

MASON COUNTY
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING WITH BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Minutes
May 2, 2005

(Note audio tape (#2) dated May 2, 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 Commissioner Kamin at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

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

Commissioners Present: Jayni Kamin, Lynda Ring Erickson, Tim Sheldon.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0010) Commissioner Kamin: I'd just like to welcome all of you. This is certainly a first since I've been a commissioner of having a joint meeting of both the PAC and the BOCC. First, let's just go around and introduce ourselves. Thank you all and I'm going to hand the gavel over to Bob Fink and I know you've all worked for him.

(#0050) Bob Fink: Thank you Jayni. First I would like to say that the intention of this meeting was to be fairly informal and to try to get a discussion going between the Planning Advisory Commission and the Board of Commissions to get some depth and feeling to the process we're about to enter into and a little bit of guidance to the PAC because the PAC is going to consider these items first and so this may give some insight into some of the hopes and direction that the BOCC is feeling that the process needs to be engaged in. Even though we want to be informal I would like to ask to be accepted as a facilitator to this meeting in the sense of keeping the meeting on focus and on the time line that we've provided. So with your consent if someone goes on a little longer we need to cut the discussion short and redirect it then I hope you will consent to go ahead and do that.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

The first item is the listing of the planning update from the 2005 legislative session. I also wanted to touch on a few of the issues that will be involved in this process. For those of you who haven't heard there was an amendment to the GMA in this current legislative session that affects the process that we're in. The amendment provided two things. One of those was it provided that when jurisdictions don't manage to meet their time line they won't be penalized for doing that in the sense that certain grants and certain state funding sources that would otherwise be withdrawn they will continue to hold that eligibility for a year. So they have up to a year grace period before that could potentially happen to them if they failed to comply with their updates on time. The other provision is for the critical areas. The critical areas need to be updated. Essentially everything is subject to review under the 2005 update for compliance with the GMA. One of the first decisions the county will make will be whether to decide which areas of the plan and regulations need to be updated and which areas don't. That's on your schedule that we discussed and in the middle of this year we'll be doing that. Once that action is taken there's basically an opportunity to do a Failure To Act Challenge to what the county has done. That's an appealable action and then at the end of the year when the county takes action presumably there would be an opportunity there as well. What the legislative change did not remove was the Failure To Act Challenge if the county doesn't act by its December 1st deadline. Someone could still bring a Failure To Act Challenge before the GMHB but one of the penalties no longer includes the withdrawal of the grant funding sources. In the case of the critical areas the county has an additional year to actually adopt regulations so not only do they have that grace period as far as implications for grant funding but they actually have an extra year to adopt the amendments and they won't be out of compliance with the GMA for another year for critical areas. That's very good for the county in the sense that one of the uncertainties in this process is what changes might be needed to the critical areas. Critical area changes are basically driven by Best Available Science and information provided in the review process. When the county started this process most of our critical area regulations were very recently adopted and there was a presumption that there were very few changes needed. I think that presumption still has a lot of merit; however, there's been two new guidance documents issued. One for wetlands and another one for the critical aquifer recharge areas. Those certainly need to be reviewed. There's also the possibility that someone may come forward with other information as part of this process and say that because of this scientific report, because of this new BAS, you need to revisit this critical area.

I also wanted to talk about the population allocations. In looking at the update, there's really two things going on. One is we have a certain mandated update; there are certain things we have to look at. We have to review them; we have to review everything. If certain things are not in compliance we have to update them. The county has identified a number of things we think we need to update. None of the requirements entail changing the basic policies of the county. There's no requirement that you change the goals or policies of the Plan because one of the new things adopted in the ACT is the adoption of an economic development element. The county currently doesn't have one. New policies would have to be developed and the county would need to look at consistency with existing policies in developing those. There is another implication of updating the process to 2025 (which is one of the goals for us this year) and that has to do with the population allocation. There are a number of people allocated to come to the county, and they have to be distributed to the urban areas, and they have to be distributed between rural areas and urban areas. The population allocation that the county chooses to plan with is anything within the range of the Office of Financial Management establishes and that range is rather broad. The county can choose anywhere in there. The county has, in the past, chosen the intermediate range as its number and there have been recent estimates what the population growth is in Mason County. There's a discrepancy between the numbers issued by OFM and numbers recently issued by the census department. So we compared those numbers with the building permit history in the county over the last several years and what we find is our building permits track very closely with what the census bureau says is the population growth in the county. We looked at the building permits that have been issued and we adjusted them down by 20% because on average 20% of the housing in Mason County is seasonal rather than permanent residence occupied. Then we multiplied that by the number of people per household, which is 2.5, and we came up with numbers that track very closely to the census estimate. About 3,000 more people just in the 2000 to 2004 period over what the OFM numbers are. The census number is close to the intermediate growth range of the OFM estimate. The requirement of the ACT is that we're somewhere between the high and the low, which is a very broad range. It's over 10,000 people in growth between the high and the low. We have a choice of deciding where to go in that number. In looking at the population allocation and looking at whether we allocate that population to one urban area or another, one of the ways to look at the population allocation is as a way to assess risk and control risk so what we're planning on doing with the assessment is not to ask for that decision to be made soon. What we

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

want to do is go through and incorporate that analysis in the SEPA process and come up with a series of alternatives that would lay out what the risk would be associated with it. If the numbers are higher than expected or if the numbers are lower than expected there are some different consequences and so those are the things we hope to examine over the next couple of months before any decision is made of what you actually want to adopt. With that, unless there's any questions, we can move on to the next item.

(#0380) Wendy Ervin: Did you take into account when you were looking at the building permits that there had been a lot of building permit approvals for a period of time so that you might have a bulge?

(#0388) Bob Fink: Not per se. We tracked the annual permits and what they amounted to. There was a slow down in the economy and economic activity for several years in the late 90's. And the levels we're approaching now are still lower than they were in the early 90's as far as absolute numbers of houses. It's still significantly lower than the peak.

(#0400) Tim Wing: I have a comment about the 20% seasonal housing. It's my impression, without real statistics to back it up, but I'm in a good spot to have an impression. I think we're growing much faster with the permanent housing than we are with seasonal housing. Seasonal housing is somewhat limited. There aren't any new places to build on Hood Canal or Case Inlet on the water; very few; or the lakes so I don't think we're seeing as much new seasonal housing as you may have 20 years ago. I think we need to be watching that real closely because I think you might see that 90% of the new houses are permanent residences and only 10% are seasonal or something like that. I doubt it's maintaining the same track as it has in the past.

(#0430) Bob Fink: It's been actually declining over the years and it was almost 30% in 1990 and in 1970 I think it was close to 40%. The number has been declining at a fairly regular rate.

(#0444) Steve Goins: A number of you have heard my spiel about the economic development workshops so I thought I'd share with you where things are today and about the approach we're taking and what the workshop might be like. Over the past few weeks we've attended various public meetings. We've sent out notices to approximately 150 citizens. We've taken an ad out in the papers. We have a number of different avenues that we've used to try to reach the public. The word seems to be getting out that this is going on and people are hearing about it. I'm getting several responses every day now so we feel like the community is getting reached. I thought I'd share with you a little bit about the process itself. The workshop is going to be set up so there's two sessions. We've established two locations for each session so that the North Mason people aren't driving to Shelton and visa versa to attend. Each session will be identical but have different participants. The first session what staff will essentially do is present the participants with a lot of demographic information sort of giving them a foundation to understand what we're trying to accomplish and where the county is. We'll present a little bit of information about what future search accomplished and those goals and objectives and there were nine specific areas that they targeted as part of that effort. Then the second half of the session we break into small groups where people can have a dialog and work through some goals, policies and objectives. How we would help to do that is I brought a sample of one of these with me. I'm calling these a 'menu' and they sort of provide the discussion with a platform to kick off and give some people some ideas to help them as they consider their alternatives. Depending on how many participants there are will depend on how many different areas each table is going to be required to cover. One table will be given this menu and it will help them understand what types of policies and programs the agencies typically adopt in these certain areas. What we will be instructing the participants is they have the option of considering these goals and policies, adopting ones they think are appropriate, or drafting their own goals and policies in these specific areas. At the end of the session, hopefully each table will have come up with something we can take back with us and session #2 will be essentially assembling all that data, and we will be presenting the presenters with what all the other tables and people came up with and sort of revisiting it again. Some of these policies we're hoping will be created by folks that have a significant knowledge in an area. An example would be, we're looking to create policy in the health and human resource sector. I'd like to have some people there that are really in the know on how that sector really works and how the county can help that sector work and be creative in crafting some policies that are part of the considerations. That's sort of how the process will get us to the point where we can begin the public forum dialog. Staff would take that data, format it to be concurrent and consistent with our plan, ensure it has all the components that the GMA requires and then start the formal hearing process. I had a meeting today with a couple of folks, and in fact, Matt is here today. We were discussing the EDC's ability to work with us in this effort. We're still kind

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

of finding what the suitable approach would be but those kinds of discussions are happening and they're continuing to happen until the time we start this.

(#0622) Tim Wing: Are any of these things on the menu directly taken from the future search goals that were established?

(#0625) Steve Goins: That's a good question. The action statement is verbatim what the future search group put together. What we attempted to do was take some of the goals; some of the goals were more like bullet points in the way the future search was setup and tried to word that into a more clear and concise statement or cover what those objectives were.

(#0640) Tim Wing: I think that's good and it should be emphasized and people should be told that so you can grab some of the momentum that was started there so the people who participated there will feel like their work is now going to another step. I understand you may add things or edit things but I think it should be emphasized.

(#0650) Steve Goins: I should mention this as well. Some of the components of future search are harder to fit into this process than others. An example was cultural diversity. I think we should be striving for that but from a purely economic standpoint that's really hard to pigeon hole.

(#0662) Commissioner Kamin: I can address that. I think that was a misnomer, whoever typed that up or maybe however we titled it when we were at the conference. The way I've been explaining that particular goal is it's more about celebrating Mason County; the history, the cultures, our heritage, and potential actions that our county has already implemented. To that end was our 151st birthday party and wanting to be able to establish some type of celebration that way. Potentially historical preservation maybe part of that. Just things that we can actively celebrate and encourage our heritage, history and cultures. I felt, and that may be something people want to talk about, and Tim you were there, but to me that was more about what that goal entails. I know that the three or four people that went to that action study for that one hour were kind of disturbed because they weren't quite sure where to go with that either and have that fit in with all this.

(#0715) Tim Wing: There is a lot that could be said for working on cultural diversity as an element of economic development to try to utilize the economic diversity that we have in a better way so that there's power coming out of some of the disadvantaged groups in our community, for example, the Indian population, but also to encourage bringing in more cultural diversity as a way of adding power and diversity to the economic base in the county. I don't mean it needs to be the centerpiece but I really don't think that it's not at all relevant.

(#0738) Commissioner Kamin: There are potentials for encouraging specific markets or encourage cultural diversity within our businesses and certainly encouraging the Hispanic business community and supporting those businesses that have that component as a part of it.

(#0760) Diane Edgin: I heard you mention that fact of human resources and health related issues and there's no doubt that this community and county needs to work as a whole on getting our hospital expanded because if it stays the way it is it's going to be a drag on us. You've got to have something that's attractive and at the same time our state is becoming a forerunner in health related matters and there's no reason to think in the future that some of that can't be spilling our way and we should be ready to capture it and attract it.

(#0785) Bob Fink: The next focus is the public participation part and we were talking about diversity and getting all this input ... there has been some concerns about the public participation and the comments we're getting and the diversity of the comments and it may not be adequate and the BOCC has some opinions on what our goals should be with regard to the participation of the public in the public process.

(#0812) Commissioner Ring Erickson: It's very important to me, and I think we've discussed it pretty openly as a commission, that we really want to make this a very inclusive process and even though our time line is short that we're going to work very hard to make sure that not only do we hear from our established leadership groups, which many of you here are involved in, but also to make sure we offer a broad opportunity for a lot of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

people to participate. Steve has already mentioned that he is getting calls from people that are interested in participating that we're advertising widely. I've had some lovely compliments; I was going to give Barbara a green star but I've had a couple of comments about how very responsive Barbara has been when people have called her about how to give their input and what are the time lines. I think this will be a more successful process the more people we hear from early on rather than people coming in at the late date of the public hearing and saying this is not what we wanted. We might not get everything done this year but we can certainly set the structure for some additional work in the next years. We're obviously going to be working on economic development but that doesn't mean that we won't be giving more detail to historic preservation or some other pieces. It's very, very important that we get everyone involved that could possibly want to contribute to this plan and that we hear from them.

(#0880) Commissioner Sheldon: I think there's been some expectation of some people that have been involved in planning over the years that in this process you would go to a meeting and there would be a document that you would read and you would object to five things and then agree with two and then object to one; I think that's in a way unfortunate because that's been kind of our process here and it's been so long and I think some people felt there would be more of a presentation made to them. I think you're going about it the right way; I just think some people have this perception that this is a process that there's winners and losers in the audience and participants and I don't think that's the case at all.

(#0915) Commissioner Kamin: I see this as an opportunity for people to become educated a little bit more on what the Comp Plan does mean. I think that the future search conference did kind of break ground and gave us somewhat of an idea of the vision for the county and I had aligned that along with the vision statement that is in our Comp Plan already and it was pretty much very similar although the elements that were in the vision statement already were the nine goals that we came out with pretty much fit in there. I guess I would hope that this would give people an opportunity to understand it a little bit more and to see the value in planning and that it's not just a list of regulations. It's our best vision for what we want the county to look like and this is how we've structured it within what the state is requiring us to do as well.

(#0988) Bob Fink: We have a very detailed public participation plan I'm sure you are all familiar with and the program that's laid out, does anyone see anything or have any particular focus that they think should be shifted or how do we achieve this goal? Does anyone have any suggestions?

(#1005) Terri Jeffreys: I don't know how workable this is but wouldn't it be possible to have a series of articles weekly in the Journal on certain elements of the plan? Highlight some of the more top goals and direct folks to the web site and have them review it. Just to kind of show them what a Comp Plan is step by step as opposed to the broader description. Last year sitting through the rezone application process was just difficult watching people come in here and say 'I've got two kids and I want to divide up my land for them' and nowhere along the line in the last ten years was he ever aware that he couldn't do that anymore and I don't want to think about all the people in this county that don't know that.

(#1045) Diane Edgin: A lot of people don't know what's going on until they build something and there's always one neighbor in the community that blows the whistle.

(#1050) Terri Jeffreys: We need to de-jargonize it so RR5 means something to somebody and then maybe even just take an area and talk about what the planning for that area is. Somehow work with the paper and I don't know if the paper has the space or the inclination to do such a thing but I think that would be at least one area of outreach.

(#1065) Commissioner Kamin: I wonder if we did do that maybe pick commissioner districts or something and have public meetings out in District #3. Explain what it means to their area. The rural area has not gone through the extensive planning process that the UGA's have.

(#1085) Diane Edgin: Maybe an insert with several pages that dealt each month or quarter with the different districts and it shows in that area and that way it goes out in the newspaper. People are so busy with their lives and we have a certain part of our community that isn't computer savvy and they're not going to go on line and try to make sense out of it.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

(#1115) Commissioner Ring Erickson: I think your points are very good ones. I suspect that by and large many of the people in the county don't know what district they live in or even who their county commissioner is. I know that Commissioner Kamin and I have visited with some of the school boards and talked about the impact that this will have on their school districts and I hope to do a round of fire commissioners soon, too. I think that's an excellent idea, Terri, but maybe also put it in the Bremerton Sun, too. That's a newspaper that has been very supportive of us and maybe reaches a different part of the county. The jargon is a problem and we want the kind of volume that you take down from the shelf and you can actually lift it and it gives you what the policy guidance for the county is. Like it's important that we maintain our rural character or it's important to us that we have a diverse and well balanced economy or whatever statements we come up with so that not only the people that are deciding what to do with a piece of land can figure out what we're trying to do but also our various department heads outside of planning, utilities and public works, can pick that up and use it for some guidance. Environmental health particularly is one that needs to be guided by our Comp Plan, as well.

(#1177) Diane Edgin: We have hospital districts, we have PUD's, we have fire districts; has there ever been a joint meeting to exchange information?

(#1184) Commissioner Ring Erickson: We're planning one for the Belfair area the last Tuesday in May. It's going to focus around transportation.

(#1194) Commissioner Kamin: We did have a meeting with the Port of Shelton in March specifically talking about the Comp Plan.

(#1200) Diane Edgin: I'm talking about everyone in the same room at the same time.

(#1204) Commissioner Ring Erickson: I think that's a good idea and we have actually written a letter to all of the groups in the county with regard to the Comp Plan process. We were talking today and one of the things that is a concern is that sometimes the diversity of interest is so great that we need to meet with the school districts and really have time to discuss the school planning issues and we need to meet with the fire departments because maybe they have a different set of issues.

(#1224) Commissioner Sheldon: We do have an administrators meeting once a month and that's been going on since about 1991 or 1992 where we have the school administrators, the Port Director, the PUD managers, the city administrator and they talk about things that are going on that are common to all the jurisdictions but Jayni and Lynda eluded to the upcoming meeting in Belfair and what we're trying to bill it as, and we haven't put it together yet, is a council of governments type of meeting in the north end of Belfair where you'd have the ports, PUD, Belfair Water District and the commissioners and see what issues we have in common and try to get some familiarity. I think a lot of people don't think that in some of the rural areas that we have that the commissioners are the only government and that's not true. There are lots of other elected local officials that sometimes don't get together. What we're thinking about doing is having the state come there and make a presentation about the new road projects and the sewer project in Belfair. That way everybody can deal with the same information.

(#1290) Commissioner Kamin: A lot of community input went into the Comp Plan originally and certainly the PAC member is representative of commissioner districts and it may be something that we'll want to look at ... at least maybe taking the PAC members from that particular district and the commissioner and maybe just having a community meeting out in a certain area and it's something that we could certainly advertise. I don't know how much response we would get but it might be a way that we could get additional input that we don't usually get.

(#1350) Steve Clayton: Regarding the public participation plan on the Comp Plan update, gold star to Barbara and staff for getting it up on the web site. Previously the Comp Plan has not been generally available and in just the last few weeks it's been made available on the web and you can pull up particular sections. In reviewing it, Barbara has updated the housing numbers. She put it in a separate section indicating where we're changing things. In reviewing some of the things, like population allocation, we have planning policies in several different places in this document but it's not the same. We don't use the same language for our population allocation in the different sections. In one section we're saying we're going to use the intermediate

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

range and in another we say we're going to use the recommendations of OFM and in the Belfair area we say we're going to use the population allocation and add 20% to it. This, to me, is part of what we need to come up with is to find these discrepancies and determine what our direction is going to be and make them all the same. Unfortunately things like the capital facilities and several other sections are literally ten years out of date. They have the jail population of 1995 and the staffing for the police department of 1995.

(#1418) Bob Fink: The annual amendments are basically your oil change. Every year you change your oil and make sure you've got your basics down. The update is more of your 60,000 mile checkup. You top off all the fluids, you check everything to see if everything is working okay. Do the minor repair that you need to do and so it's a much more extensive and comprehensive process. A lot of those sections have just never been amended since they were first adopted.

(#1438) Steve Clayton: So hopefully we'll continue the format but that's where the public has been reluctant to make comment, from what I've heard, because the Comp Plan is about 500 pages. That's a lot of material to cover and what Barbara did was take one section of about 20 pages out and we can review it and take public input on what that review is. That seems to be a good direction to go.

(#1475) Lynda Ring Erickson: Do you think people are not commenting on it because it's too complex of a task?

(#1485) Steve Clayton: As you know, there are going to be a few squeaky wheels that are going to comment and the vast majority aren't.

(#1488) Lynda Ring Erickson: But you like to approach of breaking it down into sections?

(#1490) Steve Clayton: Yes, if that's the intent of staff that seems to work well and then we can draw out some of the discrepancies between the different sections. Reading through the goals, process and policies it's quite interesting. There's a lot of good material there but we just need to have consistency and where it's inconsistent we need to make a recommendation to the board on what we think the direction should be.

(#1512) Commissioner Kamin: That's along the line of what we told staff in how do we make this a useable document. Maybe there should be an introduction that we could hand out to people like an overview of what our plan is and this is what it means to you.

(#1528) Bob Fink: We should move to the next element which this kind of leads into. We talked about what some of the goals are for the plan and the planning process and the public participation but what other issues are on the minds of the BOCC and what kind of guidance can you give the PAC in considering the process?

(#1545) Commissioner Ring Erickson: I don't mean to repeat myself but we do know that this is a short time line and that what we're looking at to some extent what you described in terms of setting the stage for the next few years for what we'll be working on and are there elements that we could develop for this plan that maybe we won't develop this year but that you are hearing from the community that we need to develop. Health and human services, parks, education; it seems to me that there might be a number that would break out that would be a little distinct from the economic development. How are we going to plan for the future? The idea that you're going to have an opportunity to really set a structure for some future work as well as what we do this year. I just want it to be useable. I want to get away from the jargon. I don't want to hear three letters here and four letters there that I don't know what it means.

(#1620) Diane Edgin: I'm really beginning to hate acronyms because you have one organization that has it's acronyms and another one the same and they become all jumbled in your mind.

(#1630) Lynda Rick Erickson: I used to be a police officer and so when I went to work for the Department of Corrections I used to see these hats that said 'WSP' and I thought these people don't look like state patrol officers. I discovered in the prison system that it means 'Washington State Prison', which by the way is Walla Walla as opposed to the reformatory which is Monroe. So I went on later in life and I was working for the City of Olympia and I was working in the Public Works Department and people kept referring to 'WSP' and it took me a while to figure out that it meant 'Water System Plan'. So I've learned over the years to be

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

very careful about acronyms because they don't necessarily mean the same things.

(#1660) Diane Edgin: The pressure is on us because this month's Sunset Magazine has an article in it on Hood Canal and Alderbrook and it says we're working toward a solution.

(#1672) Allan Borden: That's all of the county; we can help but it's not just our responsibility.

(#1677) Tim Wing: I have a question about sub-area plans. Where do the sub-area plans fit into this review of the overall plan?

(#1684) Bob Fink: Part of the work program goes beyond the minimum requirements for compliance issues. There were a couple issues identified earlier in the process which go beyond minimum requirements but the sub-area plans, basically, each of the urban areas, the idea that they would have their own plans which would address capital facilities. One of the elements is zoning, one of the elements is capital facilities, parks; a lot of the effort in planning in the county in the last ten years has been focused on the rural, urban split and what can happen in the rural area and on environmental protection, critical areas and how close can you build to a buffer and under what conditions can you get a variance. That's where a lot of the energy of the county has gone for that last decade. In the meantime, there are a lot of pressing issues of how to deal with growth in the urban areas, how to fund facilities, where they should go, when they can go in, how to zone that land so it's more predictable how development will proceed. Community development and anticipating growth and providing for it hasn't been done. There's a process that ended just last year in Belfair. The process in Allyn was underway; the county adopted interim regulations in the form of a zoning code and they are working on a plan. We have funding to work on a plan in Allyn. We have funding to revisit the regulations in Belfair and also to make sure that the regulations in Allyn and Belfair work for the community. Shelton is something that has been in the air for a number of years and the city and the county have a memorandum of understanding where they will work together to develop zoning that is supportive of what the city needs. That also needs a sub-area plan to work on that.

(#1790) Tim Wing: Specifically, does this requirement to redo our plan include redoing the sub-area plans?

(#1800) Darren Nienaber: It's not mandatory.

(#1802) Tim Wing: Is there a plan to do that?

(#1804) Bob Fink: Yes.

(#1806) Tim Wing: In this same time frame?

(#1808) Bob Fink: No, just to complete the Allyn plan.

(#1810) Tim Wing: Let me just make my case because that's what I wanted to hear. I know it will go on the back burner because we don't have to do it. My big concern is that I see a real problem with the Belfair plan. If you're going to put a sewer in there and improve those roads, if that sewer doesn't get up to the top of the hill all of a sudden it's going to be very attractive to develop in Belfair and I think that plan that's in place right now is highly flawed about putting a lot of development down near that river. I think that it needs to get addressed if the sewer is coming. I've said this for quite a while but all of a sudden the sewer is coming. I think that we need to take very quick note of that and take a closer look at that plan and potentially consider revising it. I don't say I have the answer to all of this; I just see a big problem there that I've seen from the very beginning.

(#1844) Darren Nienaber: That is a mandatory type issue and it's part of the public participation program for the PAC to make a decision as what they think is mandatory review. These are the things that we're going to review.

(#1876) Commissioner Kamin: I think this kind of confusion ... what does it mean to update our population projection? What does it mean to be updating our capital facilities? What relevance does this have throughout the county and in our planning process in particular? Certainly we need to look at those things.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

As we update our capital facilities and all that we will be looking at that. Also, I think one of the dilemmas that we do face is it seems to appear that more people are going to be moving in here but at this point there's disparity between encouraging people to move into the UGA's when we still have a lot of room out in the rural areas. How do we want to handle that? Do we want to encourage more buildable lots outside of the UGA's or do we want to encourage more multi family? I think we will have the opportunity to address that without specifically addressing the sub-area plan. That goes back to our vision and goals. Regarding growth and economic compliance; one of the things the EDC has worked on is retention of the businesses that we already have and to me I would like to be more purposeful on the type of businesses that we attract and that we're not just attracting businesses for the sake of attracting jobs that we have a trained work force that needs a job here already and not that we want to bring an industry in here and then more people are going to have to move in here for that industry. I think it's just a vicious circle and we're not really addressing that so I would hope that as we look at this economic component that we're looking to see how we balance the need for marketing the county and developing a viable economy and providing jobs for the people we already have here.

(#2020) Allan Borden: Lynda and Jayni; you said you've been talking to the schools and one thought I had was is there something that we can do through the Comp Plan to raise the integration of schools on every level and especially post elementary and secondary school levels. Raise that as either a part of economic development or it's own education element. There seems to be a disconnect between what the county is doing and what all these school districts desire to have done.

(#2048) Commissioner Kamin: I think that certainly is a good point. The action steps that were developed, there was only about an hour to do that and I don't know if a whole lot was accomplished. To me it is helping to communicate to the community and the school district that this is the work force. This is how we need to be training people for what kind of jobs here and looking into the future what do we want to be attracting.

(#2072) Allan Borden: We're sort of missing out on South Puget Sound being involved in this part of the county.

(#2082) Commissioner Kamin: Olympic College, too. Again, what is our vision and what kinds of businesses do we want to attract? My bias certainly is towards the resource industry and small business that we can support and encourage. When Lynda and I have met with the school districts their question is 'where is the growth going to be so we can plan where we're going to put schools'? Particularly Shelton. They want to know where is the population going to be. Those are the kinds of questions that we can help them with.

(#2130) Commissioner Ring Erickson: I think that Bob has told us that a lot of our growth is taking place in the rural areas and not necessarily in the urban areas and hopefully one of the policy perspectives is what do we do to make our urban areas not only attractive to new business but attractive to our rural businesses when they start to grow so that they move to Shelton or Allyn or Belfair rather than going to Kent. I agree with Jayni that we want to have a work force that when a business comes we can provide the employees for the most part here. I also want to make our UGA's attractive so that our own businesses, as they grow, want to stay here or move into those areas and our citizens, as they age, will need more assistance with what's going on in their life choices. That they can move into those areas and feel that's where they want to live.

(#2210) Commissioner Sheldon: I made a few notes about policy issues. I've always said that Mason County is just a very unique county; we only have one incorporated city and that makes us very unique. We have the South Puget Sound and Hood Canal and the Olympics. So I think we can write a plan that really is unique to us and it may take longer to do but that's what's important to most of the citizens. In this last legislative session we were very fortunate in that we have \$100,000,000 coming to this county in the next few years in very large infrastructure projects. From the expansion, widening of Highway 3, in Belfair there's \$16,000,000 in grant money for sewer project, there's \$15,000,000 for the Belfair Bypass; I talked to the Department of Transportation today about getting together and timing that and working on that so that's started before the other project. The Shelton area water and sewer project has been underway for a couple of years but now we'll have it started in another year. Just another project to think about is the new bridge at Purdy Creek on Highway 101. That's a \$12,000,000 project. If you live out at Lake Cushman or wanted to move to Lake Cushman because you worked at Alaska Airlines you wouldn't live at Lake Cushman because you couldn't tell your boss you would be on the job Wednesday at 9:00 am because you wouldn't know. Some of those

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

infrastructure projects, when they're done, those people will move out there, or they will convert their seasonal residence to permanent residence because they know that now they can get to the job on time. You see the development that we've had just in the last couple of years; look at the casino, look at Alderbrook; all that development has been good, compatible development but it has really happened because of infrastructure. It's going to generate tax revenues for the county and good jobs, I think. So the things that are important that I wrote down just on policy were flexibility, certainty, speed and how long it takes. I think if the plan has some incentives that's what people are looking for. If they do a little more they get more certainty or if they do a little more they get maybe a bonus density. We've talked about this and I've been before the group here lots of familiar times with rezones and they do take a long time and they're a difficult thing to do but I think if larger developers see bonus densities they would come in and develop a piece of property in a way that would be much more advantageous for everyone than if there wasn't a bonus density. They would set aside half the property if they could get more density in the other half and I'm not sure our plan does that. There are some bonus densities but not really for larger developments. I think the Hood Canal is going to continue to be one of our wonderful assets. I'm not going to ever say 'dead sea' or those types of things because I think it sends the impression to people that there's pollution in the canal; that you can't swim in it, you can't fish, you can't water ski and I think that's something we're going to have to overcome because when the LA Times picks that story up and national people make that comment that's going to hurt us. The other thing we tried to do in Olympia this year is to make sure the locals have as much say in the canal as the state agencies and the governor's office and there's a bill now that the governor's office staff wants the governor to veto because it puts the governor's staff on the same level with the Hood Canal Coordinating Council, which is the locals, which is the three counties and the two tribes. Projects wouldn't go forward unless we both say they could go forward. The staff in the governor's office naturally wants to have the upper hand and say what happens. You do a fantastic job in contributing your time and effort to this which is considerable so we really appreciate it.

(#2465) Diane Edgin: In putting all this stuff together I think one thing we absolutely must take into consideration is that the Highway 16 bridge and the last link in that is 302 and that's not the greatest road but now we've got the thought of Nascar coming in Kitsap County that puts another huge pressure on us and also the homes in King County bring in the kind of prices and people age and they want to sell out and say they can go do something down there because the prices are cheaper. I'm getting letters in the mail right about my extra property from California. It's coming folks.

(#2520) Commissioner Ring Erickson: Tim, isn't there money to help 302 in the legislature?

(#2522) Commissioner Sheldon: Yes, \$5,000,000 to realign 302. The portions in Mason County.

(#2530) Bob Fink: Did the PAC have other issues? This is your chance to voice your opinion.

(#2538) Steve Clayton: Are we intending to implement the trails plan into the Comp Plan this year? Trails as an element both in the UGA and out of the UGA creates a more livable and more attractive place to live. If it's been accepted maybe we should work to get that implemented and once we accept it we need to go the next step that the trails committee came forward with what to do next and that's to identify what's existing and where we want to go.

(#2570) Commissioner Kamin: We did accept the framework for developing the policies and I would think that the policy portion would be part of the Comp Plan. As far as the development of the plan I think that's a pretty lengthy process that I don't think we would have time to actually develop.

(#2590) Bob Fink: Right. Essentially it's mostly a policy document and I expect that they will make their way into the open space and recreation element of the plan but the actual parks and trails development plan is a multi year project by the time it's done and there have been discussions with the parks department about how that might happen and also with the board. There's no set time line for that yet but it's certainly something you can see on the horizon.

(#2620) Mark Drain: I just want to second Terri's idea for updates in the newspaper that are written in layman's terms and kind of notify people of issues that are immediately on the table and where they can give input to those issues. I don't read the paper from cover to back but there's a few places in the paper that I go to in the comfort of my own home and I can figure out what's going on and if a person felt like attending a

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

meeting or was concerned about something that might change then they would know how to participate in the process. I think the newspaper is a good media.

(#2666) Wendy Ervin: And I would like to third that. I'd like to say also that if it was broken down into a single subject so that somebody could understand and swallow that and not feel that they're choking on too much information. It is news and there is no reason why the paper should be unwilling to put that information in.

(#2695) Commissioner Ring Erickson: Even if we had to buy it as advertising space we can do that. I think it was very insightful that staff realized that a lot of people weren't seeing the public notices and so we went to an ad format and maybe it's just get an ad that says go to page 'x' because there's something about housing or trails or something.

(#2722) Commissioner Kamin: It may be something where we could talk with the editor of the paper and just ask if they would do a series on the Comp Plan and help us present it in a way that's relevant for the public to understand.

(#2740) Commissioner Sheldon: The Sun has done a lot of stories about the Comp Plan in Kitsap County.

(#2755) Tim Wing: I just wanted to comment that I think sometimes we've lacked having a growth philosophy that's well stated that we all kind of have bought into that's not a big long statement but a fairly short statement. I received a letter about ten years ago from Irene Davis and it had an article in it about a town that had grown too fast and too big and about how the people that had lived there forever didn't like it anymore. It was kind of a demonstration of you can get too big if you try very hard and we're right at that place in time where if we tried very hard we could make this place into a place that all of us would want to leave and so I think we need to do everything we can to emphasize to everybody involved that protecting the rural character of the county is vital because that's who we are. No one ever really moved here to live in a city and that's been the problem with these UGA's from the get go. The second thing I wanted to mention is that we need to expect a lot of growth here and as long as everybody in the county understands that most of that is going to go into the UGA's I think we can see a path clear that we can plan for a lot of growth and put a lot of growth into the county but still maintain the vast majority of the county in its rural character and try to continue to build places for all those people that are inside the UGA to enjoy the rest of the county. Some kind of a philosophy statement about that, I think, can help guide the whole plan and the whole movement. The last thing I wanted to say is that I think that we must focus hard inside these UGA's. This county, probably for lack of funds but certainly also because of controversy, has done almost nothing inside the UGA's in the last ten years. Since the GMA passed event after event after event has happened outside the UGA's. We've built roads in the boonies where five cars go a day. We've built about one mile of road inside Belfair. And we've built fifteen miles in the north end on roads that hardly anybody ever travels on. We should have been building roads inside the UGA's the day that thing passed twelve years ago. That's hindsight but here we are. Where are we going to go? I think we need to re-examine where we spend any new road money and if we're getting a lot of money from the state, that's great, but we need to make exits and we need to put up sidewalks and we need to put side roads in and we need to make it attractive for developers to come in and do good jobs of developing developments and we need to make sure that that sewer goes to places that we want the growth to go to because the growth is going to occur where it goes. If that costs us money to do beyond the money we're getting from the state then we need to do that. We need to revise those sub-area plans because they are inside the UGA's and that's were our growth needs to go. If we do all those things I think we can accept the growth and we can also maintain the rural character. People are still trying to live out in the rural area but it's really expensive now. You either have to go up a two mile dirt road to get to your property and you don't like who you're living near or you have to pay \$70,000 to \$150,000 for a paved road to a two acre lot with a view in the rural areas. So we need to make those UGA's the place people want to live so they're close to the environment they moved here to experience.

(#2975) Commissioner Kamin: I just wanted to say I really appreciate your eloquence there. When I talk about a vision for the county I think that you said it more aptly. It's a growth philosophy; how do we want to grow? What do we want it to look like? How do we provide for a prosperous future for our community but still not lose what we are, not grow into something that none of us are comfortable with. I think one of the things we certainly do need to look at is an urban roads standard. At this point I don't know that the county has one. I think basically the county has all rural road standards and I think they're a little controversial, too. We did talk today about the water; what can we do to encourage development within the UGA's; what is the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

infrastructure projects that we can help encourage as we look to appropriate our funding. How do we develop a plan and have that growth philosophy?

(#2150) Terri Jeffreys: I really think for the plan to be workable it ought to include performance measures. It ought to include opportunity to determine how well are we meeting whatever the goals or policies we had. If you having housing targets and certain types of housing products and price ranges, if you've got some infrastructure targeting or look at where your population has been going more often than every seven years so that when you go back and look at the policies you can determine if they're working or not. Just work the policies a little more proactively as opposed to just doing it every seven years.

(#3250) Commissioner Ring Erickson: I'm really glad to hear you make the comment about performance measures. This is actually a conversation that Emmett Dobey, our Planning Director, and I had. Once we start seeing what's in the plan what kinds of performance measures we can put in so that we can accurately and fairly easily measure what's going on so that we're not creating a nightmare for staff and that they have some consistency over time. Not just planning staff but the utilities staff and park staff and everybody that actually has, and certainly public works, and kind of use that as a guide and are we doing roads in the urban areas so that we're promoting better urban transportation.

(#3330) Terri Jeffreys: I would love to see the county define for ourselves what does 'sprawl' mean? I think if we all could decide on a definition of sprawl it might help us all. You've got your urban growth boundaries and so I don't understand how sprawl happens. It seems by virtue of drawing the line and then living in your densities and rural areas you don't have sprawl.

(#3365) Bob Fink: I don't know that sprawl is happening anymore.

(#3400) Wendy Ervin: Tim was talking about the boundaries in Belfair and where the infrastructure is and I'd like to draw peoples attention to what Ken VanBuskirk wrote because he's got several pointers on the same thing.

(#3500) Commissioner Kamin: One of the things we haven't touched on tonight is expanding the UGA boundaries. That's not really something we're really looking to do necessarily but what would trigger that?

(#3550) Terri Jeffreys: I assumed that was going to happen when you started doing the population and land inventory. I also don't know if that's part of your work plan.

(#3600) Bob Fink: The boundaries fall out from the allocation of population because you're now looking further ahead into the future, so there's going to be more people here, so it raises the question of whether you have to expand the boundaries. The experience in Belfair with the zoning that was established is that there wasn't any need to expand the boundaries. Within the boundaries as you increase the density and intensity of use there's actually more capacity because the densities are higher than when the boundaries were established by 2000. So even though there's more people expected, in Belfair the capacity went from about approximately 4,000 people to around 6,000 people because of the increased densities. So as we zone these areas and we get higher urban densities and multi family areas to the extent we do that's going to offset the numbers of people that are coming. The other issue with expanding the urban areas and the allocation of population is that the majority of the residential population growth is outside of the urban areas. It's close to 90%; and, although we can expect that will change in the future, it's going to be a gradual change as infrastructure is put in place. That's something that has to be looked at in more detail. The boundaries we'll have to look at, but the expectation isn't necessarily that we'll be able to expand them or want to expand them.

(#3755) Diane Edgin: Bob, I remember at one time you were talking to me about any interest in Harstine completing their sub-area plan. It might actually be easier now because the county has the Comp Plan.

(#3775) Bob Fink: The Harstine plan probably is going to have to be examined because a lot of the policies in it were actually incorporated into the county Comp Plan and there's a section that deals with that. Some of the policies probably need to be evaluated in light of the later decisions on rural areas and what can happen in rural areas. Many of the issues that the sub-area plan looked at have been addressed through general

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

regulations and general policies regarding rural area development.

(#3820) Diane Edgin: I'm thinking of being able to give them our sub-area plan which doesn't exist now because everything is incorporated. This goes back to what I was talking about because I know of some issues right now on the shoreline things are happening that are quite frankly illegal. But these people don't care; they'll do it until somebody slaps their hand. I'd like to hand them something ...

(#3850) Allan Borden: Most of the shoreline policies are uniform across the county.

(#3870) Diane Edgin: People need something simple they can read.

(#3877) Commissioner Sheldon: That can be dealt with with enforcement.

(#0130) Tim Wing: Some counties have little brochures about shoreline rules and about other restrictions. Somebody just recently told me they had been to Kitsap County and they showed me all this stuff. Why don't we have that? Maybe that's something we can look into.

(#0150) Commissioner Kamin: I think that's a great idea.

(#0158) Terri Jeffreys: I don't know if anyone has discussed it but the GMA has a provision for establishing an industrial land bank. Jefferson County is considering doing it and apparently there's a tremendous amount of inventory work that needs to be done and all this needs to happen by 2007. I'd love to see us look at this in this process. We need to at least have a discussion about it so it's in the record.

(#0180) Bob Fink: We've gotten through our agenda on schedule. The next step is right now we're preparing rezones for consideration by the PAC. These are rezones that were applied for last year. We're also working on the elements and as you suggested what we'll do is have a series of fairly bite size proposals or amendments that would be brought on a cycle where one week you would be presented the document and then the following meeting there would be a discussion of the document and then the following meeting there might be action on the document. Kind of a revolving process over the next couple of months. We've already scheduled two meetings a month and we'll have to see how that goes. We might have to do additional meetings. We've also taken efforts and we're trying to make the process more transparent to the public. We have a work schedule that we developed that shows what the time line is in some detail and what we're planning on doing is actually developing that time line in much more detail showing more specific dates with a disclaimer about dates maybe being subject to change but basically so that people know when issues that might be of interest to them are coming up, when the public notices are expected out, when the hearing will be held. The idea is to make it more accessible to the public and also to better coordinate any other people that are involved in exactly what's going on. We'll put that all on the website. The website itself, along with that schedule, we plan on updating at least every week and making sure that the information on it is current. That's essentially where we are. According to the schedule we have there's a couple of more months now until we want to adopt the work program and laying out what areas of the plan need to be updated by the ACT and what areas don't. The work program is going to go beyond what's mandated to be changed. I think it's very clear to me that there's interest in going beyond that and how well the plan fits the county. We'll be looking at the participation plan and seeing what extra elements we can add to it. There were some very suggestions today and we're going to be trying to exploit some of those opportunities in the near future. Steve's economic development process is getting underway and that's probably the major focus of the public process that's outside your process and it will be brought back a little later when there's some material produced by it. So that's where we are.

(#0290) Commissioner Ring Erickson: Thanks, Bob. Thank you all for coming.

(#0295) Tim Wing: Thank you for coming, too.

(#0300) Commissioner Kamin: I'd like to thank Bob for doing such a good job and thank each of you for all the work that you do month after month for us and I feel we have a very qualified, experienced Planning Advisory Commission helping us through this process as well as our staff.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 2, 2005

(#0315) Terri Jeffreys: I need to be excused for the next meeting.

(#0325) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second to excuse Terri from the next meeting. All in favor?
Motion passes.

Meeting adjourned.