendation in June or early July.

The county staff has done a review of the kinds of things we've identified in the update. We see the update as something where we're doing two things. One is we're updating the plan as far as it's timeline; the current plan runs til 2014. The idea for the Comp Plan is to have a 20 year timeline so we're moving it to 2025. There's a lot of changes that are simply being made in order to update information. What our current population is, what our current land uses are as of 2005. Also, what the projections are to 2025. All this information will be updated and that's a large part of the numbers being made.

In the transportation element besides updating the capital planning for the transportation one of the key things is to include state facilities and those are the other facilities of state wide significance that are in the county and there's a list of them and they need to be incorporated into the Comp Plan because of a change to the GMA a couple of years ago. Related to this is a review of land uses adjacent to airports. The idea of this requirement is that there shouldn't be land uses that pose a mutual risk to the airports. Where the planes coming in and landing according to their normal flight pass might pose a hazard to places like assembly buildings or churches or schools and other concentrations of people, and where the presence of human activity and concentrations of people may pose an unacceptable risk to the continued operation of the airport.

Zoning regulations for the UGA's have been adopted in Belfair and as an interim set of regulations for Allyn. The county is working on a plan and permanent regulations for Allyn. We're coordinating with the City of Shelton to develop some kind of regulations for consideration of zoning for the Shelton UGA outside the city. One of Steve's responsibilities is, for those regulations we've already adopted, to review them as to how they're functioning and are we reaching our goals or achieving them and how do they interact with other goals that the county has, such as economic development. By the end of the year the City of Shelton hopefully will have a set of regulations for that and the others may be modified in some way to reflect what we learn.

Essential public facilities is another issue that the county is addressing. I think there's a need to address it in a little bit more detail, particularly in working with the City of Shelton to confirm the list of essential facilities and to better define the way essential public facilities would be processed if something were proposed in the county or the city. Essential public facilities are generally the larger facilities that deal with the public and public purposes that are typically difficult to locate for some reason, maybe they have some negative potential. An example of that would be a correctional facility. A lot of people don't want that in their neighborhood for one reason or another. But it needs to be located somewhere.

The adoption of the economic development element; this is a big step for the county. The county currently has no economic development element and Steve Goins is leading the county effort to get that element

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

adopted. It's a recent change in the GMA to make that a mandatory element and it's always been an interest to the county to have something like that. It's also a current interest of the current administration so the county can play its role in the economic development of the county.

The update of population and housing; those are essentially changes due to changes in the timeline. Changing the types of housing we have, updating the information but we've also proposed the incorporation of some policies based on the housing needs assessment that was done by the county and the city last year. We have some further information we'll be giving you on that shortly.

The UGA boundary updates doesn't really mean anything in particular except that probably the boundaries of the urban areas will have to be reviewed. One of the things that happens when you change the timelines of the Comp Plan is you start looking at the additional people that will be coming before the year 2025. There's several thousand people heading to Mason County according to the projections of the state and the county has an option as to how many people they want to plan for; how many people they expect of the range of the population that the state has projected or established. What are the consequences of the different ranges? Where are those people going to go? The county has a responsibility of allocating the population to the urban areas. How many people do we target living in Belfair? How many people do we want to live in Allyn? The same for Shelton. We'll work with the city on that allocation. We'll look at a number of alternatives. At a number of scenarios. How will the capital facilities fit into that? What are our expectations for growth that needs to be supported by those facilities? We'll look at that in a lot more detail than we have.

The parks and recreation element was changed from an option element to a mandatory element. There is an existing element in the county plan and we'll need to update that as well.

Adopt local rules for forest practices is a separate requirement from the general GMA requirements. This is a provision that the state adopted a number of years ago where the local government will take over responsibility for permitting forest practice conversions. Right now when someone is developing property and it's currently in forest use they need a Department of Natural Resources permit in order to cut the trees or other similar forest practices. When they go through that conversion process the county is responsible for the environmental review of that by statute. The DNR actually issues the permit. What the law change is is the actual conversion will be processed and permitted by the county rather than DNR. DNR is stepping out. I've been told by parties in DNR that they are seeking an amendment to the statute that mandates that the counties take over this process to extend it out a little further because there's some problems that have come up with the implementation of it and there's some confusion over what the requirements are they were going to clarify what the statute does.

Adjustment to the Development Regulations is kind of a catch all. There are opportunities that we may find to improve our regulations. There are requirements we may need to address. There's been a number of changes to critical area regulations. One of the parts of the update, according to the GMA, addresses not only the Comp Plan but also land use regulations. There's been two new guidance documents issued in the last year by the state; one for critical aquifer recharge areas and another one for wetlands so we'll have to review those guidance documents and see if there's some response the county needs to make.

So those are the kinds of things we need to address. We're trying to get comment from the public as to other things they think we should address. That's one of the things we're trying to solicit from the public by May 1<sup>st</sup> and the purpose for the May 1<sup>st</sup> deadline is so that we can set a list of things on our docket and then set a timeline for those things we're going to change. We're trying to make sure that everyone will know the kinds of things we're working on and have a chance to comment.

There's one other thing that's closely related to this. There were a number of rezones that were applied for in 2004 that the county never had a chance to address. We decided we need to expedite their review. If we leave it with the process that we're going through for the rest of the program there would be no decision made on those until the end of the year and we've decided to go ahead with them. We'll be bringing those to you as separate actions much sooner than this general program. Are there any questions?

(#0840) Bill Dewey: I'd like to hear how you see the Planning Advisory Commission's role in this. On each of these elements that you've touched on tonight is it going to be the usual format where staff brings forward a

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

recommendation to the PAC for our deliberation or are we going to be actively involved in developing those?

(#0855) Bob Fink: We're trying to be a little more interactive with you and also in a better interactive framework with the Board of Commissioners. That's one of the reasons why there is a meeting scheduled on May 2<sup>nd</sup> for a joint meeting between PAC and the BOCC. As far as the general approach and strategy of how some of these issues might be dealt with we hope to get some input from you before we actually develop some of these drafts. Other than the fact that we want more of that input up front and we welcome it essentially we'll reach a point fairly soon where we'll start churning out drafts for comment by the public and for your review. At that point it will still be different because we will be preparing initial drafts of the changes we're making of all these different types before the actual docket is finalized. So if there's something that those drafts aren't addressing then there will be a final docket prepared that may include additional things that we didn't address. When we say we're addressing the transportation element until people have an opportunity to see what that really means they won't quite know if we're addressing it in a way that's complete and appropriate. We have one element on housing tonight that Barbara will be presenting.

(#0945) Terri Jeffreys: Has there been any talk about looking at the county wide planning policies?

(#0950) Bob Fink: I didn't put the county wide planning policies in there but the county wide planning policies are basic policies that are established by the local governments; the city and the county and they agree to those to guide the development of the Comp Plans for the jurisdictions. The county has county wide planning policies that were adopted in the '90's and they haven't been amended since. There is one county wide planning policy that I know should be amended because it's inconsistent with the GMA. There's a policy regarding the market factor to be used in deciding the size of a UGA. In order to have adequate capacity the county should consider a 50% market factor, which is what the county did when it first adopted its Comp Plan according to the GMA in 1996. That was found noncompliant with the GMHB and remanded and the guidance from the state is that the market factor should be no more than 25% barring some extremely unusual circumstance that you'd have to appropriately document. So that one is inconsistent. The remainder of the county wide planning policies, as far as I know, are not inconsistent and they are kind of general and you could argue that they could be improved but there's not a need to necessarily change any of them that I'm aware of. As part of the process of review, particularly in the development of the economic development element, when we look at housing policies, some of those issues may prompt an additional change to the county wide planning policies to provide better coordination between the county and the city.

(#1050) Darren Nienaber: Part of the public participation process will be to identify the changes that are necessary as part of that, technically everything is on the table. There is the mandatory review and then there is a second prong that was adopted in the public participation plan as a response to the PAC's comments where the public can offer discretionary amendments that may be incorporated in the process.

(#1075) Bob Fink: Right, what's mandated is that we address the inconsistencies. What's always an option is to improve what we have. We're proposing to do general improvements just to correct the one issue but other people may come forward and say you should change this or you should change that so it could well be as part of one of the other reviews underway or it could be just because they are aware of them and they think something needs to be made better.

(#1095) Bill Dewey: Any other questions for Bob?

(#1098) Bob Fink: I would like for Steve to come up and talk a little bit about the economic development element and planning and what's going on and then Barbara can come down and talk about some of the things she's involved in. Thank you.

(#1110) Steve Goins: I'm going to pass something out to you for reference. We're embarking on a workshop program to mainly solicit public input as we put this together. The county doesn't have an economic development element so we're having to start from scratch and we have limited time to put this together. The good news was we were able to use some future search work that was done last year as a foundation for this. We thought that was a very good fit for what we were trying to accomplish. That will be the basis on which we move forward on this plan. The workshops are designed to sort of build on that. We put together two workshops in two locations; one would be to help accommodate people in North Mason and then the other

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

ones in Shelton. The workshops would be a table discussion with the participants and we're trying to be as proactive as we can to reach out to the community. We have a rather extensive list of people we're trying to reach out to. The list is over 100 currently. We've met with the Shelton-Mason Chamber, we've met with the North Mason Chamber, Economic Development Council; we had a meeting earlier today with the City of Shelton. We've met with the Ports. We think we can accommodate the large number of people because of the two locations. The workshop will allow the community to provide their input on what they feel the direction the county should be going and coming up with a lot of the language. Staff will be bringing that forward through the public hearing process once this takes place. A draft of this nature was also presented to the BOCC a few weeks back and they generally supported the idea of the extensive public input that we were trying to achieve. The following pages give you an outline of how the workshops would be put together as we present the participants with a sort of background information as to where the county is and where it's going. We'll be presenting a lot of the data on employers, population to help them to make their decision. The discussion will be facilitated by various parties and staff. The effort would hopefully finish up by the end of June and we would be able to have a draft and move that forward. We have some time constraints regarding the timing of all this that will need to be met. That's what's going to be taking place later this spring and you'll probably be hearing about this through mailings and different things just to get the word out. Any questions?

(#1285) Bill Dewey: At Taylor's we had a meeting the other day with Matt from the EDC. Can you talk briefly about how the EDC will be working with the county on this or just how that effort will proceed.

(#1292) Steve Goins: We're discussing between ourselves how to build this document and we're looking for them to help us with a lot of the analysis of what is working in the county as far as creating jobs and what opportunities that exist that we will be trying to build on. The Taylor folks have a lot of stories that we need to hear from them and we hope they can help us by bringing those forward to we can figure out along with the public what's a good direction to go and at a county level how can we help support those endeavors.

(#1320) Bill Dewey: This might be useful for other folks here. Matt gave us the language from the GMA on what is to be included in the economic element. We may want to get copies to pass out to the PAC. It's a good summary.

(#1333) Steve Goins: We're hoping that in addition to just meeting the state requirements that at the end of the day we have something that really works for everybody and I think that would be an important element of this and the EDC is going to help contribute to that.

(#1344) Diane Edgin: Are there any numbers or application about the range of types of jobs that you hope to create? For every high paying job you're going to have 'x' number of low paying jobs.

(#1360) Steve Goins: We can certainly present the types of jobs that currently exist and the pay scales and compare those to state and regional types of pay ranges. One decision that I think will come out of this pretty early is what type of development does the community want to see? In that I mean would there be a preponderance of people who want to promote a more tourism type of environment or are we looking for a more cluster industrial type of economic base? What direction do we want to go? When the community tells us that we can guide how those will move along.

(#1400) Diane Edgin: I have talked with some people the last few years that where we have the land mass available they felt that we didn't have the educated work force and this is getting to be critical.

(#1412) Steve Goins: The education component, there's another component of this that's probably coming on line concurrently in we're having discussions with other folks at the county about the health section and how we can hopefully obtain some dollars that are leaking out of the community currently because a lot of the health services that all of us need people tend to go to Olympia or somewhere else to obtain the services and those dollars aren't staying here.

(#1433) Bill Dewey: Any other questions for Steve? So Steve, you're brand new to the county?

(#1438) Steve Goins: I am.

(#1442) Bill Dewey: Well, welcome. Barbara?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

(#1455) Barbara Adkins: My name is Barbara Adkins with the Department of Community Development. As Bob mentioned, I've been charged with keeping everybody in our group here internally on track and making sure we're meeting our deadlines and keeping everybody informed. We're updating our mailing list and making sure people tell us if they want us to keep them informed by mailings and we are keeping up with our sign in sheets for that. We have an internal calendar that I'll give you a copy of. I just want you to see that every week we're meeting and what is on our plate and some of the deadlines we're giving ourselves. Also as Bob mentioned we've had two open houses and we got comments from those and also some in the mail which I will hand out to you. I think after May 1<sup>st</sup> when we have all the comments in we'll compile it into a list so it's easier to read. They touch on all kinds of subjects. As Bob as also mentioned we're working on the elements and updating what we can and as they're updated they'll be brought to you to review. One element I have managed to update with information that we have is the housing element. It was just updated with current data. I can present this to you to look at how the numbers look now. I'll pass that out to you now. First of all, some of the information came out of the Housing Needs Assessment that was done in 2003. We weren't sure if you had seen this or not. I've made a copy of the cover page, the table of contents, the executive summary and some strategies that are mentioned here. I gave you the table of contents because if there's something in here that you see that you'd like to see more of I can get it to you but it's a pretty hefty document. I do have two copies of it here if you'd like to take a look at it. I'm going to give you two versions of the housing element. I'm going to give you a clean copy of the updated version that has all the changes in it and I'll also give you a compare copy of it so you can see where the changes were made. The compare version has the lines and strike outs but it will give you an idea of what was there, what I took out, and what I updated. I urge you to look at it because some of these numbers have changed and I think they're pretty interesting. I have updated population; you can see in here the housing units and much of that came from the Housing Needs Assessment. We're not planning by watershed this time and you'll see a lot of the documents are broken down by watershed so a lot of that is marked out and we're planning by the UGA's and the rural areas instead of the watersheds. On the compare version of page 15 there's a housing condition survey that was done in the original element. The way it was structured was by the type of housing; single family, multi family; that's all been marked out because that information wasn't the same this time as it was done the last time so it is now done by areas. I couldn't get all the information to match up with the old stuff so some of it just had to be updated with the new way it was formatted.

(#1785) Terri Jeffreys: Do you have information about second homes and numbers and any impacts of that?

(#1795) Barbara Adkins: You mean like summer homes?

(#1797) Terri Jeffreys: Yes.

(#1799) Barbara Adkins: I don't remember if it addresses that.

(#1802) Terri Jeffreys: But you didn't address it in here?

(#1805) Barbara Adkins: No. Any questions? It may take you a while to go through it and look at how the numbers have changed. The housing policies and recommendations have been added. I took two recommendations out of the assessment and put them in here as they related to county issues. Most of the strategies that are in the housing needs assessment are not directed to this county. Those are put in here for you to look at. The next time that we meet you may have some comments on the numbers or the policies.

(#1850) Bill Dewey: There's a chart under home ownership in the strike out version. It's not in the clean version.

(#1875) Barbara Adkins: There's a microscopic little line that goes through it and that shows that it's marked out. I've been trying to figure out how to show a chart in the format that I'm using.

(#1898) Bill Dewey: As we work through this process how will these amendments come to us and how will you seek our advise back? Normally we get materials ahead of the meeting and have a chance to review them and then we'll sit here and discuss them. What will be the process that we'll be going through in the weeks and months ahead?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

(#1915) Bob Fink: I think that would be the normal process. There's a lot of material to digest in the process and this is really just the first part of it and so it's very likely we'll follow a similar format where each meeting you will have materials that you've looked at that you received earlier and had a chance to look at and will discuss and then you'll get new materials that you haven't seen before that we'll present to you and give you an idea as to what kinds of changes we're making and why and then you take it home and think about it and then you come back and we'll discuss it some more. Then the hearing will be held on it depending on exactly how the timeline works. When you have questions like you did here, like seasonal housing ..... Seasonal housing is discussed in the housing element. It's presented but not discussed at any great length. There's a very high number of seasonal housing in Mason County; they don't give you a comparison figure to what the state has but it's several times .... it's also discussed in the land use element. There's 26% that is seasonal or vacant and it's actually broken down as 5% is vacant and 21% is seasonal. It's a real interesting question for Mason County because there's more development activity going on, for instance, there's more economic activity that's going than is reflected in the population growth alone but whereas there's a high percentage of the seasonal housing that percentage is actually declining and has been historically declining since at least the 40's. If I remember correctly back in 1940 when they did the census the number of seasonal units was over 40%. I think it was that almost 50% of the housing in Mason County was considered seasonal. It's a combination of two things; the main thing is the conversion of existing seasonal housing, but there's also a large number of nonseasonal housing built. I think that if you went back and looked at the absolute number of seasonal housing units, which I haven't done so I'm just guessing, you'd find that there's probably more seasonal units now than there was in 1940 but the percentage of the number of housing units is declining. So that's something that we'll explore in more detail and see if there's any implications that can be drawn from that. It might also affect the market that the county has for purchases and commercial market.

(#2080) Bill Dewey: Any other questions?

(#2082) Terri Jeffreys: The population allocations and all that. What section does that go into?

(#2088) Bob Fink: The population that the county decides is what it's going to plan for and the allocation for the population goes into the land use section.

(#2105) Barbara Adkins: I have one more thing for you. I know at least two of you already have a copy of this but I want to make sure everyone has a copy, too. In September of last year the BOCC appointed the Master Trails Plan Committee and they started working together in November and they finished working together in March. I wanted to give you copies of what they've been working on. This is just something for you to look over.

(#2155) Terri Jeffreys: We'll be adopting that, won't we?

(#2158) Bob Fink: There's two answers to that question. One is that the BOCC will probably consider what to do with it and hold a public hearing on it as a separate document as part of the parks plan. As part of the Comp Plan amendment I expect that some of it or a great deal of it may be incorporated into the parks element of the Comp Plan to provide guidance.

(#2190) Terri Jeffreys: By reference or will they pick and choose out of it?

(#2195) Bob Fink: A lot of it by reference and we'll have to see how it plays out. I don't have a draft yet so I can't really answer that.

(#2198) Terri Jeffreys: Will a different department be dealing with the parks and rec element?

(#2202) Bob Fink: Our Parks Department ... the County Planning Department kind of operates or administers the planning process and the Comp Plan process in particular but other departments have capital facilities that have to be planned and the Parks Department certainly has a large part in the role of planning the facilities and scheduling improvements and things like that and will certainly be involved in the planning.

(#2235) Tim Wing: What other things are we covering tonight?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

(#2240) Bill Dewey: We've about run our agenda. I was going to offer the opportunity for folks that made the effort to come tonight to comment.

(#2255) Tim Wing: What is this entire process going to do in regard to relating it to nearby counties? I'm particularly interested obviously in the north end and what in the SKIA area of Kitsap County or with Nascar racetrack or their policies near our northern border and that is probably going to have a lot more impact on us than any plan we would develop here so is there any plan to associate our efforts in planning with Kitsap County? Are they on the same kind of timeframe as we are in terms of updating their plan?

(#2282) Bob Fink: Kitsap just updated their plan. They finished it last year. So we'll certainly use their update as one of the things that we evaluate. We'll also coordinate with the county in the sense of sending them drafts and in particularly in the SEPA process. We haven't begun the SEPA process yet but that's the formal means of coordination with them. As you probably heard, the state divided up the different counties that are under the GMA and each year a certain number of counties and the cities in those counties are supposed to update their Comp Plan. So the first year was last year and Kitsap was one of those counties and this year is our turn and next year will be some other county's turn.

(#2350) Tim Wing: I think we ought to take a close look at what they have planned but I also think it's the case that they don't always do what they plan. Case in point is in the last four or five years Kitsap County has failed to approve plats by the numbers. Developers have been trying to get plats approved in there for about five or eight years and they've been sitting on county desks and the county officials have been telling the developers that they'll get to them when they can and they don't and they didn't and so about two years ago they ran out of lots and all of a sudden all the builders are out in Mason County buying up every lot that we've got and all of a sudden Lakeland Village is filling up with houses at a rate they've never seen before. For me that's okay, I'm in that business, but if we want to have a plan that's realistic our neighboring county needs to have a plan and follow it otherwise what's our plan going to be? Is it going to be a reaction to their noncompliance with their own plan in some cases.

(#2400) Bob Fink: We'll use what information we have in addition to the plans. If people have specific information about what's actually happening or things that cast doubt on whether they'll be successful in some of their goals or implementation those can be incorporated in the process. An example is if what you say is correct that there has been a big influx and likely in the future there will be an even greater influx of people looking for homesites in Mason County because of issues in Kitsap County that information can be used in examining what the population projection is for the county. The current county population projection that's used in the Comp Plan was the medium projection, which was not the high or low one. If indeed the rate of increase is increasing that's one reason why the county may want to consider using a higher rate of growth. We don't know what the future holds so what you're trying to do is set goals and targets and objectives for the county based on a reasonable assessment of what you think may be happening recognizing that you don't know what's going to happen in twenty years. Each year you can revisit what you've done and if there's cause you can make adjustments to it. So one of the things you do is you monitor how things have been happening and you start making those adjustments as you feel necessary to make sure that you're reaching your goals. That's why we have an annual amendment process.

(#2500) Bill Dewey: I think Tim has pointed out a phenomenon that merits looking into. There must be some way to validate this building trend in North Mason.

(#2520) Bob Fink: One of the things we've been doing is collecting information like that and one of the things we can do in the plan is if we have a major issue or question like that where there's a lot of uncertainty about what's happening is you can specifically make an implementation policy that says the county will monitor building permits in Kitsap County to see what's happening there and compare them to building permit activity in Mason County and see if there seems to be a shift that is unexpected. You can do that and that keeps the trend from going along too far before you adjust to what it is. One of the reasons you go through this process is to be able to anticipate what needs you have in the future and to start building towards those.

(#2575) Diane Edgin: We have a fair number of people that commute outside of the county across the Narrows right now and when the new span opens up that will make this area even more feasible to reach. That will put additional pressure on us.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

(#2595) Terri Jeffreys: Do you get a report out of what some of the assumptions that are behind the population projections that the Office of Financial Management provides you?

(#2605) Bob Fink: The OFM is the bureau that makes those projections and they do publish what their assumptions are. There is a provision to challenge them under the GMA but according to OFM's data they're not off target yet and in fact, according to their year to date, the population growth in Mason County over the last five years has been just below the medium projection. It actually has been slower than what the county adopted. There was recently census data released which gave a different population number for Mason County than did the OFM. That's something we stumbled across just in the last week or so. I don't know what that means.

(#2670) Tim Wing: Is it higher?

(#2672) Bob Fink: Yes, it's higher. We also have building permit information. Building permit information is considered a good indicator of population because people are building houses and moving into them or using them as seasonal homes. One of the things you don't know is if someone builds a house if they're shifting from seasonal housing to permanent housing.

(#2710) Tim Wing: I'm amused because my brother Paul complains that he listens to the weather report and it says that it's bright and sunny and he looks out the window and it's pouring rain. He says why don't they just look out the window and so when we get these estimates from some office down in Olympia that says our population has grown this much all I need to do is look out the window of my office and watch these people come in here and buying all these houses in Bellwood and Lakeland Village.

(#2740) Bob Fink: We do have that information and we were going to check the building permit records to see what that indicated but we simply haven't had time to do that since we learned of the discrepancy.

(#2755) Terri Jeffreys: Going back to the assumption, I've never seen a report go along with these numbers but have you read it and feel that they're really right on?

(#2766) Bob Fink: I haven't looked at them for years and forecasting isn't my expertise. They look reasonable to me. Part of the numbers are very clear which is basically the population growth based on natural increase. So you have a certain growth that's based on the fertility and death rates and that's very predictable and I'm sure it's perfectly fine what they do. The other portion is very difficult to project and that's basically your net migration. Your net migration varies depending on economic factors and varies depending on ... commuting time and expense and those are all different factors that can affect what actually happens.

(#2828) Diane Edgin: There's another element to this that we actually don't deal with except on a side basis and that is the fact that we have a hospital. And it actually is a really good little hospital. It's jammed to capacity and we've got an increase of people coming into the county and a great portion of these are retirees which bring in their own special set of problems. And they're seeking health care out of the county and we need to try to keep that in the county. I don't know if a lot of you know that we're losing our oncology unit as of May 1<sup>st</sup>. When you consider that 40% of the population at some point in their life has cancer you're talking a big amount of people that are having to travel outside to seek health care and it's very unfortunate that politics got in front of the expansion when we could have had a bond at a low rate of interest and the fact that Belfair needs a hospital I'm afraid that's years down the road now because if Harrison is fighting Gig Harbor about their hospital and if there's a governing body that allows these things just because you want to build one doesn't mean you're going to get to build one. It's based on need. All of these things make for how attractive are we to attract more people. That also is an economic engine.

(#2950) Bob Fink: That's part of an issue in the economic development element and I believe that the group that's studying human services and medical care will probably look at questions like that.

(#2975) Steve Goins: They have a grant to help them to analyze this pretty thoroughly and out of that they will tell us what areas can we change or try to shore up where those dollars, from an economic standpoint, can we be attracting. It's even a bigger picture than that when you consider the quality of life issue as well.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

(#3005) Wendy Ervin: There was an article in the last Journal that the government is now the largest employer in Mason County. I realize that's federal, state and local but that's not a sustainable economy. You mentioned something about tourists but tourist dollars depend upon that tourist getting from wherever he is here and if there's a reluctance to travel for security reasons or for gasoline costs reasons the tourist dollar is not a stable dollar. I think it's a lot more economically feasible to make a product and ship it out rather than make a product and ship your customer in because you can send out a thousand products but you can't necessarily get a thousand people in to buy that product. We need to look at manufacturing of products that are shipped from here elsewhere.

(#3075) Bob Fink: There's a lot of different strategies for economic growth. One of them is import substitution and one of them is marketing to the people who spend their dollars here in the county rather than having to go outside the county to spend their dollars. One of the key purposes of the economic development element is to look at all the different scenarios and all the different ways you can grow an economy and how much you want it to grow and prioritize it. We can say we can incubate the businesses or we can attract them. Where are we going to spend the money? Where are we going to focus our effort? What aspect of it? Are we going to focus on jobs for everyone, or on high wage jobs? Are we going to focus on manufacturing or attracting tourists? All these things are different strategies all of which can work to some degree but the question is where are you going to put your effort? You ask what the role of the PAC is? I think raising some of these questions as we go through this process is a large part of your role. Ultimately you will make your recommendations on the final product to be sent to the BOCC but the raising of issues that could possibly be addressed is a large part of it here. So we'll take your comments and questions and see what can be done with them.

(#3240) Bill Dewey: Anybody that has come from the public tonight can step up to the podium.

(#3255) Bob Allen: My name is Bob Allen and I'm from Grapeview. I've got two hats tonight. Some of us have served since 1989 together on different committees regarding growth management. First hat - private sector. One of the things we failed to do after 1996 when we first adopted cluster housing in our Comp Plan and that went by the wayside, more or less courtesy of the GMHB. It was one of the fights that I think was worth fighting especially for our county when we're looking for sustainable housing. Cluster housing makes sense. It makes sense for those of us who are into farming, whether it's tree farms and grapes like myself ... The cluster housing argument tends to start having a lot more weight going for it and I certainly would encourage you to at least explore that. More official hat - as a port commissioner. A reminder to the county and to staff that there are six economic engines in this county - six port districts. So having a conversation with one or two of those six port districts does not necessarily mean that you're getting a full coverage. Certainly some of them have declared that they're going to be strictly recreational situations, tourist situations, but the big three, Shelton, Allyn and Grapeview, have submitted Comp Plans prior to the 1996 adoption. It was largely, for some of the smaller ports like Grapeview, ignored by the county at the time. So our Comp Plan just basically fell on deaf ears and the major part of it called for development along Highway 3 and for us to do so and keep light industrial and any manufacturing and one of the reasons was to bolster Stretch Island Fruit, which we found other ways to do that. Even the Port of Allyn has been trying to figure out a way to also help that. We lost 124 jobs to Canada when Stretch Island Fruit bought out a competitor who was going to go out of business and they happened to be in Canada and we could have had those jobs here in this county but for simplicity and because of our development regulation problems at the time those jobs went to Canada. Developing along Highway 3 ... if you narrow some things that ports haven't yet bought the property for whether it's an aviation situation or whether it's future manufacturing jobs, as long as those manufacturing jobs are in Mason County, Mason County will reap all of the financial benefits. One of the largest concerns that I have, especially in the north end, is the fact that we have elements that seem to be promoting the idea of working with the Port of Bremerton. That's great in supplying jobs for residents here but the problem is it doesn't supply a tax base for here. The Port of Allyn has been working very hard to try to educate people in government and the county here to say 'let's get the whole plan; not just a small portion of economic development here'. So when you're looking at county policies regarding economic development I hope that the county will start talking with all of the port districts even if it stimulates some conversations with them or major conversations with at least the four big ones; Shelton, Allyn, Grapeview and Hoodsport so that we go beyond shellfish manufacturing and on to recreational opportunities as the Port of Grapeview's Comp Plan reflects. If the county development regulations are too tight then the port can't buy land with power, good transportation, whether it's rail or the state highway. It kind of squeezes how much that economic engine can

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

do therefore any money put forth by the county to try to develop it starts to become a waste of money as well.

(#3588) Terri Jeffreys: Going back to cluster housing, are you talking about other land designations?

(#3595) Bob Allen: As an example, one of my pieces of farmland of 12 ½ acres is in grapes and timber. What we had hoped to do was when that timber was harvested was to be able to develop along a view road that we own that we could then use that cluster housing at the time the regulation was 1 unit per every 2.5 acres which would have allowed us to have 5 buildable lots keeping over 2/3 in ag. The idea there would be that the farmer would be have a chance to keep most of the land in ag or most of it in timber and still use some of the land as augmentation to income. We've already gone through six months of waiting to harvest our timber because of clay conditions and as we've watched that happen even in the dry winter that we've had we've watched timber prices fall and we're just about at the break even point right now.

(#3725) Terri Jeffreys: So you're looking for R5's instead of R10's ...

(#3730) Bob Allen: I'm looking for any relief.

(#3740) Bob Fink: The county does have a provision for up to double the density on RR10 and RR20. The county used to have that for RR5 but it was remanded by the GMHB and we were essentially ordered not to do that. It was too dense for rural areas.

(#3835) Tim Wing: So if you have 10 acres what can you do with clustering?

(#3840) Bob Fink: For every 10 acres you can get 1 house per 5 acres rather than 1 house per 10 if you clustered. The size of the lots can be as small as 20,000 sf which is approximately ½ acre. So on your 10 acres you can have up to 2 lots for the 10 acres. Cluster subdivisions as an incentive was really intended to allow more flexibility and is really more benefit for larger pieces of land.

(#0200) Wendy Ervin: In RR5, RR10, and RR20 you have a residence and an accessory dwelling unit so you have one standard size house and one house that is 50% of that size or 1,000 sf so can't you conceivably get ...

(#0225) Tim Wing: You can get more houses but you can't get more pieces of property.

(#0228) Wendy Ervin: Right, but you basically own a 5 acre piece and you can put two residences on it; one little and one standard size. So you have double ...

(#0230) Bob Allen: But you'd never be able to break it out and sell it to your mother-in-law; they would have to use it as part of your property.

(#0235) Wendy Ervin: Okay, I see.

(#0238) Tim Wing: From a development point of view it's not real practical because you can't sell a piece of property with two homes on it very readily.

(#0245) Bill Dewey: Okay, would anybody else like to comment?

(#0248) Frank Phillips: My name is Frank Phillips and this is my wife Barbara. I'm currently a Fire Commissioner up at District #18 at Lake Cushman and I didn't hear too many comments about Lake Cushman today but in that development we have 19 divisions and roughly 3,000 lots which we have about 2,400 owners of those lots. There's the golf course, the lake and lots of different things up there. I got the invitation to come down here and I'm fairly new as a commissioner and I'm just interested in further development of anything that's happening and maybe I can get information to our residents up there.

(#0275) Bill Dewey: Anybody else? With that we're done with our workshop and ready to adjourn.

(#0278) Bob Fink: Before we break I just wanted to introduce Emmett Dobey who is the new Director of

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, April 18, 2005

Community Development for the county.

(#0288) Bill Dewey: I think we need to review meeting dates.

(#0295) Susie Ellingson: As of right now, we have two meetings scheduled in May; one on Monday the 2<sup>nd</sup> and one on Monday the 16<sup>th</sup>. The Monday of the 2<sup>nd</sup> will be a joint meeting with the PAC and the BOCC. The 16<sup>th</sup> will be our regularly scheduled meeting. Then we go over to June and we'll have a meeting on June 6<sup>th</sup> and June 20<sup>th</sup>. That's all we have scheduled at this point. We may need an additional meeting in July as well.

(#0320) Tim Wing: I'm seeing these open houses scheduled for May 17<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> and June 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>. Those are still on the calendar, aren't they?

(#0325) Bob Fink: Those are Steve's meetings for the economic development element.

(#0333) Tim Wing: So those are not planning meetings?

(#0335) Susie Ellingson: You are invited to attend those meetings if you wish.

(#0340) Terri Jeffreys: Do we know which of these meetings might be for the rezone requests?

(#0350) Bob Fink: The second meeting in May, we might be able to meet that target for the rezones. Part of it depends on our ability to get together the information. We may not do all of them on that day but we should be able to do at least a couple of them. There's five of them altogether.

(#0362) Bill Dewey: I need to ask to be excused on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Do we have a motion? Motion made, seconded, and passed to excuse Bill from the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

*Meeting adjourned.*