

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
October 24, 2005

(Note audio tape (#2) dated October 24, 2005
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

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

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bill Dewey, Steve Clayton, Tim Wing, Diane Edgin, Terri
Jeffreys, Wendy Ervin, and Jay Hupp.

Staff Present: Bob Fink, Allan Borden, TJ Martin.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the September 26, 2005 meeting were approved as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0080) Bill Dewey: We have two items on our agenda tonight. They are a discussion about population projections and allocations to the urban growth areas, and then the revised Allyn UGA sub-area plan. We'll do the Allyn sub-area plan first because I understand most of the people here this evening are here for that item. Steve?

(#0100) Steve Goins: I'm Steve Goins and I'm a long range planner with Mason County. I wanted to update you folks on the progress that we're making with the sub-area plan and discuss how that process is interfacing with our Comp Plan update. We have been re-evaluating how to proceed with that. We thought it would be a good idea to let you know what thoughts we had on how to best accomplish this and how to move forward. There has been some discussion, and it will continue tonight, on the population allocations and the urban growth boundaries. There is some connection between the allocation process and what happens up here in Allyn. But in a larger context, we thought it would be a good idea to discuss what the community's desires are and get the sub-area plan a little more solidified in advance of making some hard decisions in the Allyn area. That's why we want to have a little more time to finish the sub-area plan. The completion of the sub-area plan isn't mandated by the state and we don't have to complete that and approve that as part of our annual amendment to our Comp Plan. We can essentially adopt the sub-area plan whenever it's done. In our thinking, it make a lot more sense that instead of trying to rush this to the finish line, to take a little more

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

time and refine the document and get a little more public input. I have put up on the wall the alternatives that were discussed previously. These are concepts that were developed by the Allyn Community Association's planning committee. One, on the left side, a larger expansion of the Allyn UGA, and the plan on the right, is a more modest expansion essentially to the area west of what's currently within the Allyn UGA. There have been some discussions about what we're trying to achieve and what some of the constraints are. Within the Allyn area there is a majority of the land here that is part of the Lakeland Village Community. It is largely low residential and open space. There's the portion of Allyn here that's what we call the lower Allyn, which is the historical, platted Allyn area. Then some larger parcels to the north and to the south essentially along the State Route corridor. There is a limit to the amount of area that could be dedicated for non-residential uses, particularly commercial, retail and even an elementary school would be somewhat problematic. So there's been some discussion on how to accommodate some of those future needs and we really haven't arrived at something that we can move forward with, but we have been discussing various alternatives. So that's a large part of the reason why we've been studying these expansions. A number of folks have recently gotten involved in the process, as well as the Allyn Association planning committee, which has been working in various ways on this process for years. The area to the west here has some positive features and some constraints that we just haven't been able to adequately address. Chiefly, how do we best achieve access to this area is something that we really haven't arrived at a good solution on. It would be very important to connect the communities and we're having trouble figuring out the best way to do that. On the other hand, there are some lands here that the Anderson folks own and they have already expressed interest in wanting to expand their Lakeland Village development to that area. Some of this is being considered for platting now. They do have a legal right to cross the railroad there, but that is a significant geographic barrier that's something we're trying to figure out how to address, not for developing the Anderson property, but also for these other properties. There's a need to have two means of ingress and egress here, and coming up with a viable way to do that is something we just haven't landed on at this point.

I also thought I would take a few minutes to describe some of the components that are part of the plan that we're considering. The Land Use Element, which was to a great extent developed during the process where we came up with the interim zoning ordinance language for Allyn, we're trying to refine that and that's an ongoing process. Not only are we trying to see if there's any glitches to that language, but as we consider whether an expansion is warranted, what type of zoning might be appropriate in those areas and whether we can use the current designations we have or not is something we're considering. There's not currently a community design or character element in the plan that we're trying to develop, and we thought that was particularly important because of the village portion of Allyn; that there was a lot of concern over that area drastically changing. There are historic structures there, there's a component that a lot of community would like to see remain intact. We are trying to enhance the open space and parks element. Currently there's not a great deal of park presence in the area, and we'd like to establish standards for creating parks for the community, as well as enhancing the walkability of the area. There's been a lot of interest in making the area from Lakeland down to the platted portion of Allyn more accessible for walking. Even the kids that have the use the bus currently are in a situation that's probably not the most desirous. The community would like to see some action taken to see how that can be resolved. Probably the most important piece from the committee's standpoint is facilities and services. We've discussed this in the past. There's a real need for coordination of various facilities, probably most chiefly in transportation, circulation and then water, to improve the development conditions there, particularly with commercial development, there's very limited opportunities because of the lack of availability of water. So there's a great deal of time being spent trying to come up with a program to address some of those capital needs. Ultimately we'd like to have a capital facilities plan. There's been various stages of studies on the transportation component in the area trying to identify what kind of circulation needs there might be, upon build out, what kind of level of service you might be anticipating and coming to grips with what, in the long term, we need to be planning for in the Allyn area. That's probably something that needs quite a bit more work, and at this point, we're not geared up for having that completed in the time frame for the Comp Plan update. That's probably the biggest missing piece at this point. We really don't have the resources to complete that in this kind of time frame, and there's a lot of concern over the design of the area itself, and wanting to make sure we address those concerns appropriately. So staff is thinking that's it's in everyone's interest to take this at a different pace and move it in a different tract than the Comp Plan update. That summarizes my update to you. There's a number of folks here that expressed various interest in this along the way, as well as some of the committee members, that you may want to hear from tonight.

(#0470) Bill Dewey: Any questions for Steve?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

(#0472) Terri Jeffreys: The light industrial zoning over there, is that completely made up of Stretch Island facility, or does that include other parcels?

(#0478) Steve Goins: The Stretch Island parcels ... it's a lot more than just Stretch Island Fruit.

(#0488) Terri Jeffreys: Regarding compatible uses, can you talk a little about how the committee has discussed the R1 zoning and the proximity to that?

(#0500) Steve Goins: Some of these designations were created just to do some general analysis on traffic impacts, and particularly the residential just in a macro sense; just how many units are we talking about if this kind of designation was to occur. There hasn't really been a definition made, for example, of these areas, of what a particular use would entail, but I would anticipate that with this kind of a designation down here, there would be a need for some pretty strong buffering language to limit the impacts of that type of use on a residence or something else that is nearby that could be affected. But that language isn't created at this time.

(#0525) Tim Wing: I've always been of the impression that the size of the UGA's, there's three, is not something that we have full control of; if we decided to make the whole county a city, we couldn't do it. I'm mystified that we could even seriously consider expanding Allyn to that extent without running right head on into the GMA and all the protestors and GMHB. If I'm remembering correctly, we had a tremendous problem getting the UGA's sized down to what they were to get into compliance with the GMA. If there's some other angle on this, I'd like to know what it is, because the way I'm remembering it, this is not something that's going to happen; period.

(#0555) Steve Goins: We'll talk about the allocation question in more detail in the next session, but to answer your question, the county does need to base the boundaries of any UGA on what allocation is within it and whether or not the capacity jives with that allocation. We talked about the policy earlier this year that you can size a UGA up to 25% more land than the population allocation places within it. If you allocated enough land, for example, for 7,500 residents, the GMA would allow you to devote enough land to that UGA to accommodate 10,000. But all of this has to be done within the allocation that is in place, and there has to be a mechanism showing how you can concurrently develop the needed infrastructure to service all these different uses as they would come on line. You're right; the GMA requires that. I don't know, and I don't know if Bob knows tonight... we are going to talk about just how much population this size of expansion would allocate, but to entertain that idea, you would have to allocate the population to that area without exceeding that 25% market fudge that the state mandates.

(#0610) Terri Jeffreys: That's just residential you're talking about. Is there also going to be consideration of how much land is necessary for job growth?

(#0618) Steve Goins: There is not a lot of consideration, generally, as various cities and counties have had their UGA's analyzed, how much commercial and industrial zoned land is within that. There hasn't been a lot of debate over how much is too much. You can determine, through various means, what an appropriate amount of that is and the county intends on doing that next year. That's another reason why this delay in making a final decision we thought was appropriate. We hope to have a buildable lands inventory completed early next year. That would help us determine how much industrial zoned land there should be in Mason County and where it should be. Usually that number is based on how many jobs you're trying to create.

(#0650) Terri Jeffreys: So if we have not created that goal in our Economic Development Element, which I don't recall that being in there, we will not be able to back up perhaps the plan to increase the number of commercial.

(#0658) Bob Fink: The revisiting of the industrial and commercial land needs is actually in the Economic Development Element. It's looked at as one of the strategies for getting better economic planning.

(#0670) Terri Jeffreys: So job growth targets should probably be incorporated into our Economic Development Element at some point if we're going to resize our UGA's.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

(#0672) Bob Fink: The industrial land demand is going to depend on targets. There's a study that will be done assisted by economists where the county, the Port of Shelton, and the EDC are partners, along with CTED, which is contributing money through a grant. The Port of Shelton and the county are contributing funding as well, as well as staff support, and then the EDC is managing the grant. They're going to look at land demand as driven by industrial factors. That means they will have to set a target. They'll have to set a goal to reach for for industrial lands, and then there's the mechanics of translating what you're employment is and goals and targets are to what the land demand and suitability is. That would be part of the process next year. That will evolve into a series of numbers and locations. We'll look at it from the supply and from demand, how much land is needed to meet our goals. The goals aren't developed yet. That would be part of the study.

(#0735) Terri Jeffreys: I just want to stress that I'm interested in seeing a jobs / housing balance. That if we concentrate solely on putting people in homes, we're forgetting the fact that we need some capacity for job growth.

(#0745) Jay Hupp: Along that same line, I've got a concern that the major elements of the Plan, as they're outlined here, make absolutely no mention of business development.

(#0750) Bob Fink: What do you mean by business development?

(#0755) Jay Hupp: Just what I said; business development. We talk about a land use element, community character, natural environment, open space, facilities and services; there's not a word in there about business development. That bothers me.

(#0765) Steve Goins: The idea was a number of these types of sub-area plans do have an economic component to them, and generally that is something that a larger community tends to adopt. What we would find in this case is Allyn's community development objectives would very much overlap our larger county objectives, and the same types of things we'd be trying to do on a county level to increase business development locally, would be occurring in Allyn because those policies that we will be adopting ultimately are part of the larger planning in Allyn as well as county wide.

(#0792) Jay Hupp: But you can still make that same comment about open spaces and parks, and open spaces and parks are specifically mentioned in here, but business development is not. It just bothers me that you run through an old rural concept for this community with no regard to business development.

(#0805) Terri Jeffreys: I just want to remind the PAC that when we heard a presentation by the ACA, they made a good point of saying we need some commercial lands, and I don't see a lot of it up there, and I don't see a lot of it down here. I assume it's being addressed as it is a priority of the ACA.

(#0822) Bob Fink: The land study that I mentioned does not specifically look at commercial land needs. There was a marketing study done in Belfair that evaluated the commercial land needs in Belfair and in the northern part of the county and presumed that a certain share of it would be captured in Belfair.

(#0835) Wendy Ervin: Can you tell me what the significance is on this plan here on running the UGA boundary in the water?

(#0848) Steve Goins: This is not intended to be a change in use; it was really just an easier way to show where the boundary ends, than confusing someone by trying to trace the shore, for example.

(#0855) Steve Clayton: As I understood it, this was the ACA's planning group's proposal and this is the county's, correct?

(#0860) Steve Goins: They're both the ACA's planning group's proposal. They're just different proposals that they were interested in discussing further.

(#0866) Steve Clayton: If they're planning ultimately to expand to the south, toward Grapeview, which has a

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

state highway on one side and county road on the other, why are we not looking at developing the direction that there exists transportation infrastructure, rather than trying to do it to a place that we don't have the transportation infrastructure? If you're going to do both places, why not go to where you already have some infrastructure?

(#0885) Steve Goins: I think the committee could probably elaborate on this, but I think part of the discussion and part of the thought in this area was, for one, there are several very large parcels under one ownership that are a lot easier to discuss in terms of zoning. Part of the idea in the committee's mind was this is the general location of where the long term plan to have the 101 connector would occur, and that over time, that would attract some business interest. That was part of the thought process. This here is the Razor Road alignment and that alignment would eventually connect to the highway, and that route would attract some development.

(#0912) Steve Clayton: Wouldn't it be nice to lay out the 101 connector first and then develop around it rather than zone small parcels and blast the highway through the middle of it?

(#0925) Steve Goins: It probably would have been a lot clearer to show that the ridge route ... it would have made a lot of sense to use that map ...

(#0930) Steve Clayton: This wisdom of expanding the UGA to the sewer treatment area, where we have spray fields, and DNR property, and sewage treatment actually within the boundary of the UGA ... is that planning for the future kind of unusual?

(#0940) Steve Goins: I can speculate on that. For example, if the community of Allyn eventually assumed the operation and maintenance of that facility it would make sense.

(#0955) Wendy Ervin: You were saying that that R1 area that you had discussed expansion and you implied there were some problems. Can you tell me what the problems of consideration are?

(#0965) Steve Goins: Chiefly the problem that we're studying further is access. There's a rail line here that bisects these areas, and generally this is the back of Lakeland Village. It would be difficult to drive a road through Lakeland Village to connect this area to the village center, so how do you connect these areas?

(#0985) Wendy Ervin: Because you'd have to bridge the railroad, or what?

(#0988) Steve Goins: Even if you bridged the railroad, where would the road extend?

(#0990) Wendy Ervin: What about the elevations? There's some considerable areas of ill there.

(#0995) Steve Goins: Yes. Obviously there's no topographic information on this map. There's sections that are fairly steep and there's sections that are somewhat level. From the committee's standpoint, in particular, this area, there was some fairly level area that might be conducive for industrial use. That wasn't shown on this map.

(#1015) Bill Dewey: Where's the spray field currently?

(#1020) Steve Goins: I believe it's this piece right here, but it may extend down into here.

(#1028) Steve Clayton: If it's that piece right there, that belongs to DNR. So we're going to put DNR property in the UGA, and what's the likelihood of getting that into private hands to actually develop into residential?

(#1032) Bob Fink: You wouldn't. You'd have to shut down your operation for your sewer. You need that spray area where the sewer plant is.

(#1040) Steve Clayton: Right, but besides having it as a spray area and the complications involved with that and the complications with having the sewer plant in the UGA, if the property belongs to DNR, you're going to designate it inside the UGA and hope to obtain it from DNR in order to put houses on it?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

(#1050) Bob Fink: Well, no. It's dedicated as a spray area; you can't convert it to a residential use. You need a place to dispose of your effluent. If not there, you need an equivalent area very close by.

(#1070) Wendy Ervin: But setting aside a spray area inside the UGA, it seems would distort your figures; your balances. If you put that outside the UGA, then there's no question.

(#1080) Bob Fink: You'd deduct the land. If you know you need 80 acres for spray irrigation, and that's an ongoing basis, then you don't count that when you're trying to estimate the capacity of the UGA because that land won't become available.

(#1090) Jay Hupp: That's the same thing with the Shelton UGA.

(#1095) Bob Fink: They're looking in Shelton at using the land irrigation for the expansion of the sewer capacity and this is similar.

(#1115) Tim Wing: This is the second time we've taken a look at these maps, and I am real interested in hearing public comment about them, but I think that some fundamental things need to be presented to us from you guys before we can really even consider this. It has to do with where is the money going to come from to put roads to connect all of this stuff? You've already pointed out the difficulty of that. Difficulty usually means more money. There's no water. Unless the state gets off the dime, we won't have water to serve any of this. Back to the other thing I brought up earlier, I'm not sure the GMHB is going to allow you to expand these UGA's like this, so obviously I want to hear from the public tonight, but before we revisit this again, I'd like some answers about those issues because I don't want to spend a whole lot of time messing around with maps and listening to public concerns about should it be here or should it be there if we can't do anything. Right now there's no money for roads. This county continues to spend money for roads way out in the boonies and they aren't putting any money inside the UGA's now. You've heard me harp about this before and so if you expand the UGA and the policy doesn't change here, we're never going to have roads in the UGA's. There's no water and the sewers are terribly expensive. So unless some of those issues come up with 'we can do this', then I don't see any reason to get the maps out and let the public go at each other about where should my place be; in or out of it. Because it may not happen at all. I want more information about some of these fundamental issues before we start going too far down the road here about maps.

(#1180) Bill Dewey: Are there any other questions for Steve or staff?

(#1185) Terri Jeffreys: Is there opportunity for water that we don't know about?

(#1188) Steve Goins: I don't think there's much of an update in that regard. The Lakeland Village Water System, I understand, is in the final throws of getting an additional allocation. Washington Water, which is one of the servers in lower Allyn, my understanding, is next in line. They're poised to move forward with some sort of a request for allocation of water. I don't know how much they're asking for specifically. As you know, these things do take time.

(#1215) Bill Dewey: Just to be clear, tonight's meeting is not a public hearing. It's strictly a workshop to educate the PAC and bring us up to speed. Apparently there's a lot of public interest here tonight and I will invite public comment. If you can try to be brief and to the point we'd appreciate it because there is a lot of people here. We did hear a fairly extensive presentation not that long ago from the ACA planning committee on this issue so I don't want to reiterate materials that were presented before but if there are new things that have come to light since then I'd like to give you an opportunity to go ahead and address the PAC.

(#1275) Wayne Case: My name is Wayne Case. I'm secretary for the Belfair Acreage Home Tracts Homeowners Association. When the Allyn group drew some of these lines, they didn't contact us or talk to us. This map of the enlarged area ... then there's the red line that drops over across that area and then it goes down a gas line easement ... that cuts our homeowners association in half. We have covenants and restrictions against commercial areas. The blue area up there, I believe, is to be what they requested a commercial area. There was a remark from Mr. Wing about the access to the areas and the roads and everything. There is a road in the area, Rasor Road; however, Rasor Road is a private road. It is maintained

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

by the homeowners association. The homeowners association bylaws and covenants and restrictions does give the board of directors the ability to give it over to the county after a vote of the membership. If we were to tell the membership that that area right above us was going to go commercial, after I talked to several members of our homeowners association, the vote would be 'no' to turn that road over, which means there would be no access on the Belfair side of that area. We've spent years blocking that off, keeping people out of it so there wouldn't be a right of eminent domain across that area. We have some other members of the homeowners association here tonight. I've talked to probably 10 to 12% of our homeowners and when we moved in and bought up there it was to all be residential area. That's what these people have all thought it would be. When you bring up any type of commercial area, all but about a 1% are against turning the road over to anybody. They would rather have a rough gravel road than to turn it over where they will have a commercial area above them. They're more than willing to turn it over to the county for residential, because that's what all the plans have been. I've been there since 1980 and that's what it has always been. When it was logged off by Simpson, there was a temporary access agreement for 90 days and after that temporary access agreement was over, the roads were blocked off. There is no utilities access from the Belfair side. It's one of those things that when the Allyn group drew that up they didn't come up and talk to us or anything. One of the questions I was asked when I was talking to the county about this is who do our neighborhood associate themselves with? Do they associate themselves as being from Belfair or being from Allyn? Everyone across the board states that they are from Belfair. They've always been a part of Belfair. It would be a change in about half of our homeowners association for literally everything. When they thought they were living in Belfair, they would be living in Allyn.

(#1500) Ken Loomis: I live in the Trails End Lake area and this has evidently been talked about and worked on for years by the Allyn group, and I have just personally, along with a lot of other people, have just found out about this. We're hearing all kinds of different stories where five acre tracts are going to be busted into one acre tracts, and you're not going to be rural any more. We don't want that. We even have a petition going around against this. For it being worked on for eight years, how come we haven't heard about it before? Our address is Trails End Lake, Belfair. We don't have anything against Allyn, but we don't want to be part of Allyn; we're a part of Belfair. If we're going to be in a UGA, we want to be Belfair.

(#1560) Cliff Cody: My name is Cliff Cody and I'm a board member of the Grapeview Community Club. First, I'd like to reiterate what the other two gentlemen have said. I was disappointed that the process did not involve the input from the people affected in the area. On this map, this is the Grapeview Loop Road. If this line extended down the Loop Road in another mile and a half you'd find the center of the hamlet of Grapeview. These areas are, we consider, a part of Grapeview. So we're disappointed that we were never included in this. There was apparently no attempt to include us in this. Secondly, there's some boundaries here that weren't taken into account perhaps. Grapeview established it's own school district quite a few years ago, and that school district boundary cuts right through the middle of this. Grapeview also has a port district. That port district boundary is also right through the middle. Grapeview has a fire department and that boundary is clear up here. That didn't seem to be any consideration in this. Thirdly, I'd like to say that my neighbors, the people who have moved out here, live in general on rather large tracts of land. They didn't move out here because they wanted to be in a UGA. They moved out here because they wanted to maintain a rural lifestyle, and that's what we want to achieve.

(#1665) Jeff Carey: I'm Jeff Carey, President of the Allyn Community Association. I'm a little frustrated by the approach that the county is taking with this, at the moment, because what's happening is in an indirect way we're pitting community against community. If you recall in the beginning, the county asked us if we're going to expand, what areas do you start looking at? It doesn't mean you include them, just start looking. The county presented us with no criteria except population. Taking our cue off of Belfair, we said we've got this kind of density, what area has some logical flow over time ... it's not going to happen overnight. But where do you start looking to plan for growth in various communities? So we presented a plan. Somehow in the process, we've become a big, bad evil wolf. There was a lot of factors that went into consideration. No matter how you cut this, everybody has an issue where they don't want it in their backyard, or they want something else. The problem is we have to plan and we have to make it work. I do believe, in a sense, since the first statement was describing where we are status wise with the sub-area plan, that the maps in a way are a red herring. All it does is bring out emotion when you don't the facts or the figures. So everybody gets all excited because you've got these boundaries and they're on a piece of paper and it's like it's the eleventh commandment. It's not that. We have to look at the different things that have gone on in this

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

community, and work with our neighbors and work through that. The committee has existed for eight years, but this was worked on and submitted this year. The cutoff day was May 1 and it was submitted. The county has done nothing to help the communication; and it's all been on the shoulders of the ACA to do the communication. The ACA has communicated through publications. You can put it all in print all day long and nobody will take notice of it until you put in a picture. I have no problem with that because I think the discussion needs to be worked through because there's going to be give and take on the communities. There's just no way around it. The other thing is this sub-area plan ... there's a list that the county adopted of 103 items. Some were accepted and some were not. All of the items listed that were related to the ACA issue request were mandated. Somehow now we've changed so it's no longer mandated. You had a public process to get to the mandated ones; where's the public process now? There was going to be three meetings to make some touch ups to the sub-area plan. Somehow the sub-area plan has grown into a monster of it's own and I agree with Jay that, in our error, never addressed the economic side of this because we thought the county was going to address that. You need to keep cool heads, you need to put the logic through; I agree that we can't do something without knowing at the same time what are all the issues. This is the year to adjust the boundaries but we don't have the data. We haven't had the population allocations but we've tried to make an assumption of where it's going to be. The map on the left is from the ACA and the map on the right is the county. The ACA worked up a middle ground based upon some things on the commercial side which I can present tonight and give as a map as a working point. It won't make sense until you put all the data together. Remember that's true for Allyn, Belfair and Shelton. Somehow this is just getting wacky. I'm trained in a systems analyst world and we're not there. No way, shape or form. There's an approach to this. I'm not a public planner but I can work projects. What I'm concerned about is this willy, nilly popping things about delaying this. It's started really innocently that we're going to delay the zoning, but now it's all of a sudden become this, and now it's going to become the boundaries, and now it's going to become the capital facilities and pretty soon we're no longer in the year ... what gives? You've got documents in the county that says this is mandated and people testify tonight that it's not mandated. I don't know.

I'll give you another look at Allyn. It's going to take more public input and more work, but the problem is if you don't put it down once, you don't have any frame or point to discuss. Now with different criteria from the county, testimony from people at Grapeview, from people at Trails End Lake, we're looking at a different configuration. I'm not saying it's perfect or it's the final one, but I'm just saying that our organization is willing to work, and has always been willing to work, with all community organizations in this county. Every time we've ever sat down with any group we've been able to work it through. So this is Alternative #3.

(#1980) Tim Wing: Four or five years ago when we were first learning what the GMA required and it was at one point determined that the people in Allyn wanted to be a UGA but the reason they wanted to be a UGA is that they would have the most control of what happened inside their boundaries as opposed to being a RAC, and I had the impression then, and actually it was clearly stated then, that Allyn didn't want to become a large urban style area at all; that they'd only use that designation so they would have the most control. Was that correct, and has that changed? What has changed that?

(#2015) Jeff Carey: It depends on who is saying what. My recollection is that we were a RAC and that we'd probably stay that way forever. Through the 1999 and 2000 timeframe we were faced with a dilemma, at least what was conveyed to us at that point in time was that some of the businesses we had in town, that if they left, we couldn't bring them back in if we were a RAC. My interpretation is that they would be a nonconforming use. I never liked the full urban side, but we couldn't make it work with a RAC. We were trying to find a solution. That's why you heard things like a village used, and there was no middle ground. That was one of our dilemmas. You can ask other members here their interpretation, but that was my recollection. You were severely restricted to what people could do with their property that were within the community of Allyn at that time, and remember the RAC at that time was significantly larger than the UGA boundaries currently today. We got hammered on that, and then we flipped eventually to the UGA and then got really hammered. Most of Lakeland Village was out. That's my recollection of what happened five or six years ago.

(#2090) Tim Wing: The other thing I wanted to say is that I take you at your word. I know all the people in your group and you're a great group to work with so I think what you've said here, Jeff, about being a moving target and wanting to work with neighboring communities to come up with what's best for the whole area,

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

which might mean that they're not going to be part of Allyn or it might mean that maybe they should be, I think people should take you seriously because that group is an excellent group to work with.

(#2115) Jeff Carey: Thank you.

(#2118) Wendy Ervin: It seems to me very unusual to include the area of Grapeview that has a port ... there is an area that is served by the Port of Grapeview. What was the discussion when you were creating a boundary that had two ports in it?

(#2132) Jeff Carey: Basically looking it legally as what is the difference between King County with their ports? Or other counties? We didn't see any problems in that; that was not our discussion. Our framework was how do you make it so residents can live there, how do you work it for the businesses; we weren't hung up on the different governmental boundaries. We already have the same issue with Fire District #3 already so it's already been approved and adopted. You have those different boundaries.

(#2160) Wendy Ervin: So somebody in a UGA that was served by the Allyn Port could be taxed for the Grapeview Port and visa versa.

(#2166) Jeff Carey: No, if you're in one, you're not in the other as far as assessing goes.

(#2178) Steve Clayton: Jeff, the R1 zoning is not 1 parcel per acre. What is that density that you're stipulating?

(#2185) Jeff Carey: At this moment in time, the interim one says up to 6. One of the items that was on that list of 103 items was to adjust that to 4, because we've looked at other communities where 6 lots per acre existed and said that environment doesn't make sense.

(#2200) Steve Clayton: So quarter acre lots is the ultimate goal?

(#2204) Jeff Carey: Yes.

(#2208) Steve Clayton: I appreciate you putting the map in the North Bay Review; it was good publicity and ultimately in the Belfair Herald. My concern has always been public input and what would be the chances of future meetings of your group being published in the publication of record, which is the Belfair Herald? That's where legal documents go; not the give away Allyn North Bay Review.

(#2225) Jeff Carey: Because we're a nonprofit. Anybody can ask for them, as far as trying to publish minutes in some other document.

(#2232) Steve Clayton: I'm not asking for a list of minutes. I'm looking for a publication or mention to the editor, Kevin Moore, when your meetings are for these different planning groups. We have a letter tonight and several testimonies that people haven't heard about it before and that's my concern; that the Allyn local give away newspaper is not a publication of record and doesn't meet the requirements for the county for meetings.

(#2250) Jeff Carey: It can be looked at. There's no issue there. The big issue is that we don't get consistent coverage from the Belfair Herald, so 180 degrees ... in this year alone, there were six different times that all of these issues have been stated. It's only when there's a picture that people get excited. That's the fact.

(#2278) Steve Clayton: It was stated in the Allyn paper, not in the Belfair paper, which we've had people testify that Trails End doesn't consider themselves part of Allyn, and a gentleman came from Belfair Acreage Tracts and they don't consider themselves part of Allyn. If you send me an Allyn paper, it might get looked at but if it's not a picture, it's going in the garbage.

(#2305) Jeff Carey: This process has not been an overnight thing. There's this constant conveyance that it was. This plan was supposed to be part of the three meetings this year; not that we're in a hurry to get it done, but somehow we're delaying it, or at least it's been proposed that we're delaying it. Where is the public

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

process on that? We don't want to lose sight of that.

(#2250) Bill Dewey: I, too, would like to compliment you on your efforts here. Sometimes in participating on these community committees, whether it's the PAC or your group there in Allyn, it's somewhat thankless. You are doing your best, and I think trying to be responsive ... we have heard from different people that certain groups aren't hearing so trying to be more responsive, considering the Belfair Herald, and getting your notices out more broadly would be good for the process. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

(#2400) Bob Allen: I'm Bob Allen, Port Commissioner of the Port of Grapeview. I've addressed this body before on a couple of issues. One thing I'd like to remind you all of is that both the Port of Allyn and the Port of Grapeview have Comp Plans so if you're interested to see what the port districts in those areas have considered for economic development for jobs and growth, not just commercial growth but possibly light manufacturing ... the Port of Grapeview recognized in 1992 when they first developed their Comp Plan that the Stretch Island Fruit establishment needed to grow. Fortunately, some things happened that the county got involved and did allow it to grow. The port district was not able to do any performance to that at the time. The port district has no objection if the Allyn border includes Stretch Island Fruit. That would be up to the ACA and Stretch Island Fruit. It still would remain in the Port of Grapeview. One thing I think my neighbors and I would like some assurances, not only from this committee, but from the county ... one of the biggest confusions going on right now is that with this center map was adopted, there's the big fear that people will be moving to a different community without actually leaving their homes. No mail service changes; people in Belfair will still get their mail at their Belfair address. People who think they live in Grapeview and actually live at an Allyn address currently, but get a post office box in Grapeview, still will continue to do that. Fire District #3, Fire District #5; still those political boundaries hold still. The port districts between Allyn and Grapeview hold as they are and continue the good working relationship they have. We have a whole lot of folks out here from Trails End, Belfair Estates, Grapeview, who have a huge concern that we are, or the Allyn community, is trying to annex them and that they'll lose their school district, their fire district, their port district, so we need some assurances to the communities involved in any of these considerations. We have three of them in front of you right now. They need some reassurance that that is not a political boundary as much as it is a geographic boundary for the purposes of the UGA. It would relieve these communities from fighting with each other and fighting with the ACA. The Comp Plan of the Port of Grapeview does identify the area surrounding the Fire District #3 station #2 at the south end, which is not in this pervue. But it does, in one of the potentials, address the Stretch Island Fruit area. The Port of Grapeview, in 1992, originally recognized all of Highway 3 and specifically around the Stretch Island Fruit area as a potential terminus for future economic development for port purposes. There are already some light manufacturing and some farming going on in those areas and that's where the power and the transportation is. It made sense to keep that kind of development away from saltwater, freshwater, so that those could continue to be developed as residential areas, therefore using any other type of light industrial or commercial possibly along Highway 3. Certainly around the Dawn Road area, those people objected to that thought process so you need to be aware of that. My main points are some relief from the county and a relief from the PAC that any proposal under consideration does not change where you live or the communities name that you live in or any other issues, and that the ports have Comp Plans that need to taken into consideration by the county and the PAC. I won't attempt to speak for the Port of Allyn, but I think we both would appreciate having that recognition that the hard work that those commissioners in the respective port districts have done with their staffs to make sure that there is a Comp Plan. We can't get any funding without them if we approach the state for federal funding. Please consider those efforts, too.

(#2660) Tim Wing: I am a member of the PAC, and I'm not going to speak for the PAC, but I'm not wanting to see communities ignored or centers or a sense of community change if that's not necessary. The Allyn group recognized a serious problem within Allyn; congestion, lack of roads, lack of infrastructure, and a need to do something about that, and they were asked to throw out some proposals for discussion and review, and that's what they've done. What we need to do now is ask you and others to go back to your communities and say that that's all that's been done, and that we all need to just keep talking until we figure out a way to resolve some of the Allyn issues, but do it in a way that is not going to interfere with the communities that have spoken here tonight. I think, at least from my point of view, and I'm guessing that others share this, that that's what we would want to try to do. Resolve this and keep the sense of communities that are in place but we've got to do something inside Allyn. Bob, if the ports have good plans, and I know they've worked hard on them, they should probably work with the sub-area groups to get them integrated into sub-area plans. The

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

economic portions of these plans should reflect the port's plans.

(#2735) Bob Allen: I know the Port of Allyn has worked with the ACA, but by law, we're required to register those Comp Plan with the county and they are on record with the county. I know that I hand delivered the 1992 one and the consequent two updates over the last several years, but yet there doesn't seem to be any recognition of that. It just seems like when I talk to county staff, I get a very blank look as to the fact that, not willing to admit by that expressionless poker face that there is a Comp Plan and that we are a legal entity and that we are an economic engine that's supposed to be building jobs. We don't build residences; we build jobs. Our communities basically dictate to us how many of those jobs they'd like to see and where they would be. So the port commissioners in my district have actually expressed to different community groups the fact that this is a nonissue related to the other political entities that we've mentioned. We're not quite to be believed because, after all, even though we are their neighbors, we are elected officials. When you cross that line, you're now one of them. So I'm calling on this body, as well as the county as a body, to release some of this tension and to let people know that what's being considered will have no affect on addresses, the school districts, the taxation basis, or any of these things. I hope you'll join me in reassuring our fellow citizens that from those standpoints, this is a nonissue. From other developments, like the potential 'look see' of sewers extended to areas that if the citizens so choose to, there is that potential. That's why we're looking at these boundaries. We know that for the rest of North Bay, it could be an interesting project to finish off the cleaning of North Bay where it is more populated. That's just a 'look see'. I'm not promoting bringing sewers down Grapeview Loop Road. That's a decision the communities would have to make.

(#2900) Steve Clayton: Bob, have you participated in any of the planning committee meetings in Allyn, and are there any conflicts that you see with your Comp Plan and with what they've proposed here?

(#2915) Bob Allen: The Port of Grapeview has no conflict with any of the plans with the planning committee in Allyn.

(#2920) Steve Clayton: Have you participated in any of the planning sessions on this?

(#2922) Bob Allen: Not in a direct way. When it has been directed, it has not been consistent. We just get to look at the proposed plan because they're out of our jurisdiction. That's why I come to you, and then it becomes a county issue.

(#2942) Bill Dewey: Can staff speak to some of these issues he's raised as far as the other jurisdictions and the overlap of the UGA and how that might affect it?

(#2960) Bob Fink: You mean hypothetically or legally?

(#2965) Bill Dewey: Either or both. Obviously there's interest and concern that's been raised a couple of times tonight. I certainly as a PAC member don't know the answers.

(#2972) Bob Fink: The UGA boundary is a boundary in which urban growth can happen under the GMA. That has nothing to do technically with the boundaries of school districts, port districts, postal service areas, or fire districts or cities themselves. There has been an issue with incorporation in the City of Shelton. Allyn is different than many urban areas in the sense that there is no incorporated City of Allyn. Where you have an incorporated city, there are rules and laws that apply to cities and one of the reasons for some of the boundary decisions in the Shelton UGA had to do with school districts and fire districts. There was some consideration given to those because within the area annexed by a city, it's my understanding that it's all within one school district. It's all within the fire district of the city. That's not to say the urban area is the same. That doesn't mean there's a change in jurisdiction or any necessary consequence. But when a city annexes an area or an area in a city, that does have an affect to revenues and jurisdictions of fire districts and school districts.

(#3080) Tim Wing: Does that mean that if we decided to do one of these maps and part of the Grapeview school district ended up inside the Allyn UGA, initially that wouldn't mean anything, but then if at a later time Allyn incorporated, that might, at that time, interfere with the boundary of the Grapeview school district?

(#3105) Bob Fink: In the case of a new incorporation or the expanding of an existing city, the UGA boundary

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

sets a limit to the boundary of the city. So in this case, yes. Let's take a hypothetical; you decide to extend the UGA down into the school district and the fire district to the south because that's where you want some of the urban growth to go. For instance, urban growth would be the industrial or commercial development along Highway 3 that the port suggested they would like to see. That requires urban development; that requires an urban designation. So if you designate that area, for instance because you want to support that kind of activity as a UGA, then if the town of Allyn should decide to incorporate as a city when it was deciding what boundary it wanted, the boundary could extend as far as the UGA boundary.

(#3170) Terri Jeffreys: But it doesn't necessarily have to go that far.

(#3172) Bob Fink: No. It does not have to go that far. Incorporation is something the public votes on.

(#3190) Steve Clayton: There was something said about sewer services. That's not currently something the public votes on.

(#3195) Bob Fink: Sewer services also can't be extended beyond the UGA boundary, except in very narrow circumstances. The very narrow circumstances are either an immediate health or environmental threat.

(#3210) Steve Clayton: The current application for the Allyn area is that if sewer is in your area and it's within the UGA, the public does not vote on whether or not they get the sewer; it comes.

(#3225) Bob Fink: It's not the type of action that requires a public vote like incorporating a city. Expanding a sewer system doesn't.

(#3240) Bill Dewey: If you're going to expand a sewer outside the boundaries of a UGA for the environmental or public health, it's only to accommodate the growth that's there currently. It's not to accommodate any expanded growth in those areas, correct?

(#3260) Bob Fink: I think that's something that up to interpretation. What is clearly true is that you can't allow growth that changes the rural character of the area. So you can't allow urban growth unless it's designated as urban. Whether you can allow new growth and how much you can allow is arguable.

(#3300) Bonnie Knight: My name is Bonnie Knight and I'm from Allyn. Jeff was dead on. We've been meeting for eight years, but this whole different look at it didn't come up until this year, when Steve was working with us and told us we really didn't have a plan here. That's what triggered a lot of the 'what if's' type of thinking. I'm real sensitive to that, too, because we've always tried to get along with everybody. One of the major things that happens when you're going south was the Stretch Island thing ... we were looking at the sewers primarily. Where is the sewer service going to be in 20 years. That was really a driving force. We didn't really have a lot of time ... we're so busy just trying to take care of the alligators that we have not really had a lot of time to even discuss those areas. One of our major thoughts was urban services because of the UGA boundaries. What areas would likely be included in 20 years. That was really the driving force behind those areas. It wasn't real complicated from a group of people who are not professional planners, except for Jeanette. As far as what happened six years ago, the whole world has changed in six years and Allyn certainly looks different and the Razor Road going through will certainly have an impact on Allyn; a big impact. We had to change the way we looked at the world when we realized that that was likely going to go through, and since that's the third item on the county's list we had to take it seriously.

(#3422) Bill Dewey: Anybody else have any comments before we shift gears and go to population projections? There's a lot of interest here tonight and I appreciate everybody coming out and sharing their concerns and look forward to continued deliberations on this. We will take a short break before we begin on the population allocations.

Break in meeting.

(#3460) Bill Dewey: The next item on the agenda is the population allocations to the UGA's.

(#3560) Bob Fink: What I just passed out has two parts. The single page is just a correction of Alternative #6

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

that's near the bottom of the first page of the handout. The draft date is October 1, 2005. Alternative #6 is the alternative that's based on the current allocation of population in the county Comp Plan. That allocation ends in 2014. One of the things we're looking to do this year is to change the timeline of the Comp Plan to 2005 to 2025, which means that we need to allocate new people to the urban areas. A new growth rate or expectation for growth. We need, if necessary, to look at the size of the UGA's if appropriate. You've seen this chart before. It's essentially unchanged, but what I wanted to show you in relation to that, because there were some questions about where those numbers came from. If you go to the next page, which is titled Alternative 1 - Share of Growth 2005 - 2025, what this does is break up where growth is going; the allocation of growth to each area in each five year period based on where people are settling now. Looking over the last ten years of growth, from 1994 - 2004, approximately 80% of the people who are moving to Mason County are moving to the rural area. The balance, approximately 20%, are moving to the different urban areas, with 13% of those in Shelton, and approximately 1% in Belfair, and then approximately 5% in Allyn. The number of people that are going to Allyn has recently gone up a lot only in the last couple of years because of sewer. If you look a little further in, there's a graph which shows the Allyn permits as a % of total permits. When the sewer became available, the number of permits showing people settling in Allyn versus the county as a whole, it changed from being around 2 - 3% to going up to 8%. It jumped up as sewer became available, and it is a more significant part of the growth in the county than it was prior to having sewer. What this tells us is that there is a demand for housing on fairly small lots with sewer. When sewer and other public services become available, it's reasonable to expect that the existing distribution of population; existing growth patterns, will change. The current plan is built on that premise, that as urban services are provided in urban areas, there will be a shift in population growth. The real question, and one that is very difficult to address is how much will that shift be? How big will it be and how quickly will it happen?

So we basically developed a number of scenarios that show that shift over time. I just wanted to share with you how those numbers are created. The way they're created is we have a growth range that we're considering from the Office of Financial Management of how many people they expect to move to Mason County. They provide a range from low to high, and what we focused on was the range from the intermediate level to the high level growth. If you go back to the table on the first page, we have four different alternatives.

The intermediate growth is in the first column; there's 21,299 people that are expected to move to Mason County from 2005 - 2025. That's the intermediate level of growth. The high level of growth has 41,648 people. Then we have two intermediate projections that fall within that range. If things were to continue exactly as they are now, you could expect 80% of the population to move to the rural area. But we don't expect things to remain the same; we expect to do things to attract development to the urban area, and there's pressure on the rural area that will limit the number of people that can go there, presumably because of the zoning in the rural area the land will become relatively expensive, whereas the zoning in the urban areas allows higher density and a lot more flexibility for use.

Alternative #2 basically shows a gradual shift to growth in the urban areas. If you look at Alternative #2 figure, you can see how the first five years growth is pretty much the way it has been for the last ten years, with approximately 77% of the people moving into the rural areas. Each five year segment we increase the % of people moving to the urban areas so that in Shelton it goes from 14% to 16% to 18% to 19%. In Belfair it goes up to 2%, but then five years or so from now, it's quite possible sewer will become available in that next five year period so it jumps up to 7%. That's one pattern of how things could change. We expect them to change, but we're just not sure of the magnitude.

If we go to Alternative #3, we're depositing a much greater magnitude in shift. The first year instead of Shelton growing to 13% it grows to 14%. As you get into the next five years, it jumps up quite a bit, where, instead of being 7% it goes up to 9% for Belfair, and then when you get ten years out ... ten years is an important number because if you figure it takes several years to build a sewer system, it's going to take several years for developers and people that own land to design their property around having sewer and having water available. In this case, growth in Belfair doubles again from 9% to 20%. Then it levels off a bit from fifteen to twenty years at 22%. That's another possibility.

On Alternative #4, there's a little bit more emphasis on the growth going to Allyn rather than going to Belfair or Shelton. The % of growth going to Allyn is higher. If you look at Alternative #3, which has a very big shift, by the time you get twenty years from now, the forecast here is that only 26% of the people are going to be moving to the rural area. The balance of people are going to be moving to the urban areas. That's a very

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

significant shift in the patterns. It certainly is possible that people will do that, but you have to realize that it is a pretty big shift in the way things are going on now. So I just wanted to give you that background on where the numbers are coming from. The range of numbers is quite broad depending on what scenario you want to look at. I would call all of these fairly reasonable scenarios because it's a matter of what could happen, it's a matter of what you expect to happen. The allocation is not just a matter of existing trends continuing. It's also a matter of what your expectations are; it's also a matter of what your targets are. What do you want to see happen? If you want that many people to go to Belfair or Allyn, then you've got to plan for that many people to come, so you have to start addressing issues that come up here. What kind of services do they need if these many people come?

(#0325) Matt Matayoshi: On our current track, what's our population growth looking like; 21,000, or 31,000, or 36,000 or 41,000?

(#0330) Bob Fink: A couple pages in there's an estimated population for Mason County 2000 to 2004. On here they have the OFM estimates ranging from high to low.

(#0345) Matt Matayoshi: So we're at about medium?

(#0347) Bob Fink: It depends on whose estimate you believe. The census release numbers last year, which are slightly above the intermediate estimate of the OFM, and the county reviewed its permits ... one of the things we don't know for sure is how many people are building houses for vacation homes and how many people are building houses for residences. Assuming people are doing that in the same proportions that currently live in the county, then our estimate is that there's slightly more population than the OFM intermediate estimate.

(#0370) Matt Matayoshi: So the county's estimate would be closer to the higher estimate?

(#0372) Bob Fink: It's still very close to the intermediate estimate; just slightly higher. The census is a little bit higher than the county's, but the OFM is estimating a number very close to the low estimate. They still believe that the growth in Mason County is closer to the intermediate range. What the GMA requires is that you're somewhere between the low growth and the high growth of the OFM. What you need to realize is that there's a lot of uncertainty about this. Two different agencies cannot even count up the number of people that have come the same, much less project how many people are going to be here twenty years from now. One of the things we talked about with regard to dealing with the population projection is as risk management; to try to get an understanding of what a good population projection is and trying to control your risks using your allocation. You want it to be realistic but you also want it to be optimistic. There's certain places where one number is more important than the other. One of the things I wanted to talk to you about is I wanted to get into a review of a workshop that took place last week between the City of Shelton commissioners and the Mason County BOCC. It was a meeting that was intended on focusing primarily on the UGA and UGA planning. But these capacity and allocation issues came up. The City of Shelton, over the last years, has taken the information that the county developed that has parcel information and used the modern tools of analysis to do some land analysis for the capacity of the UGA in the City of Shelton. Attached to the agenda is the City of Shelton Land Capacity Analysis. One of the things that concerned them when they did that is there is a lot more capacity inside the UGA than they had expected. There was a lot more capacity for residential growth within the existing urban boundary than they were expecting the demand would be in their regional planning. The City of Shelton has been going through a process to plan expansion of their sewer and water systems on a regional basis so they look at the area outside the city, including the Washington Correction Facility and the State Patrol and the Port of Shelton and the unincorporated area inside the UGA, which is within the county jurisdiction. So they've been making projections for population growth based on 2% and at that rate there's a surplus capacity within the UGA based on this analysis. The growth capacity that they come up with is 10,000 people, and that's about 3,000 to 4,000 people more than they're actually expecting to grow. One of the purposes of this was to have the city and county able to share what's going on and what do they want to see happen. I wanted to share with you what went on. Essentially, one of the outcomes of the meeting is that the City of Shelton is still internally debating what it is they would want to request the county do with regard to the UGA and UGA allocation of population. There's a number of factors they're weighing. That's really the main body of it. They have a number of other issues that they'd like to address and they don't really have formal recommendations at this time to make.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

(#0555) Bill Dewey: So what's you're suggesting, just based strictly on the numbers they presented, is that the UGA needs to be shrunk by 40%?

(#0565) Bob Fink: It's by quite a number of acres, and not by 40% because a lot of the area is already developed. Some of the area is not suitable for development. There's a number of adjustments that are made to the gross acreage. I think there was about 400 acres of residential land that they were looking to take out. These numbers are subject somewhat to what assumptions you make. That's another uncertainty. If you make a different set of assumptions, you can come up with slightly different numbers and you can also test your assumptions and see whether they really make an impact or not to what your final decisions are. It looks like that right now we won't have a recommendation to bring to you for rezoning the Shelton UGA. That was something we were working towards with the city as a joint process. There's a number of critical decisions the city faces and most likely they're not going to be done so that's something that will probably not be done with year. It will probably be done next year. One thing we do want to do this year, and we talked to the city about this, is, if we're going to update our plan to 2025, we do need to establish an allocation of population. One option is to allocate enough population to meet the capacity that's needed. What this cover sheet shows is, among the alternatives we considered, are allocations of population to Shelton high enough to fill the capacity of the UGA. It's just not the number that the city was using in their projections. The city was using a projection of a straight line of 2% annual growth. The number the county projected was 30% of the growth going to Shelton in our current plan. The alternatives here are quite a range and some of them are lower than what the city is projecting and some of them are higher than the city either projected or needs for its capacity. One option would be to leave the UGA boundary alone and allocate enough population this year to be in sync with the size of the UGA so you don't create a situation where the allocation drives the size of the UGA. You don't want to have fewer people allocated to the UGA than you have capacity over that twenty year period. Within the range of numbers we were looking at that's shown on this first sheet there's more than enough people to allocate to Shelton. There's an alternative that has enough people to allocate to Shelton to be appropriate for the size of the urban area.

(#0695) Terri Jeffreys: Which one is that?

(#0698) Bob Fink: My calculation is that we need to allocate about 10,500 people to Shelton, which is about 25% of the growth. The intermediate growth with 15,000 people would meet that standard, for instance, which is 30% growth under the current standard. The point is it's within the scope of what we were considering doing. Now that you understand how these numbers are generated, you have to realize that they're a matter of judgment. No single scenario is perfect because you're taking expectations and saying that the trend is going to change. We know which direction the trend is going to change, but we don't really know how much and how quickly the trend is going to change. So these different alternatives are different scenarios of how the trend might change. There's no way to know what's going to happen. The other thing that was talked about with the City of Shelton is risk? They're planning for water and sewer systems and how do you deal with risk when you're planning for major facilities like this? There's risks on the upside and risks on the downside. If you plan for more people than come then you run the risk of not having your revenue goals, not being able to pay for your system. If you don't plan for enough people you run the risk of running out of capacity and perhaps having to have a moratorium while you build more capacity. The way to deal with risk is to watch how fast the capacity is used and once it reaches a certain capacity point, then planning the expansion is started. That could be five or twenty years out. The water and sewer systems are sized for a certain capacity. You deal with the uncertainty of it by knowing that you need to start expanding your system at a certain point. It takes you so many years to actually expand the system once you know you need to expand it so you keep an eye on that and as you move toward that point you start expanding. You deal with some of the uncertainty with revenue by charging enough fees early on in the system so that if you don't have as much growth as you need you can start reducing the fees earlier. If you know what side your risk is on then you have a better chance of accommodating that risk in your planning and the way you set your fee structure. Those were some of the things that were talked about and we don't really have an answer at this point. My own inclination is because we're looking at so many unresolved issues we're not going to rezone Shelton this year. We are relooking at the issues of how much industrial and commercial zoned land is needed to meet our needs next year. This isn't the year under a mandated deadline to start playing too much with the boundaries. It's probably better to see if we can allocate in a reasonable way a population to meet the size of the existing UGA.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

(#0855) Tim Wing: If this isn't it the year, why isn't it the year ... are we postponing it so we can do it at a time when we're not in the midst of getting the Plan approved?

(#0865) Bob Fink: There is an issue just of time. One thing is, how would you change the boundary? If you wanted to bring the boundary in how would you do it? The city is certainly looking at that but they don't even have an alternative to offer of how they would like to see the boundary changed.

(#0878) Tim Wing: So they're kind of the reverse of Allyn?

(#0880) Bob Fink: Right. Allyn is different situation. One of the things about this year versus next year is next year we're going to have better tools and the year after that even better. We're going to develop information and do studies to do a better assessment of what the industrial, commercial and residential lands are. What the needs are. So we're going to have a better basis for making decisions next year than we have this year. Another issue is we have to take action on a given day this year. If we needed an extra two weeks to look at the issue, we don't have them. If we needed an extra two months to look at them, we don't have them. Two months more is next year. We can do it next year. It's simply a matter of time and timing. The ideal time to really readdress these issues would probably be in 2007. I say that because by that time our GIS system should be complete as far as establishing a parcel layer for the county as a whole, and some of these questions will be much better and more accurately addressed. Some of the assumptions that have to be made to come up with these numbers can be done away with. You won't have to make as many assumptions because you'll have better information than you have now. Some of this information is going to be available in 2006. Planning is an ongoing process. It's a matter of refinement, and each year when you make these major changes, you do another iteration and another refinement to what the plans are. Plus, the world changes. The world changes around you. When the Comp Plan was adopted in 1996, I'm sure people thought the sewer would already be built in Belfair. Well, it's not. It doesn't exist there. The one in Allyn was completed and was completed on schedule, but the one in Belfair wasn't begun and they're actually in the process of re-evaluating the plans now to see how to begin. On the other hand, the legislature this year granted \$16 million dollars for construction of the sewer plant in Belfair. They put it in their budget. So the financial capacity is certainly there in a way that was never possible or certainly couldn't have been relied upon before. So there's a big reason to expect that it will happen fairly soon.

(#0985) Terri Jeffreys: So we are mandated to adopt new population forecast numbers and to do the allocations. Is that correct?

(#0990) Bob Fink: That was our interpretation. This is a major update of the GMA. We're supposed to review our plan to make sure it's consistent with the GMA and meets the standards. So we look at changes to the ACT since ... the first thing that was done a couple of years ago was look at changes to the GMA since the time ...

(#1008) Terri Jeffreys: Part of the discussion of this workshop ...

(#1010) Bob Fink: If we are updating our Plan as far as changing our timeline then we do have to do a new allocation because our allocation ends in 2014. Having done that allocation, we don't have to change the UGA's, but the UGA's do have to be consistent with that allocation. So if the allocation is not consistent with the size of the UGA's, then we have to change the UGA's. Or change the zoning within the UGA's so that it's consistent. It's not just the size of the urban area, but it's how intensive the development is that's allowed within the urban areas, and also what area of more intensive growth. Under the current zoning in Belfair, for instance, if there wasn't enough capacity for the population you wanted to allocate to it, you could increase the density that's allowed in the residentially zoned areas. Or you could expand the residentially zoned areas.

(#1050) Terri Jeffreys: For the purposes of continuing of any policy / planning decisions made this year ... because we wouldn't be visiting UGA sizing ... you're suggesting that it probably wouldn't be a good idea to visit UGA sizing until Shelton decided what they would like to do, until we had GIS online ...

(#1065) Bob Fink: Until we get our industrial lands study done ... the presumption is that we'll revisit all these things next year.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

(#1075) Terri Jeffreys: So I'm assuming that if we choose to do adopt the population forecast numbers, status quo would probably be the best thing to do, wouldn't it?

(#1080) Bob Fink: Well, what does status quo mean in this context? I don't know that the GMA necessarily even requires you to change your timeframe, but the GMA does require a 20 year planning horizon. So that's why we presume that that probably means we want to change our timeframe. If we keep with the 2014 timeframe, we're not even 10 years out. If that's true, or if we decide that it's not worth the risk of not doing, then we need an allocation to 2025 and we change our planning to that timeframe. Now the question is, do we want to revisit the urban area? Well, I think we have a reasonable range of discussion as to how to allocate population. If we allocate population that's appropriate to the size of the urban areas that we currently have and the zoning that we currently have, there's no reason to necessarily revisit those issues at this time. We would expect to revisit some of them, particularly zoned areas, next year. We expect that during next year the city and county will work together. The regional planning on sewer and wastewater will continue. More pieces will fall into place so that what gets adopted is better. Anything we do now is probably going to be changed next year. There's not a lot of time to spend on it this year. We have a whole year to spend on it next year. We'll have more information. It's actually in the work plan to revisit these issues.

(#1150) Jay Hupp: Are there any forces that are pushing us in the direction of changing the size of the UGA's?

(#1154) Bob Fink: Not that I'm aware of. The City of Shelton is concerned about it's investment in planning for it's major capital improvements, and having discrepancy between what's in the urban area and the Comp Plan as far as population, and what's in their sewer planning as far as population. The driver there is more population than it is what area you serve. You're sizing your system more to a population than you are to a service area.

(#1175) Jay Hupp: So it seems to me that unless the City of Shelton comes forth and requests a change in the size of the UGA, then it would probably be prudent to leave it as is.

(#1190) Bob Fink: For Belfair, the only request we have is a specific request, which was already reviewed by the PAC. It only involves 10 acres and really doesn't affect this kind of analysis.

(#1198) Terri Jeffreys: Couldn't it also be said that for the sewer ... the same type of considerations for the City of Shelton should probably be applied to the Belfair sewer system?

(#1202) Bob Fink: There's extra complications for the Belfair sewer system in the sense that they're examining the extension of sewer outside the UGA to address environmental and health situation in the Hood Canal. They do want to know what the number is, but they'll size the system based on the number. This is where discussions get more involved. I don't really know what the proper answer is from the utility service providers, but the consultant for the county that's working on the update of the sewer system is looking for a number that they can use in their planning. There's risk on that number. These decisions on your capacity, on the areas, really precede the detailed facilities plans because the facilities are designed to serve those areas, not the reverse. You don't do your zoning because you have capacity; the capacity may affect your timing, but you're really saying how much are we going to grow and then try to figure out how to serve that growth. I'm inclined to think that the proper recommendation is to adopt an allocation for Belfair that's appropriate to the area. If you look from the review that was done when the Belfair regulations were adopted, the capacity of the existing UGA would be about 5,600 people. Only 41 of those people would be affected. It would be less if you took out the long term ag land. That's well within the range of what we were considering allocating. The same goes for Allyn.

(#1325) Steve Clayton: I was looking up in what we passed as a planning commission last year. The Belfair planning group, which was a public process and zoned it with a recommendation, which included 6,952 people in their UGA. We, at this level, on the planning commission, reduced some of the parcels from R10's to R5's at staff's recommendation because we felt the UGA had too much density. My concern I brought up before was now that we're acknowledging that we actually have the capacity, we should increase the density of the UGA's. We already went through the public process. At this level we reduced it. Perhaps we should put it back to what the community said that the zoning should be in the UGA for those affected parcels. The

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

numbers came from the FSEIS. So it went through a public process and I'm kind of opposed to the planning commission making jumps back and forth.

(#1385) Bob Fink: That's a different question. The number I was suggesting is the number that was consistent with what was the action. That we allocate the number consistent with the current zoning.

(#1400) Steve Clayton: This isn't rechanging UGA lines, and it is a tangent off of one of your proposals ...

(#1412) Bob Fink: And nobody has requested it.

(#1415) Tim Wing: How often can you change this stuff? Annually?

(#1418) Bob Fink: The rezones can be done more than annually, but we'll revisit the Plan generally on an annual basis.

(#1425) Tim Wing: I find half of this to be a waste of time to even talk about it because you don't have a sewer in Belfair, you don't have the roads in Belfair ... let's change it from this to this because we're going to have 6,900 people instead of 5,300 people. You're not going to have anybody in Belfair unless you get the infrastructure. It's nuts to say what's going to be 15 years from now? You don't know. We've got a bridge coming through from Pierce County. Gig Harbor has moved out here. Kitsap County moved out here. You started out, Bob, by talking about how the sewer created all this growth in Allyn. It doesn't cost any less right now to develop a lot in Allyn because there's a sewer there. All those lots up in Lakeland were designed for septic systems and most of them could take a septic system. There were a few that were problems. The reason people all of a sudden moved to Allyn was that Kitsap County and Gig Harbor ran out of places for the builders to build.

(#1465) Bob Fink: And there's no other place to build in Mason County? What this statistic doesn't show is that more building permits were issued in Allyn. What it shows is that where people were locating, a higher % of people that moved to Mason County moved to Allyn.

(#1480) Tim Wing: It's the only place they could move and they couldn't find a place to live where they started looking. This is my backyard; this is what I do. They come into our office all the time saying they decided to look out here because they couldn't find any place in Poulsbo, Silverdale, Port Orchard, Olalla; it's all too expensive so here we are.

(#1500) Wendy Ervin: You had a Street of Dreams and you had people who had a certain expectation of a level of ambience. Allyn offered that. Shelton doesn't. Do we have a Street of Dreams in Shelton?

(#1510) Tim Wing: I'm not going to tell you that the sewer didn't have anything to do with that.

(#1514) Bob Fink: Okay, then we don't need to build sewers.

(#1516) Tim Wing: Yes, we do need to build sewers. What I am saying is that I find all these numbers and projections to be kind of smoke and mirrors. What are we wasting our time with this for? I know we're required to so we need to come up with a number. But I think we need to look outside our county to see why people are moving here as well as taking projections from Olympia and trying to plug them into some notion as to how many people want to move to Belfair where there's no place to build because of the infrastructure. I don't know if anybody has considered sitting down with new incoming people that perhaps are buying a house and asking them why they moved here? I can tell you that at our end of the county about a third of them are going to tell you it's because it was affordable.

(#1550) Bob Fink: So if you provide sewer and it's affordable to live where sewer is they will move there?

(#1550) Tim Wing: Yes, they will.

(#1550) Bob Fink: Okay, that's what I said. I never said anything different.

(#1560) Tim Wing: I have some frustration being on this committee because this committee deals with

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

proposals from staff which we review and then we decide whether to recommend that someone else pass them. So I don't have the authority to pass stuff or to propose stuff. And I see a big problem with Belfair and Allyn. This all stems from the fact that Allyn is so congested you can't get through it and Belfair is worse. So I've been harping about the roads and I don't know if anybody has done anything about this yet, but they're about ready to do eight miles of road in Grapeview. It's a rural road. You can stand out in the middle of it for three minutes sometimes and a car won't hit you. You can't be in Belfair for two seconds without three cars hitting you. The problem with doing maybe twenty miles of roads every year in Mason County ... we asked people that were here where does the money come from? They said one of the reasons we do this is that 75% of the money comes from the federal government and we can't use that for roads inside the UGA. I'm thinking how about using the 25% and that would give us five miles within the UGA and if we had been doing that for the last ten years we'd have plenty of roads in Allyn and Belfair. I don't get it. We're just kind of spinning our wheels, in my opinion.

(#1615) Terri Jeffreys: It was obvious to us at the joint TIPCAP / PAC meeting that their criteria for determining where those road dollars go is safety, safety, safety. It has nothing to do with accommodating growth or anticipating growth. We asked them to please change their criteria and put some of that money towards that. So it's been acknowledged at some level.

(#1635) Bob Fink: Oddly enough, there's a new draft out of the Transportation Element that we're going to distribute tonight before you go. Your issues have been addressed to some degree. You'll have to look at it to see if they're addressed well enough. That's part of your role. They don't have a lot to do with the sizing of the urban areas. They may have a lot to do with what your expectation as to what to realistically expect. One of the things that was included was the designing of a road network, and figuring out where those roads should go, what their capacity should be.

(#1675) Tim Wing: That sounds good.

(#1685) Steve Clayton: Another question on Belfair. The county is working on a master planned unit proposal for the Overtons. That would have a reflection on the population allocation I would assume. What's up on that? We have a plat application from them that's a couple of years old that has roughly 4,000 units in Belfair on their property. I'm assuming this master planned proposal is in place of that plat application. Is that another reason why we should bump the particular allocations in Belfair or have another look at them next year?

(#1720) Bob Fink: That would probably be a reason to look at them again next year, but we don't know yet if they're going to propose something. It's something that the Overtons requested as part of the process when the work program was set. That was added by the BOCC to the work program. Right now we're looking at finishing those amendments that would go into the Comp Plan this year so they can be amended when the Comp Plan is amended and the regulations would follow soon thereafter as possible. They have started holding meetings with stakeholder groups and doing other things that they do to try to develop a draft for consideration.

(#1755) Wendy Ervin: In all of these population considerations we're only talking about residential ... we're not talking about industrial, right?

(#1762) Bob Fink: There are expectations for industrial and commercial ...

(#1766) Wendy Ervin: It would seem to me ... when you're talking about residential you're looking at sewer and water that serve those residences but there are some businesses or industries that are very water intensive.

(#1782) Bob Fink: The system designers take into account a range of demands. They take into account existing businesses and if there were a particular industry in an area they would take that into account. They have various multiplying factors that they use to figure out what the demand is. The sizing of the UGA does take into account the nonresidential land demands. What Steve said near the opening of the meeting, it generally hasn't been an issue that's caused a lot of concern as far as GMA appeals because there's not any real good standards for what the demand is. In other words, how you calculate the capacity and the demand.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

They county, when they established the urban areas, they used acreage that was based on the existing patterns in the county. So many acres of land per 1,000 people and with the population projection, that means it had to be a certain amount of acreage. Similar techniques have been used in other cities and counties. Another technique that's often used is based on employment projections. You figure out what your employment is going to be and then there's rules of thumbs to relate the number of jobs with the area needed on average to serve those people.

(#1885) Wendy Ervin: Are we expecting tonight to make a decision as to which model we wish to hang our hat on for planning?

(#1900) Bob Fink: No. You're not expected to make any decision tonight. I just wanted to let you know more information about what has been discussed with the BOCC and also the current status of our work program. Part of that status is that there will be an update in zoning for Shelton and we'll figure out an allocation which may require a change in the UGA. We'll need to do that for each urban area. The analysis isn't complete for Allyn because we've had issues there, but it doesn't appear that a reasonable allocation to Allyn require a change in the Allyn UGA either. So it's quite possible that the recommendation that will have to come pretty soon will be more or less a status quo. Rather than use this as an opportunity to address those issues, we're still in a mode where we think that further planning is needed. But the deadline can't be moved. So the response to that is to do those things that are necessary on the deadline in the way that's necessary and the rest will wait until next year or the year after. There's a lot of things that you can expect to be happening. You always know more with the passage of time. The planning in Belfair for the sewer. They have enough water capacity in Belfair just on the Belfair Water District service to meet their needs for about 15 or 18 years. There's money available for sewer so financing shouldn't be the critical problem. But it's yet to be done.

(#2000) Wendy Ervin: In the last several years there's been a lot of twiddling of ones thumbs over Belfair and whether they're going to do this or that and now there's a lot of twiddling going on about Shelton and there's an area of the UGA that needs sewer and water but it's not in the city, and the sewer and water is in the city so maybe we need to annex this, but maybe we can't afford to annex this ... it seems to me that there isn't going to be a decision made on expanding the sewer and water until some very large foot comes down and stomps and then maybe somebody will make a decision. Then the other thing is you said something about the Shelton UGA being larger than need be. There was a lady that had nine acres and wanted out. Can we let her out? That would contribute nine acres towards reducing the size of the UGA and make somebody happy.

(#2050) Bob Fink: The problem was the location there.

(#2060) Wendy Ervin: The fact that the line is not straight doesn't seem to have any relevance anywhere else in the county ...it was a formal request about a year ago and it was denied and I thought she should be let out then.

(#2085) Terri Jeffreys: The jury is still out on whether the Shelton UGA is too big.

(#2095) Bob Fink: When we look at areas to remove certainly she would be on the list.

(#2100) Wendy Ervin: Alright. You made me happy. The other thing I'm looking at here is if you're looking at these things, the two that are together are the building permits and the census. If you want to find a trend in something that seems to have some commonality it looks to me like those two patterns are running roughly parallel so it would seem they would be more accurate than anything else.

(#2130) Jay Hupp: Don't we have to go with the OFM projection?

(#2132) Bob Fink: We have to remain within the range.

(#2134) Wendy Ervin: But that is because you have a high estimate and a low estimate so that's right dead center in the middle of the range.

(#2138) Allan Borden: Don't you think census would increase as building permits increase?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

(#2144) Wendy Ervin: I think the difference in those two lines is that the census is following the number of people who are coming in and the building permits ... there's a greater number.

(#2155) Tim Wing: People aren't going to go and get a building permit if they can't buy a lot.

(#2160) Wendy Ervin: I know they've already got the lot. They're either moving from an apartment or some rental situation ...

(#2165) Tim Wing: If you look in here you'll see that the Allyn building permits have just kept on going straight up until all of a sudden now it's going backwards. It would have kept going straight up if there had been lots to build on.

(#2175) Bob Fink: If sewer was in Belfair today it would still take several years for people to plat the land and put in those connections and do everything else that was necessary to provide for the building.

(#2188) Tim Wing: One more comment about where the growth is going to come from. I've got a young family right now that is looking for five acres; two and a half to five acres in the North Mason area. We competed and lost for a \$90,000 five acre piece that's not even on a paved road. Those things now are up to \$90,000 and they're going fast. It was on the market for less than 48 hours and when we got our offer in we were second. Lakeland Village lots three years ago we were selling them for \$20,000 - \$25,000. Lots in the very same area right now are selling for \$62,000 - \$80,000, and there aren't any left. There's a few people who have lots in those old areas of Lakeland on the market for \$115,000. No one has stepped up to that yet but there's people thinking about it.

(#2235) Diane Edgin: Talking about the pressures beyond our borders, Kitsap County, Jefferson County, Thurston County, the medium price of a home in Jefferson County is \$339,000. That's just incredible.

(#2250) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#2440) Bob Fink: I'd just like to touch on Allyn briefly. We don't necessarily need to change the Allyn UGA. For many of the same reasons I've stated before because of the time and the necessity to act by a given date and because of where things fit into the overall situation that may be better to take a status quo approach and leave those things as they are and then readdress it over the next year or two.

(#2495) Bill Dewey: We have a few minutes to open it up for public comment.

(#2510) Ken VanBuskirk: My name is Ken VanBuskirk and I'm from Belfair. Whichever population allocation you folks select and whichever decade you select it in I'd like to suggest that you consider right sizing the Allyn UGA with the stakeholders input and modifying the Belfair UGA to take the Union River Valley out of the Belfair UGA. I've talked to you folks about it before. I agree with Bob that there is a lot of uncertainty but it's a fact that there's a critical aquifer recharge area under the Union River Valley. I don't know if Allyn has a critical aquifer recharge area, but I don't think the GMA intended for us to put impervious surfaces over the top of a critical recharge area.

(#2560) Jeanette Moore: I'm Jeanette Moore. I can't agree with Tim Wing more in that this is not an appropriate process for any kind of considered planning. It seems much more like a full employment plan for planners. There is no criteria for what seems to be happening. There doesn't seem to be any objectives laid out for how you would make choices between what moves and what doesn't. There are no standards. There are no outcomes identified with respect to each urban area except somehow trying to get out from under the mandate of the GMA. And you have been handed an unreasonable timeframe as we have trying to respond to the needs of this time to either expand or contract or have your population allocated. It's no way to run a railroad. The process is simply flawed. We have mentioned just stopping it; being out of compliance for six months and doing a somewhat better job. But I understand that the powers that be don't want to do that. But I have a feeling it's a shell game with who has the pea under the shell. That does not really make for good citizen input. I also object to it on the part of substance. Allyn has been asking for expansion of that for months and you said at the same time that there's no proposal to expand the Allyn UGA. Well, I don't know

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

where the proposals come from to expand the UGA if we haven't been working with the planners and talking to the BOCC and certainly talking to you folks. Let me tell you something about what my concern is and what gives me heartburn. Stretch Island Fruit has just been bought out by Kellogg. They always come in and expand their plants. What is Kellogg going to do sitting down here unless it's in the UGA who can be more responsive to it? This owner here wants to come into the UGA. He sits between the two ends of Razor Road.

We need areas up here for jobs. It isn't enough to just have all these houses. There is no question that the low cost here are putting enormous pressure on Mason County for housing. Within the UGA the only available subdivisions are owned by one property owner. We need others and already the houses here are up to \$300,000. The pastor of the Baptist Church happens to belong to the ACA. He rented a home in Lakeland. He had other properties to sell before he could buy. In between the time he rented and the time he sold his other houses outside the area, he could no longer afford to live in Lakeland. He lives up at Sand Hill and goes back and forth. That's not serving community needs today. I guess I feel a little bit fussy about it since we have been working and working and trying to get some answers out of the county and move forward. We've actually been working on this for nine years. We're not going to live that long. These are important decisions that people need to make today; not two or five years out. Somebody needs to go after water rights up here if there's a hope of developing it. We're particularly cognizant of our mortality. Ben Merservey is a very ill person. We've been sitting down here week in and week out for years and yet we aren't going to all live long enough to see this if you sit around and talk about tweaking something. What's your criteria? What are your objectives? Where are you going? That's basic planning. It's really frustrating and you guys have to be frustrated, too. I'm asking for your cooperation, too. Steve Goins has been absolutely marvelous to help us work through the plan that we're working on now. We gave that plan to the BOCC in October of 2002. We are finally getting some staff support in 2005 to complete it. That draft was paid for out of the ACA funds. We need to respond to people's means and the Baptist minister shouldn't have to go out of town to live. Please consider what the overall program is.

(#2835) Jeff Carey: I looked at some of these fact sheets and I understand there's a lot of assumptions, but I'll just give you another prospective looking at the same numbers. In data that I've looked at from the City of Shelton, in ten years from 1994 through 2004, they've picked up a gross total of 246 dwellings. At 2 ½ per dwelling that doesn't add up to 4,300. Be thinking about that. The thing that concerns me is we're adjusting the populations and allocations to fit whatever we've got. That doesn't, in the long term, seem to make sense. In short term, any time you start making errors in approaches, then you're just compounding the problem. There apparently was little time taken to prepare what the buildout for Allyn and Belfair was. The last page shows R1 dwellings at 560. Maybe there's a new plan out but forever Lakeland was to develop out at 1126 total. I don't know where you picked up a couple hundred more. Even using their numbers with county staff we've agreed that there was, two months back, 830 dwellings in Allyn. Then they show adjustments for market factor and right of way at 3,900 you have enough space. In these meetings we agreed that there's restrictions, sure, but Allyn could easily develop at roughly 50 to 60 dwellings per year. So that's 2,500 to 3,000 on top of the 2,000. So 3,927 doesn't cut it in my book. If it's being changed I don't have any problem with that, but there needs to be discussion and we haven't had it yet. I'm kind of picking at things but I'm a numbers type person and I'll will go through the detail. Those are the problems I see with what's currently presented here.

(#3090) Barry Fischer: I'm Barry Fischer and I live on Sherwood Creek. To answer Tim's question about moving here. I moved here three years ago from Tacoma. I grew up in Kitsap County. I wanted to live in Kitsap County. I was looking at Wildcat Lake when my wife made a phone call and found a piece of property in Allyn that doesn't have any sewers, I didn't care about the sewer; it's got a salmon stream running through the middle of it. It's 9 ½ acres, which at 4 houses per acre, would give me 37 units. But the salmon stream running through it makes almost half of it unuseable and the other half has a hill on it. But as long as I'm alive, there will be no more building on it. That part of it as far as things going on don't make any sense.

(#3165) Sharon Bell: I'm Sharon Bell and I live at Belfair Acreage Tracts. I'm one of those people by the blue rectangle up there and it's in my back yard. He's talking about his little stream on his little piece of property. How would you like a Walmart in your back yard. Or any other kind of a mart. I really think there should be a little more consideration about just one person or a few people pushing so hard for this to be rezoned to commercial where it's residential now. Also taking into consideration all the other things Mr. Case said about the problems you're going to encounter. There's a lot of people with horses and all kinds of other things. We moved there for the specific reason to get away from the city. Now you want to zone it commercial. I think

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 24, 2005

there has to be a better place within this UGA to put that little blue square.

(#3225) Bill Dewey: Anyone else have any comments? Okay, I think we've covered some good ground tonight. There's been some good input, both on UGA boundaries and the population allocation. Do we have any other business to deal with?

(#3265) Bob Fink: I'm going to hand out to you an updated version of the Transportation Element. We will be hearing that along with some other issues on November 1st.

Meeting adjourned.