

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
June 27, 2005

(Note audio tape (#1) dated June 27, 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, Tim Wing, Steve Clayton, Wendy Ervin, Terri Jeffreys, Mark Drain and Diane Edgin.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0015) Bill Dewey: The purpose of tonight's meeting is to hold a public hearing to consider the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Update Review. This review of the Mason County Comp Plan and Development Regulations is being done to meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act. In addition to the Update Review, the hearing will be on a proposed work program for 2005 and 2006. On the program will be the community planning issues that should be addressed through the end of 2006, including those issues identified for amendment by the Update Review. We'll start out with a staff report. Then we'll open the public hearing for public comment and then we'll get into the discussion by the PAC. Barbara?

(#0040) Barbara Adkins: My name is Barbara Adkins and I am a Planner with the Department of Community Development. As Bill mentioned, this is a public hearing tonight on the 2005 - 2006 work program for the Comp Plan Update Review. Open for discussion this evening are the items on the work program and the time line given to each of them. This is an opportunity for you to go through them and decide which items you agree should be on the list. If there are items that should not be on the list ... are there items that are missing from the list. Look at the time frame they are allotted for and determine if they need to be moved from one year to another. Ultimately what we want to do tonight is for the PAC to decide if they want to accept the work program as it is and send it on to the BOCC for approval. Or do you want to revise it, approve it, revise it, and have us go ahead and send it on at that time. Or you could reject it and set another public hearing to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

incorporate the comments and changes. The work program and the staff report were furnished to you at your last meeting and we have copies here for the public. The staff report is quite lengthy so I won't read it but I will briefly go through what is in the work program itself, which is the smaller of the two documents. On page 1, is #1 - GMA Mandated Updates - 2005. This is basically a list of changes that staff recommends based on what the GMA says that we need to do to bring our plan current according to GMA standards. These are the changes that we recommend be done in 2005. On page 2, #2, GMA Mandates - 2006. These are also mandated changes that we suggest be done in 2006. Next is #3, Non-Mandated Changes, proposed for the 2005-2006 Work Program. These are changes that are not necessarily mandated but staff suggests that they be done and changes that have also been suggested as part of the public review process. The final pages gives you an entire list of all the projects that we are recommending that you address in 2005, along with all the projects that we suggest be addressed in 2006. So what we need to do this evening is address any issues that you have or the public has with the items on the list. We have four planners here tonight that can answer your questions.

(#0150) Wendy Ervin: On page 2, Item 1.2, 'Integration of the Shoreline Master Program in the Plan and Regulations'. In that are you speaking just of integrating the language or are you speaking of integrating ... you're got a number of various boundaries; shoreline buffer zones, shoreline management boundaries, etc. Are those boundaries going to be integrated into one or is it just the language?

(#0180) Bob Fink: My name is Bob Fink and I am the Planning Manager for the Department of Community Development. We're not looking at amending the language in the SMP in the sense of changing it. What we are interested in trying to do is coordinate ... the regulations are now a part of the County Development Regulations and the policies in the SMP are actually part of the Comp Plan Policies and so in recognition of the statutory change we are simply trying to integrate them together and not change them. There is an update requirement of the SMP and that update for Mason County isn't required until 2012.

(#0200) Bill Dewey: I'd like to go ahead and open up the public hearing. Does anybody have any specific questions just to clarify any issues? Okay, then we'll open it up to the public.

(#0225) Matt Matayoshi: Good evening commission members. Thank you for allowing me to speak this evening. My name is Matt Matayoshi and I'm representing the Economic Development Council of Mason County this evening. I had an opportunity to review those items that are on the proposed work program for 2005-2006. I would like to point out that we support the airport and adequately buffering and protecting the future of the airport and are pleased to see that's on the list. In regards to Master Plan Industrial Development through the RCW 36.70A.365 and 367 we recommend that this be added to the Comp Plan and the provisions for this would allow the county increased opportunity and flexibility for prospective investments into the community. The third item I wanted to address may have been eluded to but was not clearly addressed in the proposed work plan and that is zoning for rural areas, including the Rural Commercial and Rural Industrial zones. I would propose that this be reviewed and that increased flexibility be added to these provisions as there some challenges, even with existing industry or commercial activities that are not included in either category. This may include extending the zone to add Mixed Use or Light Industrial activity to be a conforming use under Rural Commercial or Industrial, particularly where there's activity of retail, commercial, and some light industrial activity occurring in the same location. The other concern is with the size limitation of buildings no greater than 7,500 sf and also the height restriction of 35 feet maximum. My experience has been that the more constraints that are added on make it more difficult or challenging for existing investment to continue and then also for new investment to occur. I appreciate you allowing me to add my comments to the public record. Thank you.

(#0315) Tim Wing: Matt, regarding the height restrictions; what kinds of restrictions do you feel are more appropriate than the existing ones?

(#0330) Matt Matayoshi: I didn't come prepared to suggest a specific maximum height but I thought it would be appropriate for that to be reviewed in that 35 feet may limit some opportunities so there could be a provision added where those that are over 35 feet could be reviewed, or if you had something that was 36 feet or 38 feet then those current regulations would not allow such a structure to be constructed.

(#0345) Bill Dewey: That is already proposed to be reviewed under the work program.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

(#0347) Matt Matayoshi: Correct.

(#0375) Bill Dewey: So just for clarification, Matt, based on your comments, is there omissions for what's proposed for the work program that you feel need to be in there, or are you speaking in support of what's here?

(#0378) Matt Matayoshi: I'm speaking in support of what's here and for the addition of review of the Rural Industrial and Rural Commercial zones.

(#0400) Warren Dawes: I'm Warren Dawes and I live at Southeast Mason County. I just wanted to make one point with an issue that I have brought up and it's listed on your work program on page 3 as Item #3.10, Consider inholding lands for rural residential designation. We've talked about this before. I think the way it's presented for consideration in the plan is good in that it is looking at the rural zoning regulation but I wanted to point out to you that this issue truly is a critical areas, long-term commercial forestry issue as well. When the Comp Plan was being drafted I sat on that committee and I also sat on the sub-committee that was dealing with the long-term forestry issues. The large forestry land owners were very specific in saying that one of the problems they have for long-term commercial forestry operations is the proximity of residential to their long-term commercial forest. It brings up questions of liability, incursions on the land by residents and they at first were lobbying for a setback from the long-term commercial forestry land but that wasn't done. As a result of that I think that the way that zoning came about, if you recall, the 1 per 20 acre lands are the ones that are usually up against the long-term commercial forestry and that provides a protection for them so it's inconsistent that the in-holding lands would result in a 1 per 5 zoning density. It just doesn't fit that those things can be totally surrounded by long-term commercial forestry. I would just point out that that is just a second consideration, besides looking at the rural zoning, that you're also looking at the critical area resource and protection of the long-term commercial forestry. As such, if you don't move it over into the mandated 2006 GMA issues, because I recognize that critical areas resource has been put off until 2006, that you do it concurrently and judge for yourself that this is really a critical area resource issue. You might also consider consulting with the major land owners who have the long-term commercial forestry about their views on this issue. They were very strong on it. I just wanted to pass that along.

(#0500) Jeff Carey: My name is Jeff Carey and I live in Allyn. The only question I have is on the list of the hundred or so items to work through, Items 80 and 83, what was the criteria for not bringing them up in either this year or next years review? On Item 83, since we understood the issues of population were going to be addressed in the Comp Plan the concern I had is that it seems to give a fictitious representation if you ... say you have a bunch of RR20, and from what I audited, which is about 48 or 50 square miles worth of RR20, where it seems like less than 5% has any residential population at all that if you use that number at all as any calculation to what kind of population you can allocate to the county rural lands it seems to me to be fictitious. That's the chief point at this point.

(#0550) Bill Dewey: Is there any clarification that staff can offer for Mr. Carey as far as Items 80 and 83 and why staff is recommending they not be placed on the work program at this point?

(#0565) Bob Fink: Can we address that later?

(#0575) Jeff Carey: Okay. On the other issue obviously we're happy to see the issues with the Allyn UGA are being addressed that were sent to the county and it looks like all of them have been listed here, both from the Allyn Community Association as well as from residents within the UGA so we're pleased. I should switch hats now and say I'm Jeff Carey, President of the Allyn Community Association. As President and also as Secretary within the Allyn Sub-Area Planning Committee, working with the county and residents we see that all are listed for 2005.

(#0605) Bill Dewey: Those are the only people that signed up to testify. Is there anyone else who would like to testify?

(#0620) Ken VanBuskirk: My name is Ken VanBuskirk of Belfair. I just saw the staff report this morning and you folks have done a lot of hard work on this. None of our current County Commissioners approved the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

Belfair Sub-Area Plan, as you well know. It was a last minute approval by two of our former Commissioners and to me it's created a land rush up in the north end of unprecedented proportions. I know it's a bit selfish of me but if you look on page 21 you'll see Item 95 is a rezone request that I submitted in 2002. It was tabled last year by our former Commissioners, the same ones that approved the sub-area plan, and I hope that it gets back on the table. Page 12, Item 10, I see that the UGA boundaries are going to be considered to look at and that should address our concerns with our particular rezone. I would really like you folks to reconsider Item 6. To me it's much more important to have you take a look at the zoning proposed in the critical aquifer recharge area of the Belfair UGA than it is to put all the effort into an unenforceable sign ordinance. On page 9, article 5.14; that sign ordinance is already being enforced, sending out letters to A-board owners so I just ask you to consider that. North Mason is posed to receive millions of dollars in infrastructure. Roads, sewers, stormwater; are we ready for it? The recommendation you folks make to the BOCC is going to forever change the rural character of our community. Given all the controversies surrounding the Theler Center, the Pacific Northwest Salmon Center, and the involvement of the Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group with the sub-area plan, I think the sub-area plan deserves more scrutiny than it's getting in the proposed 2005 - 2006 work program. I would ask that you consider that in your deliberations and I've been asked to submit these documents for your consideration. You can look at them at your leisure. Thank you for all your time and effort.

(#0735) Bill Dewey: Is there anybody else that would like to testify at tonight's public hearing? Seeing no response, I'll go ahead and close the public hearing portion and begin the discussion of the PAC.

(#0758) Wendy Ervin: I would like to say, regarding what Mr. VanBuskirk just said, on page 11, Item 6, when we had talked about that briefly before and the stuff that we were given to read, that seemed to me ... there seemed to be some legitimate points and I think that it's not unreasonable to address that and to really look at the idea of making some adjustment to the UGA boundary before any bypass or anything goes on. I think it needs to be on the list.

(#0785) Steve Clayton: Under Item 10, it is on the work program to review the Belfair UGA.

(#0788) Wendy Ervin: So you're saying that these two are redundant?

(#0790) Steve Clayton: Item 6, it appears that Mr. VanBuskirk is recommending where to draw the line and he's also, in that section, recommending some different things other than redrawing the UGA. Perhaps what staff intends is that we do look at the UGA's.

(#0800) Wendy Ervin: So Item 6 would be incorporated in 10?

(#0805) Steve Clayton: Part of Item 6.

(#0807) Terri Jeffreys: Not necessarily because if you're looking at UGA boundaries as part of a numbers game and you fit the population increase projections into the space and lots available as opposed to looking at the UGA sitting on top of a critical aquifer, those are two absolutely separate issues and I don't see them every really coming together in a discussion.

(#0818) Wendy Ervin: Then I continue to suggest that we bring Item 6 into the work program.

(#0822) Steve Clayton: If we're reviewing where the UGA's are drawn and where and if they are to be enlarged then doesn't that cover his concern of whether or not it's on the critical aquifer area?

(#0830) Terri Jeffreys: If the decision is made to reduce the size of the UGA then you're looking at where you reduce it and that possibly would cover the conversation there.

(#0836) Wendy Ervin: But what you're saying is there's two sets of criteria. One is the critical aquifer recharge area and the other is a population issue and so they may be the same line and maybe not.

(#0846) Terri Jeffreys: To me it's two different discussions unless there was a decision that it is oversized and you do have to start redrawing the lines and then you establish criteria for that.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

(#0855) Wendy Ervin: As we have seen this presented before, the idea was to kind of move it away from the aquifer. That's why I think this is important to address.

(#0875) Tim Wing: I think there's two areas of concern that I have about that. One is, when you start talking about the aquifer in the Belfair area you're talking about the entire UGA. I don't think people know exactly where that aquifer is. If you're talking about setbacks from streams and rivers, that's something that can be defined but when you're talking about an aquifer, I think you're getting into a pretty loose piece of information. The second thing is if you're talking about sizing the UGA based on population projections, I don't have much faith in any of the population projections, whether they're small or large, for the North Mason area. I think 20 years from now we can tell you how big it got but right now trying to size the UGA based on what somebody thinks is the population, I don't think 'that somebody' knows what it's going to do. There are too many big variables out there that will have a huge influence on it.

(#0910) Wendy Ervin: When this was brought to us earlier, the thought was, as the UGA sits the sewer is going to go here (*Wendy draws example*) and it is therefore going to draw construction and development in this area, which is the closer area to the aquifer recharge area. The suggestion was to draw the UGA boundary out like this (*Wendy draws example*) so the sewer goes here so you put your development in an area that is not as close to that aquifer area.

(#0935) Bill Dewey: The way I'm looking at this in my own mind is if there was new information or new science (BAS) available to us since we deliberated the Belfair Sub-Area Plan it might be worth raising but ... we talked about the aquifer recharge area in our deliberations, and in fact, I lobbied for Low Impact Development in those areas. It's something that we have deliberated as a PAC and I'm not aware of any new science that's come forward since then so ...

(#0960) Wendy Ervin: What I'm remembering hasn't been that many meetings ago and it was after we had all our discussions about the Belfair UGA. Subsequent to that, this issue of it being close to the aquifer recharge area ...

(#0975) Mark Drain: I think we gave it good consideration and what kinds of uses could happen in that area and I don't think we're out of line with what we did except we're verging on it now and we may as well add it to the agenda if we spend much more time on it tonight. Maybe we should just stick that portion of it on. I think for me we've got it covered already.

(#0990) Tim Wing: I question whether there was BAS that was used at the time the sub-area planning group made their decisions about how close to the river development could occur.

(#0996) Diane Edgin: I was there and the day we drew the lines, there was a group of five of us and we just did lines and had absolutely no idea what was there. They just said we've got to put this population somewhere and we figured out.

(#1005) Tim Wing: I'm not talking about that session. I'm talking about the sub-area planning group sessions that I attended. The meetings I was at, decisions were made based on what's the best way to make the town flourish. It had little to do with protecting the areas that needed protecting. I've spoken strongly about the issue that my personal view is that the plan is flawed, that the sewer needs to take care of the existing base of businesses in the old part of town and simultaneous open up new areas so the town can continue to grow but if you don't open up the new areas it will grow right where it is and it's not good. I think that needs to be addressed. I don't think science was used to determine the way it is and I'd like to see some science used but I also have some questions about science when you're talking about water under the ground and how big is it.

(#1042) Mark Drain: Tim, we weren't guiding where the sewer was going to go. So that was out of our realm and I think that people in designating the UGA's and what when on there, we took into consideration existing regulations for critical areas.

(#1070) Bob Fink: I wanted to point out that the review of the critical aquifer recharge area is something on

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

our work program for next year as part of the critical area review. There was a new guidance document issued by DOE quite recently this year and it's something we will look at. There's nothing that I've ever heard of that says that a UGA cannot be over a critical aquifer recharge area and in fact, most of the Shelton urban area is over a recharge area; they're hard to avoid in Mason County. But that doesn't mean that proper precautions shouldn't be taken in the development on where they're located.

(#1100) Diane Edgin: One of the things that I've seen since I have been involved with things on Harstine Island is as time has gone on I saw us come up on a boom time in this state and because we were lagging in many areas, we missed it. That hurts all of us because that's our tax base. And if we're not careful, we're going to run into the same thing again and what Bob said right then is there is a document that is available right now. Do we take this thing right here and move it to this year and plop some other things to make the time line more timely for this county? I'm really tired of seeing this dragging.

(#1130) Tim Wing: My personal view is I'd like to see it redone because I don't think it was done well. I also think it needs to get review before they get very far in terms of planning the sewer because that wasn't even on the table when the decisions were made; no one even thought we were going to get a sewer for 15 years. Now it's fairly imminent. Where you put the sewer is where the development is going to want to be. It seems to me that should be a reflection of the sub-area plan. I don't like, personally, the way it's set up. I think there's too much development planned for behind Belfair and down towards the river.

(#1170) Wendy Ervin: You made a comment that you didn't plan where the sewer was going to be but by virtue of drawing a circle and saying this is the UGA and then the law saying it will be served by sewer, essentially that's what that did. That plan is roughly where it's going to be.

(#1185) Bill Dewey: So, Bob, is it safe to say in 2006, when the county considers critical aquifer recharge areas, that the one that's there in Belfair will be amongst those that are considered?

(#1194) Bob Fink: What we'll do is we'll make sure that the protection is in place for the types of development that's allowed there are adequate. That would be something that was reviewed. A lot of the issues are addressed as parts of other things. Wetlands also have new guidance that was issued by DOE that the county will be reviewing next year to make sure the wetlands protections are appropriate and adequate.

(#1212) Diane Edgin: Why can't we start reviewing them now?

(#1220) Bob Fink: It's not that we're not starting now; the problem is when do we need to finish? There's a problem with getting done with what we have to do that we consider mandated by 2005 and so most of the things that aren't mandated by 2005, with the exception of a few ongoing projects, have been deferred to 2006.

(#1240) Steve Clayton: It's almost like the cart after the horse because what we're doing is we're saying we're going to revise the UGA boundaries now and next year we're going to look at the critical areas.

(#1245) Bob Fink: It's unlikely the critical area boundaries will change. Looking though the guidance, it's probably not going to change the boundaries. It may cause us to relook at what some of the regulations are. The same for wetlands.

(#1270) Steve Clayton: There's a critical aquifer recharge area up Old Belfair Highway and it's based on elevations, soils, conditions, etc. Currently part of that area is mapped and it is in the UGA. Our county standards say, and I believe state standards say, you can only put 1 house per acre in that area but it's zoned in the Belfair plan as 3 houses per acre and 5 houses per acre. So we've got several hundred acres there that we can't build out to the density that our plan says until we get a sewer plan in there and there's no plan for sewer to go up Old Belfair Highway in the next decade but the contention of staff is in the next 20 years it will go up there. There was discussion on whether that should be changed and designated into an urban reserve so you don't give the impression to people that they can actually build there in those urban densities. That also makes the population allocation distorted.

(#1320) Tim Wing: I have felt all along and continue to feel that wherever they put the sewer is going to be the dictating thing. It's not where we draw the boundary or what the zoning is, so to speak. If you look at Allyn,

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

the population in the UGA of Allyn has just exploded. Belfair has been stagnant because you can't afford to operate there and you can't build in so many locations and if they put a sewer through and put it in the right place, the town will grow in the right place. I've said all along that my misgivings with the density of population planned in the downtown area of Belfair, behind it where the water is, no one will ever build there because the rules ... if you want to build there you can build there but it's going to be so expensive they're going to build somewhere else or they won't build there at all.

(#1365) Wendy Ervin: And by having large chunks of land set out that appear to be buildable on the map but aren't, you put an enormous economic pressure on the rest of the property that exists.

(#1375) Bob Fink: Well, it is a 20-year plan and I think the presumption has always been that sewer will eventually be extended throughout that area in the 20 years that the plan covers. It is correct that sewers allow growth but where the sewer will be provided will depend on where the county needs the sewer based on the zoning and the UGA boundary. The boundary and the zoning drives where the sewer goes and the capacity that the sewer will be designed for; not the reverse. That would be normal capital planning.

(#1400) Tim Wing: If that's the case then I would really like to see the plan reviewed and have it changed. There's a lot of large building planned in an area that shouldn't be, in my opinion.

(#1410) Steve Clayton: So the plan review you're talking about is the particular zoning aspect in the UGA?

(#1414) Tim Wing: Yes, particularly the downtown node and behind it.

(#1418) Allan Borden: I'm Allan Borden with the Department of Community Development. I just wanted to correct what Steve said. The current Resource Ordinance standard under the aquifer recharge areas doesn't say development can be 1 DU per acre. It says that sewage treatment has to be the strength of 1 unit per acre. If you try to build more than 1 unit per acre you're going to have to have to rehab your septic system.

(#1438) Bob Fink: The county is developing some more sophisticated tools for analyzing build out potential and they can take into account a lot of these factors that you're talking about and come up with more accurate expectations. That's true in the rural area as well. Going back, we're currently building a data base for the rural area that takes into account whether parcels are existing, even if they're substantial in size or whether they're large enough to be divided, and if so, how many lots they can be divided into. Eventually we'll use this information to be able to give everyone a fairly good idea of what the potential build out is in the rural area at the current zoning densities, just as we have good estimates for what the potential is in Belfair, we'll have similar estimates for the rural area and we'll have GIS based estimates for the build out and development in both Allyn and the Shelton UGA's. These are crucial bits of information to understand the dynamic of what can happen with the plans we have and how they're being considered for amendment that isn't quite in hand yet but will soon be available. The existing lot size in the RR5 zone is actually about 2.5 acres. So almost all the lots are smaller than 5 acres. Many of them are as small as a 1/3 of an acre or even smaller. When we do the analysis we will be able to reflect the fact that these existing lots have a right to develop, assuming they can be developed, for residential use. Although the system won't be perfect in the sense that there will be a number of assumptions that will have to be made to come up with a solution, but we'll have a better idea that will reasonably reflect the actual build out potential of the area. There are problems with designating rural lands at 1 acre. This was something that was considered when the rural area was divided into 5, 10 and 20 acre pieces. The concern was that the 1 acre isn't really acceptable as a residential density in the rural area, except under perhaps extreme circumstances. If we designate areas as 1 acre and then any of those areas could be divided that would create an issue with preserving the rural character of the area and with compliance with GMA. That was one of the reasons why the greatest density allowed in the rural area is 2.5 acres, which is only designated in the RAC's and in one place near Tahuya. It's possible you could find an area and designate it as 1 acre instead of 5 acres but the lots wouldn't be 1 acre. The lots could be any size, probably less than 5 acres, but probably not an acre. If some of those lots were 2 acres or larger, you would be creating issues with the possible redivision of those lands. If all the lots were under 2 acres then you're still not getting an accurate account of what the development potential is by simply looking at the gross acreage that's there under the zoning and what the zoning allows. You still have to take into account the individual parcels so if your concern is to be able to accurately reflect what the development potential is, rezoning those areas as 1 acre still wouldn't give you a more realistic vision of what

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

the development potential is. That was one of the reasons we didn't propose Item 80. Under Item 83, where there's Commercial Designated Forest Lands, the county really took a different approach. The county designated, as the GMA provided, Long Term Commercial Forest Lands, and there was a list of criteria that those lands had to meet in order to be resource lands. Among them was lot size, which typically had to be 80 acres or 40 acres if it was adjoining other long term lands in the same ownership. It also had to be part of larger blocks of land to avoid the very factor that Mr. Dawes mentioned earlier where you have this fringe affect between the nonforest lands and the other lands. So having designated all these Long Term Forest Lands essentially all the other lands that aren't urban lands are rural lands. They're not forest lands in waiting or rural lands in waiting; they're simply rural lands. The county designated many of those areas that had a number of critical areas, that had large lot sizes that were adjoining resource lands, and that had various other criteria and designated many of those areas under the 20 acre density. It was a different approach to what is proposed here and staff really isn't recommending trying to take a whole different track. To the extent that you want a realistic picture of the development, we think we can get that by doing this analysis that we're doing based on parcels and parcel size. There's no real reason to look at trying to change the whole approach to zoning because of the fact that these properties take advantage of tax programs.

(#1775) Bill Dewey: Since that was an effort to get at Mr. Carey's questions earlier and he has his hand up, I'd like to offer him the opportunity to speak again.

(#1785) Jeff Carey: I'll take the last one first. Are we saying then when we're dealing with the RR20 that it has no basis for population?

(#1792) Bob Fink: It does. It's potentially developable at 1 to 20. There's no policy basis to preserve it for forest use especially.

(#1802) Jeff Carey: In the RR20 there's about 136 square miles in this county and even at RR20 it has a sizeable population allocation; approximately 11,000. The flip side of the question, when we did the plan before, did the county audit and do all the soils test of the Long Term Commercial Forest?

(#1825) Bob Fink: Yes. They did evaluate it. The tax assessor actually keeps those records.

(#1835) Jeff Carey: No, I means evaluation in the sense of soils and all the other criteria.

(#1837) Bob Fink: On Long Term Commercial Forest we did do that. That was relevant to their viability.

(#1840) Jeff Carey: Because this just seems like this is a big piece relative ... it's a lot of square miles of timber.

(#1844) Bob Fink: You can find the actual criteria in the Resource Ordinance.

(#1848) Jeff Carey: I've seen that and that's why I proposed a different type of level because I knew it was more to the Long Term Commercial Forest. Then, going back to Item 80, the intent of that wasn't to create a bunch of 1 acre lots but to basically address the plat, which there's about 500 plats in Mason County, and basically, from my calculation of numbers, there's about 24,000 lots already platted. I'm not saying we need to create more; I'm saying we need to address this and nail it down. These plats already exist; they're buildable lots.

(#1880) Bill Dewey: Bob, are you saying that the analysis the county is doing will take into account those platted lands?

(#1884) Bob Fink: Right.

(#1886) Bill Dewey: So we'll have some concept as far as what's buildable.

(#1892) Bob Fink: To understand why it wasn't recommended or to understand why you might want to put it on the agenda ... the issue is that we will basically have all the parcels and what their zoning is and be able to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

group them and analyze them and say these parcels are all under 5 acres and they can't be divided under the current zoning if they were RR5, but they are potentially developable. We would look at that and be able to tell you what the total count was. We're not looking at just the gross acreage; we're looking at the actual plat and saying there's 500 lots and that's the number of houses you could potentially get.

(#1940) Jeff Carey: Is the GIS thing going to go outside of the 280 some miles?

(#1950) Bob Fink: The GIS program is currently in the process of completing the parcel layer for the county but that information won't be available before the end of the year. That's why we developed a different system using just basic parcel acreage information which doesn't allow us to do as sophisticated an analysis as we could do if we have GIS, but it does allow us to get a fairly good estimate of what the build out would be in the rural area. When that GIS information is available, we'll reanalyze it.

(#1980) Jeff Carey: I would still like to see the PAC consider it because we need data and the bottom line is there's over 24,000 lots and almost 500 plats in this county and it needs to be addressed. It's another gaping hole in trying to figure out how to allocate population in this county.

(#2008) Bill Dewey: I'd like to get the PAC focused on the work program. We've had some additional things that may be included. What is the will of the PAC? Are there things we'd like to add? Are we satisfied with the staff recommendations? I'd entertain additional discussion at this time.

(#2030) Mark Drain: Would it be possible for us to accept the plan as written but reserve the right to add an issue if, down the road, we have further discussion and see a need to address it?

(#2045) Bill Dewey: I guess we could ask that of staff. What we've been presented with tonight is that we've been given three options to consider. One is, approve and forward the work program to the BOCC as is. Two is to approve it with revisions. Or not to approve the work program and schedule another hearing to review modifications.

(#2068) Mark Drain: And I've thrown out a fourth option.

(#2072) Bob Fink: There's two elements. One element is a consideration of what the county's current Development Regulations and Comp Plan is and what parts of that need to be updated as mandated by the GMA review. Those things either have to be reviewed by the end of this year or for the critical areas by the end of next year. The other part is the voluntary efforts that the county is undertaking or could undertake to improve the regulations and the plan. Those things are discretionary depending on their importance. If new information comes forward or if a comment is made that is important to be recognized, this kind of action can always be reconsidered; but we need to set a course for the next four or five months to finish those things that we need to finish by 2005. It wouldn't be surprising if something comes up that would also need to be considered. I don't know that you need to reserve the right or what it would mean to reserve the right to reconsider those things but if something comes forward that the PAC needs to consider and needs to recommend for consideration, they can do that. A lot of these elements are pretty generally drafted. For instance, several of Mr. VanBuskirk's recommendations; the ones we didn't recommend putting on the plan. Several of them are on the plan. His comments really touched upon in other issues and other discussions and they're perfectly subject to people raising some of these issues during the discussion relative to the boundary of the UGA, relative to the population allocation, relative of how you're going to deal with that population that you're allocating to the different urban areas. Those things can often be brought up during that discussion. If you want to send this forward, I think it is fair to say that, if something really important came up, the county wouldn't ignore it simply because it wasn't on the work plan.

(#2192) Diane Edgin: Mr. Dawes mentioned about doing something concurrently and it had to do with the critical areas and the commercial forest lands. Were those the two things that he mentioned as doing concurrently? That would be in 2006.

(#2205) Bob Fink: Maybe we should ask Mr. Dawes to elaborate on that.

(#2220) Warren Dawes: I was just noting that you have your GMA mandates for 2006 and the critical area

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

resource items have been pushed off to 2006. That was explained in your handout. I wanted you to understand that inholding lands are not just rural zoning; they also greatly impact critical area resource long-term commercial forestry. I thought it might behoove you to consider your resource ordinance update at the same time you do the inholding lands because if you do one before the other ... it just seems like it would be easier.

(#2260) Terri Jeffreys: Most of the work tends to be regulation oriented as opposed to reviewing the policies that are sitting in the plan right now, or perhaps updating them to more accurately reflect the demographic changes that we've seen in this county since this plan has been adopted. I'm wondering if there is opportunities to maybe review some of the visions, goals, and some of the things that were done in the policies in the text of the Comp Plan? Most of this work is basically working on development regulations and I had anticipated maybe a text review as well to see if it matched what's on the ground right now. Has that been considered?

(#2315) Bob Fink: There are certain implications perhaps from the population allocation where that will come up. There's a couple other issues, but we weren't proposing a whole review of the policies in the plan, which would be quite an undertaking. It certainly couldn't be done this year. You could spend days working on a single policy and to go over them all ... basically, you're asking for a change in policy direction for the review. That's not necessarily inappropriate, but it's a pretty big task. Most of the effort as far as setting new policy is related to the economic development element, which is a new element. There aren't very many existing policies regarding economic development, and we were going to focus on those first. If you had specific questions regarding other policies in the plan, you could raise those; but I would recommend that we would probably not try to address them until next year or maybe later years, depending on the urgency of the particular policy. The concern of the GMA is that the regulations be consistent with the policies in the Plan as well as the policies in the Plan being consistent and not so much with what direction or what policy the county wants to establish, as long as the goals of the GMA are reflected. Our feeling is that the goals of the GMA are reflected throughout the Plan and so far we have no clear direction as to how to change policy, other than establishing an economic policy or set of policies. There may be related changes to land use or other areas in the Comp Plan that would fall out from looking at the economic policies.

(#2414) Terri Jeffreys: I don't agree with that statement that the Comp Plan ... that you can't set out a discussion that doesn't necessarily have to be implemented. I think about the fact that that development pressure on the Hoodspout area and the possibility of sewers coming in there, it might behoove us to start a discussion about establishing Hoodspout as a UGA in order to help contain sprawl in that area.

(#2442) Bob Fink: As I said, if you have a particular policy that you wanted examined you could bring it forward for discussion as opposed to a general review of all the policies. The idea of changes to Hoodspout, including the idea of designating it as a UGA, I don't think that's part of the current work program for 2006. But that's not to say that in 2006 that it may not be put on the table. As I said if there's a new issue that's important that comes up during this review process or during the process next year, it's not the intention of the county to ignore that just because it's not on this work program. If you have a specific policy issue related to some specific group of policies in the existing plan that you think ought to be changed, there's nothing wrong with you bringing that up now and trying to find an appropriate place for it in the work program. However, just reviewing all the policies in the Plan to see if we really still want to keep those is a major undertaking.

(#2515) Bill Dewey: Did you have something specific in mind, Terri?

(#2520) Terri Jeffreys: That was one area and I was just reading through county wide planning policies and the future vision that's set out there, I don't know that that matches what we might see in the economic development element or if it matches what's on the ground here. We have some incredible development pressures in this county being sandwiched between two major population centers and I think we've had some discussion about whether we're a bedroom community or not.

(#2555) Diane Edgin: I remember a number of years back that when we were talking about Belfair that at the time under the UGA there was things that Kitsap, because of what they had in commercial right up against the North Mason line, that that could spill over into North Mason as a like use. We have the airport up there and right across the line here we are and the portion of North Mason could be industrial because they were two

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

like type areas.

(#2600) Bob Fink: The northern part of the existing UGA is industrial / commercial. The need for industrial lands is one of the issues that's going to be looked at in more detail; it's on the work program. Those all require an assessment of what the industrial needs are for the county. Are there adequate industrial lands and are they in the appropriate places? Those are in the work plan. I think there will be some fall out from the economic development element in the fact that we're creating new policies and we're trying to do certain things that have never really been explored or weren't related in the plan. There may be some change in policies that are a consequence of the review done for the economic development element.

(#2685) Tim Wing: I'm hearing you say that this is a pretty big bite and you can get it done but if we add much to it it's going to be difficult. I'm believing also that when you start talking about changing the boundaries of a UGA or putting buffers up against forest land, aren't we headed towards having to have, in order to be fair, a lot of public input and hearings? I'm just wondering if there really is time to do that in this go around. This whole thing is due here in five months, right?

(#2718) Bob Fink: It's due December 1st.

(#2722) Tim Wing: Where I'm going with this is I'm feeling like we should probably be accepting the recommendation from the staff which sounds like is a tuning up of existing issues plus adding an economic development element and then we should be also voicing our interest in identifying things we think should be addressed at a future time, say in 2006.

(#2750) Bob Fink: Right. Either in 2006 or 2007. Some of these things take a long time to do.

(#2752) Tim Wing: Given all the discussion we've had here that's where I am with this at this point. It doesn't seem to me to be practical to start readdressing some of the basic philosophies in the Plan at this point in the process. Not that they shouldn't be addressed but they're going to take more time and I don't know that there is more time.

(#2768) Terri Jeffreys: It's just unfortunate that this whole Comp Plan updating process that's gone state wide has turned into 'let's check the state regs and how they've changed and adjust the Plan'. It's just unfortunate that's how it's being played out in all the different counties and I thought ours would be different.

(#2785) Steve Clayton: So to clarify, we started out a couple months ago when Barbara brought us the housing element and we started to review that and then we were presented with the land use plan and we sat with the BOCC and said that we would go through the Comp Plan and you used the term 'in bite sized pieces' and review it. Now staff is recommending that we don't go down that road that we presented to the BOCC at that time, but we're going to follow this. That's the presentation that we started with this year.

(#2830) Bob Fink: We are doing that through most of the Plan but we're not reviewing piece by piece all the policies that are there. There are certain policies that are proposed for review and there will be some new policies, like for the airport. A lot of the Plan will be changed simply to update the Plan from its 1994 and 1995 adoption to now it's 2005 and we're looking to 2025 so all the numbers change throughout the Plan. That doesn't change the policy direction that's laid out in the Plan. The Belfair Plan was just adopted and some people have concerns about the actual form of it. There's the Allyn UGA; there will be a vision and sub-area plan for that as part of this. And Shelton; we're working on something proposed for that. So there will be a whole new set of policies that are urban policies rather than the rural policies that the county spent most of its time on. One focus is to complete the process for urban areas; what is the proper vision for the urban areas? How big can they be? What's coming down the road as far as people go? Tim's exactly right. You're not going to know exactly how many people are going to be here in 2025. Even in 2025 you won't know exactly how many people are here because you have different estimates. Right now we have a census estimate and an Office of Financial Management estimate for the 1994 population of the county that differs by a couple thousand people. We're also planning for what is most likely to come. We don't wait until 2025 to happen before we start reassessing our Plan and whether we need to make adjustments. Presumably we can revisit the Plan every year as things become known and at least every seven years we have to revisit the Plan for an update and at least every ten years you have to revisit the UGA's for an update. So it's not that

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

this Plan is going to sit untouched for 20 years after we adopt it. It's a living document.

(#3014) Steve Clayton: So as an example, we're going to review the UGA's and then somewhere toward October or November those numbers will be plugged into the Land Use Element of the Comp Plan and you'll present that to us to say that these are the numbers we gathered from this material?

(#3030) Bob Fink: Right. We're working on what is to present a range of growth. One of the purposes, besides SEPA, for developing a range of growth is so that you can give some thought in your capital planning and your other activities to anticipate what happens if the growth changes. So the build out data in the rural area and the information on recent growth trends in the county is all information that we've either already generated or that we're still in the process of putting that analysis together and it should all be available pretty soon. That will be used to update the numbers in the Comp Plan.

(#3100) Bill Dewey: So we've gotten some last minute public comments faxed in just now from Advocates for Responsible Development so to make sure we consider those I'd like to break for ten minutes to read them. Then we can move forward on a recommendation.

Break in meeting.

(#3175) Bill Dewey: So, I'd like to move us forward with a recommendation if we can.

(#3200) Wendy Ervin: This has come up twice this meeting, here in the middle of the comments from Advocates for Responsible Development, is the 20,000 parcel figure. Earlier it was mentioned 24,000 parcels. Maybe six months ago that subject came up and you had a comment that had to do with, given your real estate experience, where those parcels are and what size they are. I would like you to repeat that information and I ask that it go on the record.

(#3250) Tim Wing: What I said was that I believe that included in these large numbers of lots are many, many lots ... hundreds and thousands of them that are absolutely impossible to build on. They tend to be about 25' x 100'. We're building on some of these lots up in the Bellwood development but we take six of them and put them together to make a lot that is a little over a quarter of an acre. But if it takes six lots just to make a lot big enough to work then these numbers grossly distort the position that there's all these lots out there that should be built on. Even beyond that, there are a lot of small lots in this county that no one has built on because no one would want to live there. They're ten miles up dirt roads and they're in very poor locations. To think that we're not going to allow the creation of any additional lots because there's all these 'lots' without recognizing that most of those undeveloped lots aren't developed because no one wants to live there. I should add, too, that some of those small lots that I'm referring to are literally on hillsides as steep as a cliff and under swamps and if anyone doubts that I'll be glad to take you out and show you some of them. They were lots that were created on paper and the county never went out and looked at them and said they would be good building lots. They just drew lines on paper and said there they are.

(#3350) Bill Dewey: Okay, do we have any specific recommendations for changing what staff has put forward as a work program?

(#3375) Wendy Ervin: I'd prefer what he said about adopting it with the idea that we could add to it if necessary. Adopt the work plan as proposed but if we feel there's something else that needs to be incorporated in later then we can do that.

(#3400) Bill Dewey: So you feel like that is necessary even though Bob has offered that that option is open to us? Do you feel we need to incorporate that into a motion?

(#3415) Wendy Ervin: No, as long as the door is open to us that's okay.

(#3425) Bill Dewey: That's the way I understood it and correct me, Bob, if I'm wrong.

(#3430) Bob Fink: That's essentially what I said. I don't think the BOCC would ignore an important issue just because it wasn't on this work program. Certainly we wouldn't recommend ignoring an issue just because it's

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 27, 2005

not on the work program.

(#3450) Tim Wing: I spoke a couple of times about needing to review the Belfair UGA. I still believe strongly on that but I don't think it's a good time to do that right now. First, because I don't think we have the time to do it. It would require significant public input. Secondly, I think that review needs to be done at a time when there's better information about aquifers, where setbacks from wet areas and streams are considered, where the sewer is, in fact, eminent and their planning is in process and where the roads are going to be. All those things need to be looked at together and I don't think that this is quite the right time for it because the sewer is a critical part of that. I do believe when that sewer planning begins in earnest that is exactly the time to do it.

(#3515) Steve Clayton: I don't have any troubles with what staff has set up for us. Any other comments? Then I'll make a motion that we accept staff's recommendation.

(#3525) Terri Jeffreys: I have a question. The Housing Element that was being worked on by Barbara, is that going to be considered in the Comp Plan update?

(#3535) Tim Wing: I had a similar question. The Economic Development Element is not on this list. Is that somewhere else?

(#3555) Barbara Adkins: It's at the bottom of page 3.

(#3560) Tim Wing: Okay.

(#3570) Bill Dewey: Okay, Steve's motion is to adopt what's been put forward by staff on the 2005 and 2006 work program.

(#3580) Mark Drain: I second Steve's motion.

(#3588) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? We heard some specific recommendations by Mr. Dawes and Mr. Matayoshi. Do you think we've considered those enough? Any further discussion. Hearing none, all those in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#3625) Wendy Ervin: Are we going to tackle these things in the order that they're appearing here?

(#3640) Bob Fink: Probably not. What we'll do is as soon as this list becomes final is set up a detailed schedule for the rest of the year to carry us through this adoption process. We'll be trying to estimate when the hearings will be held and what particular issues would be on the table for discussion so the public knows and you know when these things will come up.

(#3670) Bill Dewey: So with that, I'd like to acknowledge staff for their fine efforts in giving us this program. Putting together all the public comments was a great job and I thank you for that.

Meeting adjourned.