

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes
November 14, 2005**

(Note audio tape (#3) dated November 14, 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 Vice-Chair Steve Clayton at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

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

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0080) Steve Clayton: We'll start with the Airport Overlay Zone Ordinance.

(#0085) Barbara Adkins: I'm Barbara Adkins with the Planning Department. The 2005 Comp Plan update has a mandated item which is changes to the plan and regulations regarding airports. To address that issue we've put together an Airport Overlay Zone Ordinance that addresses the land uses around Sanderson Airfield. I'll go over the ordinance with you and we also have two people from WSDOT Aviation Division here to help review this. What this Overlay Zone Ordinance is designed to do is to minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards as a result of incompatible land use development around the airport, as well as protecting the airport itself from incompatible land uses that will encroach it and impair planned development and use of the airport. I will read from the ordinance to you. The airport helps us determine what kinds of land use is going to be best suited for the area surrounding the airport and the maps divides the areas around the airport into two different ways of looking at it. Map #2 is the airspace protection areas. These are areas that are in the air that affect the approaches of landing and takeoffs and how this protects the land use in relationship to height. We don't want development that's going to interrupt the flight patterns around the airport. On page 3 it defines how those areas of surfaces are described and put on the map based on how far away from the runway they are. The other map is the safety compatibility zones. There are

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

six of them and they are described starting on page 2. The land use within those zones is what we are trying to have some sort of control over incompatible uses that go in there as far as residential and nonresidential development. What we're asking for in all the zones is that we have no residential land use except for infill and low density development. In the nonresidential areas we're looking for land uses that don't concentrate large numbers of people indoors and outdoors. The table on page 7 has a pretty substantial list of nonresidential development land uses that we put into that category. It's also explained in the text under that table.

(#0265) Jay Hupp: Your description of Zone 5 would have it offset 1,000 feet from the centerline of the runway and connect with these two points here rather than just being depicted as the runway itself.

(#0290) Barbara Adkins: The runway is this line that goes right down the center. Then Zone 5 is this area right along here.

(#0295) Jay Hupp: Okay. Then it describes it right.

(#0300) Wendy Ervin: It seems only common sense to make a plan around an airport. The only thing I wonder is who is training the people who are fielding questions on a county level when somebody calls to find out if they can build this or that? This is a complex sort of thing and it could be easily misinterpreted. There have been several times when somebody comes and they're feeling hysterical because they've been told something by someone at the county that left them feeling hopeless. Then they come in, for instance, and find out they're grandfathered in. There's things like schools and whatever that already exist in that large green area in Zone 6 that seem to be not compatible with what the description of this is and I would like to know that the people at the county who are answering the phone are not going to give out wrong and misleading information and panic someone. It looks to me like you've got the High School, the Jr. High, and a number of churches, quite a bit of gathering together type of activities in this zone.

(#0360) Barbara Adkins: Because this is all new they're not going to have an answer to it and once this goes through and the overlay is put into place then we will have to get the people at the front line and bring them up to speed on it.

(#0385) Bob Fink: I'm Bob Fink, Planning Manager. Training is something that we do on an ongoing basis. When this new ordinance is proposed we'll sit down with everyone who is normally involved in answering questions and train them on this ordinance and how it's interpreted and applied. After that, we meet weekly as a staff and go over what problems may have come up. We meet on a weekly basis to try to resolve these issues. That doesn't mean it doesn't happen. Sometimes people don't always ask the right questions and so they may not get the right answers.

(#0420) Jay Hupp: Has the city had any input on this?

(#0422) Bob Fink: Yes. We met with both the City of Shelton and the Port of Shelton in developing this code.

(#0432) Jay Hupp: And the city is comfortable with one house in five acre zoning in this Zone 6?

(#0435) Bob Fink: The city is outside our jurisdiction. One of the things that came apparent when this was done was that there's a fair amount of flexibility. You know what your goal is; your goals are to try to increase safety of the public and preserve the functioning of the airport. Sometimes there are tensions between those different purposes. All the general guidance is given as to what a good regulation might look like. Ultimately exactly how this is done is up to the local community. This is a county proposal and this is something that presumably we would be able to live with. This is what the public review process is. We haven't heard yet from people to see what the issues are, but there is that conflict and we'll have to see. The city is presumably going to want to adopt a similar regulation and that means that they will need to look closely at the land uses inside the area. We haven't, at this point, heard any response from them as to what they're looking to do. They are in the middle of working on their sub-area plan and that's not finalized at this point. As they move that toward finalization some of the issues may be looked at.

(#0500) Steve Clayton: Concerning the Zone 6 area, on page 7 it says it's 1 DU per 5 acres. Some lay in the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

county's rural area, some in the UGA that's of county jurisdiction and some of the UGA of city jurisdiction. Have we taken steps, or do we plan to take steps, to see that those parcels are zoned appropriately?

(#0520) Bob Fink: We don't have zoning in the urban area at this point. Infill is allowed for existing lots. In the rural area the zoning is pretty much compatible, although we may allow more uses than are here. The list of uses are really a level of intensity so that you could get something like a school. A school is something you wouldn't want in this area but what you're talking about is very small schools. The list of uses in that table are not absolute uses. As proposed now, it would overlay on the zoning. If the zoning says you can do an assembly building or a church, then you can do that as long as you're not exceeding the threshold for capacity. So if you have a 20 member church meeting on 5 acres, then you may well not exceed these thresholds.

(#0565) Steve Clayton: The UGA that the county has jurisdiction over ...

(#0570) Bob Fink: We're waiting for that sub-area plan to be done. One of the issues of developing the final proposal for the sub-area plan will be the interrelationship between the zoning that's part of that sub-area plan and this overlay zone.

(#0580) Jay Hupp: The way I read this, the word 'prohibits' is pretty specific to me.

(#0585) Bob Fink: It prohibits land uses that exceed those thresholds. If you look at that table it says 'Prohibits land uses that concentrate people indoors or outdoors'. Then it says 'These land uses may include ...' Whether or not those land uses concentrate people is depending on a threshold that is contained in the nonresidential development usage intensity criteria on page 8. There could be some of these types of activities that are done on such a low intensity basis that they would be permitted. These are the most likely activities that would exceed that threshold.

(#0640) Wendy Ervin: What about the school stadium, which is an existing use? That could presumably hold more than 100 people per acre. Also, is there going to have to be an adjustment to the size of the UGA to accommodate the fact that these bits of acreage may not allow as much development as a UGA in general allows?

(#0665) Bob Fink: The answer is that we don't know. We're waiting on the sub-area planning work to be done, which would include zoning. That zoning should be coordinated with this overlay area and the concerns that are expressed through it. Then there will be a new proposal when the numbers come out and then the answer may be 'maybe there's not as much capacity as originally was thought'. We're still a ways from knowing what those changes might be if there is an issue. The existing uses can continue.

(#0690) Wendy Ervin: Even if they exceed these limits?

(#0692) Bob Fink: Yes, even if they exceed these standards.

(#0694) Diane Edgin: What about expansions?

(#0696) Bob Fink: It could not be expanded if it's a nonconforming use.

(#0720) Tim Wing: So does that mean the high school would have to move if they wanted to expand?

(#0725) Bob Fink: That's a possibility.

(#0730) Tim Wing: Do you think that's realistic?

(#0735) Bob Fink: That's one of the issues you'd have to deal with. With this regulation you'd need an exception for something that's already there but that would be a consequence of this current draft. That's really a question you'd need to address to the school district. We should consult with them and let them know that could be an issue for them.

(#0750) Jay Hupp: There's an out of court agreement between the school district and the port that restricts

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

the aircraft that are coming into the port from a noise prospective, and it also restricts what the school can do as far as the port's interest are concerned. It seems to me if you're really going to put something like this down on paper you really need to sit down and look at that agreement.

(#0780) John Shambaugh: I'm John Shambaugh with DOT Aviation. It's pretty typical when we do planning around airports that we're going to overlap into the schools. This is a local decision. There may be an option here. The idea is to prohibit K-12 schools especially within Zones 1 through 3, and maybe the option is that you restrict those type of schools or institutions within those zones and still allow your high school to be developed. I'm not sure exactly where your high school is but it's off center. We would rather see an off center development at an airport than one that's down centerline.

(#0810) Bob Fink: Presumably it would be considered a lower risk if it wasn't right in line with the runway.

(#0815) John Shambaugh: The same is true for medical facilities and we would still rather see them prohibited there, and I understand there are some in Zone 3, so you may see some intensity there. You can be creative in how you apply that.

(#0825) Bob Fink: You have to realize that it's not just an issue of safety to the school, but it's also the issue of the over flights and noise and other interference of the operation of the airport with the school. You could make a provision to allow for their expansion.

(#0840) Tim Wing: It would seem to me that we would have to do that or have something in here that allows for negotiation on issues of that type. Right now it can't expand.

(#0850) Bob Fink: This is a draft, but the problem is the proximity of the airport to the school. That's what the issue is, and the question is how do you deal with that issue?

(#0860) Steve Clayton: Under nonconforming conditions, where does it say you can't expand a nonconforming use? It talks about changing a nonconforming use, or abandoning a use.

(#0890) Bob Fink: It only addresses the continuation or maintenance of the use. My thinking is that it would not be allowed to expand because it wouldn't comply with the intensity provisions.

(#0902) Steve Clayton: We'll open up the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#0920) John Shambaugh: I'm John Shambaugh with WSDOT Aviation. I am the senior aviation planner for the state. My primary duties are with the airport system of the state and also the land use program. Kerri Woehler is here, and she's going to be taking over that program. We're here to help provide you with assistance or help in developing this ordinance. The airport overlay that you see here overlays existing zoning. So anything that's allowed in the underlining zone is still permitted unless it's specifically prohibited in the zone.

(#0965) Steve Clayton: If we have a residential development density of 4 DU per acre underneath that, and this overlay zone says 1 DU per 5 acres ...

(#0975) John Shambaugh: The guidelines talk about 1 DU per 5. You have one part of the airport that's rural and you have one part in urban. There are some techniques you can use to increase density. When you're talking about compatibility or safety is more open area. In developing this it's better to do developing off centerline instead of centerline so maybe what you're doing is there's some tradeoffs. If you have a large land parcel you're allowing that use where it exists today to intensify so that it doesn't encroach into these other more risky areas. You can do residential clustering. By looking at some of your maps, there's a lot of wetlands at the east end of the airport so the other question would be what type of use is allowed now and does it even allow residential to occur, and if it does, how can you provide incentive to the community and the developer to develop it a way that's more compatible with the airport.

(#1025) Wendy Ervin: On Map #2, the outside oval ring says 'top of conical surface'.

(#1035) John Shambaugh: That map shows what's above the ground level. Around here there's probably not

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

a lot of activities that would penetrate those surfaces. Anything above the surface is critical for aircraft so what you try to avoid is prohibit any penetration of those surfaces.

(#1040) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#1170) Tim Wing: You described some flexibility as to what could be allowed in different zones. Is that flexibility receptive to the way this is written?

(#1180) John Shambaugh: Yes, there is some flexibility here. There is the potential for infill. You have a mixed use development that allows residential. We saw some areas that still need to be worked on to make it more user friendly, but there is some flexibility built in. The PAC may want to look at additional flexibility. Zones 1, 2, 3, and 4 are the most critical zones. Zone 6 is the traffic pattern around the airport. That's when an aircraft comes in and wants to land on the runway, they're using that traffic pattern and it's not as critical. Zone 5 generally is only for aviation.

(#1222) Jay Hupp: In your relationship to the development of Comp Plans in communities that have airports around the state, how much influence has DOT had over whether or not Comp Plans are acceptable or unacceptable as far as the considerations for airports are concerned? If this community comes forth and rejects the guidance that's reflected in this ordinance, what historically has been the position of DOT as far as the Comp Plan is concerned?

(#1250) John Shambaugh: We provide technical assistance so our mission is to provide you with as much technical assistance as possible so that you can make informed decisions. Also, if you are going to reject certain parts of the overall guidelines, then you need to make findings as to why. There are a couple of provisions with GMA. Cities and towns have to develop policies within their Comp Plans and have consistent DR's that discourage incompatible development. Every community that has adopted guidelines and policies has a different way and a different approach. We're okay with that. If you were to say you were just going to outright not do this then at that point you would have to come up with some very specific findings as to why. You need to be building your record so that if you do go to the GMHB you can defend yourselves.

(#1315) Jay Hupp: What has been the historical activity of DOT on this subject with cases before the GMHB?

(#1325) John Shambaugh: I know of one in San Juan County. There was a hearing there that they did not address compatible land uses down centerline of their runway. The county went back and readdressed the issue. We wrote a letter and told them they did a good job in evaluating their risks and that's actually in the GMHB record. They said that based on the letter that DOT wrote that they were okay with it.

(#1350) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#1425) Wendy Ervin: We have non airport related business activities there. Does this prevent growth of that portion of the port that is businesses?

(#1430) John Shambaugh: No. Industrial and commercial land uses are generally the best land uses you can have around an airport. I've seen a lot of airports around the state and Sanderson Field has probably one of the largest industrial developments around it and that's really good. Even though commercial and industrial uses are the best developments you can have around an airport you still do not want them at the ends of your runway. If an aircraft goes down, it's really not the initial crash that is a problem, but it is the fire that occurs after that.

(#1500) Jay Hupp: When we look at page 7, it talks about prohibited land uses that concentrate people indoors and outdoors. Then there's a list of examples, and it seems to me that includes all of Zone 6, which encompasses most of the port.

(#1525) John Shambaugh: I can tell you there's a lot of communities out there that do not regulate Zone 6.

(#1550) Marlene Taylor: I'm Marlene Taylor, Port of Shelton Commissioner. I noticed it says 'all military uses' in here. I don't know if you're aware of the fact that Sanderson Field was a Navy airfield and that it was

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

deeded to the people of Mason County and then they formed the Port District. In the original deed it does say that if in case of a national emergency, it does revert back to the military. So I think that needs to be stricken or modified.

(#1600) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#1700) Wendy Ervin: This table on page 7 does more to confuse things than it does to clarify anything. You've got all the explanations in the text and by grouping Zones 1 through 6, which are not the same, it doesn't make sense. I think you should strike that table altogether because it is useless and confusing.

(#1750) Steve Clayton: Any more testimony? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing on airport overlays.

(#1790) Tim Wing: I'd like to send this back to staff and ask them to address the point that was made about the military, to create flexibility in Zone 6, with particular attention to the schools and port facilities. Other than that, I think it should be passed.

(#1820) Wendy Ervin: I'd like to add to that to strike that table on page 7. Everything is clearer in the text.

(#1840) Jay Hupp: Marlene, are you comfortable that the port staff has had enough input with this that they're completely comfortable with the way this reads.

(#1845) Marlene Taylor: That's part of the problem. We're going to update our airport master plan in 2006, and it's really difficult when these things don't all happen at the same time. So I'm not sure if we're going to have to follow your plan or how it's going to work. We haven't really had any input at all.

(#1870) Bob Fink: Do you want staff to come up with new language to bring back to you to review, or do you just want to give us direction on how to change the language and we'll wordsmith it consistent with your direction and move on?

(#1890) Tim Wing: I'd like to complete it and move on. Jay, are you comfortable with it?

(#1892) Jay Hupp: I'm very uncomfortable with it. I'm not sure there's been a detailed enough interface with the port staff or city staff for the county to be coming forth with an ordinance that affects both of them.

(#1900) Tim Wing: Is there a way for us to put a clause in here that says that this will be a document that will be reviewed with the port and city in the early part of 2006 and leave it open for adjustments?

(#1915) Wendy Ervin: Send it back to staff to change the language and then it will be brought back in 2006 when the port is ready to do theirs.

(#1935) Bob Fink: That is a concern because we need to adopt implementing regulations that are consistent with our intent. If you're not comfortable with giving direction to staff with what you want to see fixed, or you want to see it again before it moves forward, we can do that. We'll contact the other agencies and see if we can get additional responses from them or input for you and probably bring it back to you next week.

(#1970) Wendy Ervin: We're not mistrusting you changing the language, we just don't want it enacted. We can enact it as an interim document with the language changes.

(#1995) Tim Wing: I'm in agreement with Jay. The county really can't and shouldn't make a decision about all of this right now just because we have a deadline if the port and the city aren't involved with it. How can we put into this that this is an active document but it will be under review and modification given the other two bodies input in 2006?

(#2020) Bob Fink: There's no problem with having it subject to review and the intention to revisit it next year. With the City of Shelton's sub-area planning going on through next year sometime we expect to revisit it in any case. We also were aware that the Port of Shelton was going to update their master plan next year, which I don't think means the beginning of the year, but during the course of the year. What we would like to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

do is adopt an overlay zone with the recognition there's certain planning processes that are still underway and we expect to revisit them next year.

(#2055) Diane Edgin: I don't have a problem with doing what you're suggesting with an overlay zone because we've got to start somewhere. We know from our recommendations that's the zone that needs to be protected.

(#2080) Jay Hupp: John, did you say there were a number of communities that had adopted this concept without putting zoning on Zone 6?

(#2088) John Shambaugh: Yes.

(#2090) Jay Hupp: If we remove all the zoning from Zone 6 I think it eliminates all the concerns.

(#2095) John Shambaugh: One of the reasons they've been able to do that is that they've been able to make a finding that the underlying zone that is Zone 6 is compatible. If you're in the west end of the airport, which is commercial forest, generally the uses in that zone are compatible. You'll be able to make a finding that says we don't need it in this area because it's already compatible. Same with the rest of the area.

(#2135) Jay Hupp: I don't think I have any problem with the relationship with either the port or the city if we eliminate the zoning on Zone 6, and with the stipulation that we make sure there's no conflict with the legal agreement between the port and school district.

(#2155) Wendy Ervin: And the port and the military.

(#2170) Steve Clayton: Do we want to do this as a interim, or let staff make changes, and if there's conflicts, bring it back next year?

(#2175) Tim Wing: Everything is up for review and reconsideration every year, right?

(#2180) Bob Fink: Potentially, yes.

(#2185) John Shambaugh: They are going to be updating their master plan next year and that process is at least a year or longer, and we would encourage that at the end of that process that it be re-evaluated again.

(#2195) Steve Clayton: How do we best address Zone 6?

(#2210) Jay Hupp: Just eliminate the zoning restrictions.

(#2215) Steve Clayton: Do we have a motion?

(#2235) Tim Wing: I move that we accept this with the staff directed to redefine the issue surrounding the military donation of the field, that there be no zoning in Zone 6, that reviews will be done with the school's contract, and we'll strike the table on page 7.

(#2255) Wendy Ervin: I second that motion.

(#2260) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Next is Changes to UGA boundaries.

(#2285) Bob Fink: The memo you received discusses the changes to the UGA boundaries. The recommendation is essentially based on the recommendation that was made earlier regarding population allocations to the UGA's which is to adopt an allocation which is a status quo allocation that would preserve the currently existing boundaries so that the only change to the urban areas is the one that was approved prior to this which was the removal of the VanBuskirk property from the Belfair UGA which is not significant enough to change the projections or to add additional land to balance that.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#2350) Steve Clayton: Any questions for Mr. Fink? Any public testimony on this?

(#2360) Jeff Carey: Jeff Carey, President of the ACA. To me it just seems crazy that whatever boundaries we've got we just adjust the population and that's the allocation. We just need to go through working the numbers through a rationale process and that needs to occur. I appreciate your doing your discussion and recommendation after each presentation. The bottom line is we're not happy with the population allocation at this time because all we're doing is Chinese accounting. It has no rhyme or reason to what's going on. We've stated that several times. I would appreciate your consideration on it.

(#2440) Ken VanBuskirk: My name is Ken VanBuskirk and I live on Davis Farm Road in Belfair. I just received notice of your meeting this morning. I understand that the population allocations are status quo. The BOCC did put our specific rezoning on the agenda, but some of my neighbors want me to help them get out of the Belfair UGA. Some of you know the Belfair UGA boundaries, in particular the Union River Valley, and that has been a concern for at least ten years. I've looked at some of the minutes from this group from back in the 90's and some of the former members and current members recognize the properties in the Union River Valley aren't that buildable. Since the 90's the critical aquifer recharge area has been mapped. There are several salmon bearing streams that have been identified and property values have soared. Although, since that time, Allyn has become a UGA and they're further along with their infrastructure than Belfair is. You have the opportunity to recommend corrections to the UGA boundaries and I would urge you to do that.

(#2535) Buzz Moore: I'm Buzz Moore and I live on SR302 in Victor. I'm a member of the ACA and of the planning committee. I think you're putting the cart before the horse to look at the boundaries before you look at the population and you look at the available land within the boundaries. I haven't seen a description of that so I just can't understand how you can make a decision or take a position unless you look at the population and the available land and then you consider what's going to happen to the market. What's going to happen to the market in Allyn and Belfair if you delay this? Anecdotal information from Richard Bell, who sells real estate for Windermere, and is the principle agent for Lakeland Village, tells me that they're down to around 200 lots now. That has to be addressed or we're just going to bring growth here in North Mason county to a halt.

(#2600) Steve Clayton: Any other comments? We'll now close the public hearing portion of the hearing.

(#2615) Wendy Ervin: I would like to see us in Belfair moving that western boundary back, and making that UGA smaller by taking those lots along the western side of Old Belfair Road and then allowing growth in the eastern portion of the UGA. I think there is a case to be made that all of that that is along that side there should be put back in the rural area and then all growth should take place away from that direction. It is not useful to have that in a UGA.

(#2675) Jay Hupp: Are we sure all the property owners involved would be comfortable with that?

(#2680) Diane Edgin: We don't have anything in writing stating one way or another at this point.

(#2685) Wendy Ervin: That's true, but I just want to have that discussion be open. Mr. VanBuskirk has brought in letters from his neighbors supporting him being taken out of the UGA and he just said his neighbors are wanting his help to get their property out. I think there is a feeling at ground level that these people want to be in the rural area and not the UGA.

(#2705) Jay Hupp: I think probably there is too, but I hate to make a snap decision without having input from all the property owners that are involved.

(#2715) Wendy Ervin: I don't think we can make that decision tonight, but I'm just expressing that's my feeling.

(#2720) Tim Wing: I tend to share your view but also Jay's that it's not something we should be doing tonight. Although I share a lot of views about the valley, I'm not comfortable with diminishing the size of the urban growth area. If you take it out of there you need to make sure it's replaced in some other place and that

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

would require further discussions.

(#2775) Steve Clayton: Mr. VanBuskirk has brought it up before and we actually discussed it at the Belfair planning stage that there are some good environmental points and it's not just the west side of the road. It also includes some of the east on what's considered the critical aquifer recharge area that goes up Old Belfair Highway.

(#2800) Tim Wing: So before us is the question is whether to adopt the staff's proposal and I move that we do that.

(#2815) Steve Clayton: Staff has two proposals. One is UGA's as is and one is the UGA's minus the VanBuskirk property?

(#2825) Bob Fink: No. We're supporting the change to the VanBuskirk proposal. That's the only exception. When we said that all the UGA's would be left the same, that's with the exception of changing the VanBuskirk property, which you've already acted on. That doesn't plan a major role in determining the area.

(#2850) Jay Hupp: I'm going to second Tim's motion.

(#2855) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes to accept staff's recommendation. We'll move on to the Essential Public Facility hearing.

(#2880) Allan Borden: I'm Allan Borden with the Department of Community Development. I have a short staff report that discusses a change in the definition in the Comp Plan and DR's concerning Essential Public Facility land uses. Staff reviewed the definitions in both the Comp Plan and DR's for Essential Public Facilities and in reviewing those related to the City of Shelton, the county Public Works Department had a concern that their existing operation and maintenance facilities located in both Shelton and Belfair weren't really clearly defined as essential public facilities in our definitions. Staff would agree that providing roads in the county and having an operation and maintenance facilities for both equipment and materials used for maintain public right of ways, that they do provide an important function just as important as airports and state highways do. Staff proposes to make the changes that are on page 2 of the staff report that include local transportation facilities, including operation and maintenance facilities and a change in the DR's that also include public works operation and maintenance facilities.

(#3005) Wendy Ervin: I think that sounds very fair and I make a motion that we accept staff's recommendation.

(#3010) Steve Clayton: Let's see if there's any public testimony before we rule on this.

(#3020) Kerri Woehler: I'm Kerri Woehler with WSDOT. We would also propose that you include Sanderson Field Airport among your essential public facilities. The GMA recognizes airports as essential public facilities and clearly identifying the airport among some of the other important facilities that you just mentioned helps protect the airport and helps add to the policy foundation in your Comp Plan for the DR's.

(#3045) Steve Clayton: Looking at this, I see that airports are already included in both of the sections. Sanderson Field is just not listed individually.

(#3055) Kerri Woehler: Okay, we would just support having that and adding the label of Sanderson Field onto it to get specific.

(#3068) Steve Clayton: Any other comments? We'll close the public hearing on Essential Public Facilities.

(#3075) Wendy Ervin: We can include Sanderson Field into each of these, although it doesn't state the names of state education facilities, the prison, the courthouse is not named, so I'm not sure it's necessary.

(#3100) Tim Wing: I agree with you. If you don't name all of them then you shouldn't be naming any of them.

(#3130) Bob Fink: This would also address any new airports.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#3150) Tim Wing: I move that we pass this as recommended by staff.

(#3155) Wendy Ervin: I second the motion.

(#3157) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes to accept staff recommendations on Essential Public Facilities. Next is population projections and allocations to the urban areas.

(#3180) Bob Fink: There's nothing new to report to you.

(#3190) Steve Clayton: So staff is recommending alternative #1 on page 2 of the November 1 memo. We'll open it up to public testimony.

(#3240) Buzz Moore: My name is Buzz Moore. I'll hand out to you a paper I wrote regarding Allyn Growth Estimates and I want to make it a matter of record. Figure #1 shows the projection model we have to the data that Bob Fink had brought together on the ratio of the building permits in Allyn to the county building permits. You can see that with the square data points, those are the Bob Fink data and triangles are the model. You can see that it's a very close fit except for one point. Mr. Wing said last week that was because of anticipation of building in Lakeland, which probably is accurate. That is the data point that really doesn't belong to the set. If we turn over to Figure #2, this is the ratio if we project it out using the model and you can see that if nothing changed Allyn would capture over 60% of the building permits. If we wanted to estimate the number of households we would need for the population, we would multiply this number on Figure #2 times the corresponding estimate for Mason County households. That would give us the estimate of the households in Allyn. On Table #1, I looked at the different alternatives that Bob Fink had put into his presentation and at the bottom of the page of his presentation he had alternatives A through D. Then I calculated the compound growth rate for what is implied by those population growths. It's not very extraordinary. You can see under alternative A they expect Mason County for the next 20 years will only grow 1.68% on a compound rate. Alternative D, which is the highest growth rate, it is only about 3%. I was interested in the news tonight about the pressure in the central Puget Sound counties for housing and I suspect that these numbers way underestimate what we're going to have. On page 5 are the Allyn Growth Estimates Under Different Scenarios. The top scenario is alternative D and this is how Allyn would grow in population with that scenario. The bottom scenario is alternative A and then I examined a curve that he had that looked at population growth as determined by the building permits and that is plotted where we have the circles. Just below that where we have the solid dots is that determination but with an assumption that Belfair was going to capture some of Allyn's growth. I don't think that's going to happen. I think the housing market is so strong that Belfair and Allyn would be complementary to each other. If you look at the near 'O' on this plot, we're just about in the position where Allyn is now with 200 lots. If we look at alternative #1, we would have about 904 households with alternate A in growth, and about 440 households with alternate D. If we follow those and we had lots available we'd run out of our 20 year growth early into 2009. I have chosen the 2012 as really being as far as we can reliably extrapolate it. It seems to me that alternative #4 that Bob has proposed is what we should look for. That's out far enough in the future that we could bring lots on and have subdivisions and go through the process of building a community and we would still have time to examine our growth and make adjustments. The ACA recommends that we make a choice of population based out to 2012 and that we plan to examine that about 2009 to readjust. We recommend that it be about 5,500 persons, which corresponds to alternative #4 as applied to this data that I got from the building permits.

(#3780) Steve Clayton: Buzz, staff has told us that you are on the agenda next year for review because the Allyn plan is an interim plan.

(#3782) Buzz Moore: We have been on the agenda to have this job done for ten years now. Do you think that makes any difference to us? Do you think that we can trust what the county has said?

(#3798) Steve Clayton: This year we passed an interim zoning code for Allyn and it ...

(#3800) Buzz Moore: That's the one thing that has happened. We haven't had our roads repaired, we haven't had investment in the community. Mason County has taken tax money out of our community and has not returned it. So how can we trust what they're going to say? So you think they're going to do that?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#3825) Steve Clayton: It's an interim zoning code and I believe Mr. Goins has been regular in attendance in working with you, hasn't he?

(#3838) Buzz Moore: Just do what you will.

(#0185) Jeff Carey: Jeff Carey, President of the ACA. The ACA does not support the current population allocations. We also find it very interesting how you're going to make a decision when basically this process has no scientific basis. It appears clearly that whether we're talking this year or next year that there's a whole process with identifying population allocations that we're not doing. So we're not happy. We've been talking to staff and trying to work through this but if you ask us at this point in time, we're not happy with the approach that's being recommended by staff. The proper research has not been done and I think it's really disingenuous to the whole spirit of the GMA issue of just plopping down numbers without digging down in the trenches and digging out the data. To my reading of the WAC's, we're not following the process. That's up to you, but I don't think the county is, I don't think this process, and I don't think we even have. We need to get to that process. Whether it changes population or boundaries, we have to have a process so that all citizens in this community feel and trust what's going on. We may not get our way, but at least it has proper process.

(#0265) Steve Clayton: So to clarify your position, Jeff, your group is not happy with it. Not the ACA in general, but the ACA planning committee?

(#0270) Jeff Carey: The ACA is run by the board of nine. Contrary to popular belief, it's the board that's on the hook. So a committee is made up of two or more board members typically and has other general members from the association. The idea is that a committee works out the nitty, gritty business for the board, makes a presentation to the board, and then the board buys off or not. The board, to this point, has been supportive of all the issues I've brought to you. The board's position is that these matters need to be addressed in the proper and right way. Obviously we've been lobbying for changing this or changing that, but the proper process needs to be followed, and that's not really my job to identify, but I feel like our organization is on the short end of the stick and that in the end, all people, whether they want the boundaries changed or not, will feel better if the proper process is followed. In my judgment, we are not following the proper process.

(#0315) Tim Wing: Is there a particular alternative on this list that you prefer?

(#0320) Jeff Carey: I will state that because that list is not created with the proper process, to choose anything is wrong; period.

(#0350) Ken VanBuskirk: Ken Vanbuskirk. I have a suggestion. I heard something earlier about adopting status quo on the population allocations. I understand that DOE is asking the counties to look at their critical aquifer recharge areas in 2006 and since the population allocations in the UGA boundaries go hand in hand, and since none of our current county commissioners approved the Belfair sub-area plan, might I suggest that you recommend to the BOCC that they take a look at the Belfair sub-area plan for amendment.

(#0400) Jeanette Moore: I'm Jeanette Moore. What I haven't heard anybody discuss is a firm schedule for going back to the GMHB and adjusting the boundaries. I've heard a lot of 'well, we'll look at next year', but I haven't heard any agreed upon schedule for doing that next year. My question is 'when does the law mandate that the county must go back before the GMHB and review it's boundaries'?

(#0425) Tim Wing: It's my understanding there are opportunities to review them annually.

(#0430) Jeanette Moore: But when must it be reviewed again?

(#0435) Bob Fink: If the question is when must these numbers be reconsidered by the GMHB, the answer is never. The action of the county could be appealed to the GMHB with a petition following any failure to act. If no one petitions the GMHB, it's never heard by the GMHB.

(#0450) David Overton: She's asking when the Comp Plan needs to be updated; when is that mandated by state law?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#0455) Bob Fink: I don't believe it's required to be revisited for about ten years.

(#0460) Jeanette Moore: The only outside of the county imposed demand on approaching adjusting the boundaries of these UGA's and having an amended Comp Plan, and having a data based review of population growth won't happen for another ten years by state law. So what you in effect are saying is that we weren't able to do this this year and if the GMHB understood very clearly the basis for these allocations, would that meet their criteria for adequate planning? So you're saying 'Gee, trust us'. My question to the PAC is, if this was your community with our history what would you urge? We're just citizens like you sitting trying to make the best of difficult times.

(#0530) Steve Clayton: Any other comments on population allocations? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing portion.

(#0535) Wendy Ervin: Alternative 1, which is the recommendation of the staff, has such a small amount allocated to Belfair because of conditions that have been in Belfair, but those conditions are not going to necessarily maintain, so I don't believe we can just extend current growth trends based on what has been because what has been will not be in the future. Alternative 1 is just not rational especially in terms of what the numbers are for Belfair.

(#0560) Tim Wing: I tend to agree with you. I think the entire situation in Belfair changed last Tuesday with the gas tax not being repealed and the probability that the alternative route would be built there and Highway 3 would be greatly improved. Also, with getting the sewer there, all of a sudden Belfair changes from a place that has almost no where to build to a place that has huge areas to build. I also bring up that all of these projections have failed to take into consideration the things outside our county. The Tacoma Narrows Bridge, the policies and efforts in the surrounding counties to either stifle growth pushing people into Mason County, or to rapidly develop and create more lots. Thurston County has a moratorium right now on cluster development and on any new developments. That has to have an impact on people wanting to come to Mason County. None of these figures took any of that into consideration.

(#0625) Steve Goins: It sounds like there may be some confusion between what staff's recommendation is and the alternatives on the table. Staff's recommendation is not one of the alternatives that's included on the table.

(#0640) Bob Fink: Alternative 1 in the memorandum is closest to Alternative 6, but it doesn't match any of the alternatives that are on the table. It's pretty close to alternative 'b', which is the intermediate growth plus 10,000 people, which would be the number we're using for analysis purposes. It is not identical to alternative 'b' and one of the ways it's most different is in the allocation to Allyn. The reason for that is we think, in the long run, the best allocation is the 2,500 people, but because the planning for Allyn isn't done yet, so we wouldn't know where to expand Allyn, and that's really the principle reason why we feel we're not ready to act yet to change the boundary of Allyn, which would be the consequence of allocating more people there because then you need to bring the area of the urban area back in balance with the population allocation. When earlier this evening you voted to keep the current boundary of Allyn, it was basically based on the theory that that was the way you would go with population allocation. The problem with expanding Allyn isn't that it's necessarily contrary to our recommendation. Our recommendation is concerned about the basis on which the expansion would be and where the expansion should take place and what the zoning should be in the area that's expanded. Those issues haven't been explored to an adequate level of detail to act at this time. That's why the recommendation is a status quo. We hoped to have those answers by this time, but the sub-area planning is simply not ready. When they looked at some possible areas of expansions, they ran into issues with the local property owners and other people with interest in the property they were considering expanding into. You had some testimony on that. The issue is where is the proper place to expand? We don't know so that's why the recommendation we're making is to not change it until these issues are settled. My understanding of the BOCC and my understanding of what the public desires is that these issues not be left sitting for ten years and that we continue to work on them.

(#0780) Diane Edgin: I could be comfortable with that if I saw a date that we would revisit it.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#0785) Bonnie Knight: Bob, isn't there a schedule that the GMHB has on a yearly basis where you have to have stuff to them by a certain date in the year in order for them to deal with it next year?

(#0795) Bob Fink: That schedule is an internal schedule. In order to take action on something by the end of the year, the county would need to have started the process by about the middle of the year because of the public process.

(#0805) Bonnie Knight: But it all leads up to a GMHB date.

(#0810) Bob Fink: It's the county submission date. They wouldn't be involved with the action by the county unless there is a petition filed with them. The GMA does limit the county to acting once a year and so that typically has been towards the end of the year and that is a restriction we have for amending the plan.

(#0825) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#1005) Tim Wing: How critical is it that we have a number for this, and that we have a number by December 1st? These numbers were all developed before we even knew if we were going to have an alternative route in Belfair, or they were going to do Highway 3. They don't take into consideration all kinds of outside things.

(#1015) Bob Fink: There's all kinds of things we don't know now that we'll know a year from now or two years from now. That's why these plans change and are intended to be monitored and adjusted as they need to be.

(#1020) Wendy Ervin: He asked how critical it was.

(#1025) Bob Fink: It's my understanding that we wouldn't be able to update the plan as we are required to do under GMA unless we adjust the time horizon to 2025. That gives us a 20 year plan.

(#1035) Wendy Ervin: So we have to pick some numbers.

(#1040) Bob Fink: Right. We have to pick some numbers if we're going to do it on time. Not only are they numbers from Allyn but also the numbers from Shelton need to be examined in more detail. The same issues arise as to how are you going to change it? Which properties are going to go out of the urban area, which properties are going to be changed into an industrial use rather than residential? What specifically is being proposed as far as a change? Just remember that GMA clearly states that the UGA's have to be sized consistent with the allocation of population of those urban areas. So to have that inconsistency is something that you know is not going to be acceptable.

(#1100) Wendy Ervin: We've just accepted the UGA's at the sizes that they are. How does this lay on the UGA sizings that we just decided?

(#1110) Bob Fink: It's the same. Those allocations that we're recommending would meet the capacity of the urban areas as they now stand.

(#1130) Steve Clayton: Did you come up with a hard number for the rural allocation?

(#1135) Bob Fink: We have a hard number now and it's the balance left over from this projection here so if 31,299 people were to move into the county, you subtract the three urban areas from that total and the one FCC and that balance is the balance that would be expected to move into the rural area.

(#1165) Steve Clayton: Any further discussion or questions for staff?

(#1170) Tim Wing: I don't see we have much choice with these numbers, but I would like to see the PAC urge the BOCC to commit to revisiting the shape and size of at least the Allyn and Belfair UGA's to reconsider these population numbers and the size and shape of the UGA's because of new issues regarding roads, sewers and revisiting population growth projections and to do all of that by the end of 2006. I took seriously the comments from the Allyn people that they have been at this for ten years and it's still not even complete.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

Life isn't that long. I fully recognize that commissioners have changed, politics have changed, staff people have changed; there's reasons why we are where we are. I'd like to urge them to get on to revisiting those issues in 2006 so we don't sit here next year and listen to people saying this has been going on for eleven years.

(#1222) Steve Clayton: A perception I have on that is the Allyn plan was accepted last year with the currently accepted area. That was the first nine years. In the last year they have decided to expand it so this expansion that they're talking about has just happened this year. The rest of the UGA that they've been working on was approved; it's an interim document but it was approved. So they haven't been working on this expansion for ten years.

(#1240) Bonnie Knight: Five or eight years ago we did ask for a larger area and we were told 'no'. That's not an accurate statement. Bob Fink was at those meetings so he can tell you. I just want to make the record clear.

(#1260) Jay Hupp: I concur with Tim. It was pretty obvious way back last summer that we were going to get between a rock and a hard place in trying to bite off more than we could possibly get done in a six month period and we've run into this frustration with every subject that's come in front of us. I think we've had an inadequate opportunity to study this subject in depth and come up with an intelligent decision in every one of these things. I fully appreciate the frustration out there in the audience and I suffer with the same frustration too. On the other hand, we can either ride on this train or we can get off of it. I think we need to make a decision on the numbers but I also concur that I think we ought to recommend to the BOCC that there be a date certain to begin to put some of the very important aspect of this Comp Plan into a study environment that's going to come up with some better answers. I make a motion to accept the alternative proposed by staff.

(#1340) Wendy Ervin: I second the motion.

(#1344) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second to approve the recommendation by staff. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#1350) Tim Wing: How do we deal with the message to the BOCC to urge them to revisit these things by the end of 2006?

(#1360) Steve Clayton: The interim needs to be approved or extended on Allyn. Will the boundaries be available for changing through that?

(#1370) Bob Fink: The interim zoning code in Allyn expires March 31, 2006. How is progress on the work in Allyn, Steve?

(#1378) Steve Goins: We've made progress on the sub-area plan. The single biggest piece we've had trouble getting ahead on is our capital facilities plan. The idea was to try to finalize the sub-area plan and do an analysis of the zoning to ensure that's compliant with what we're trying to achieve. We haven't had time to analyze whether that UGA needs expanding and how you would accomplish that.

(#1405) Steve Clayton: Just to refresh everyone's memory, the PAC never reviewed the Allyn plan. We passed it on to the BOCC on an interim basis. It was never brought to us for a public hearing.

(#1415) Tim Wing: I think there's real problems with expanding the UGA. There's no available water there for development and the decision to expand that UGA behind Lakeland Village is a big decision about road expenditures as well as property owners. Even though I'd like to see some headway by 2006 I'm not believing that by the end of 2006 you're going to have an expanded Allyn. That's just not realistic. I think it is realistic in Belfair within two years.

(#1455) Steve Clayton: So the current plan by staff is by March 31st to have an update on the interim and have it accepted as a plan and then review from there population allocations and possible expansion?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#1465) Steve Goins: In addition to that the department is working with the EDC to analyze industrial land county wide and have a study done that would determine how much industrial land is appropriate within the county, where that land should be designated industrial and compare that to where we are. That would also help in the Shelton analysis to determine how much industrial land we should be planning for this 20 year horizon. Adding industrial land to the Allyn area would be something that would be considered once we have that study in hand. We hope to have that in the first quarter of 2006.

(#1495) Bob Fink: So March might be a little early to have a final conclusion on an allocation and expansion of the boundary but there should be good progress by then.

(#1500) Tim Wing: The county has to make a decision on whether they're going to spend money on roads inside these UGA's or aren't they. Serious money in Allyn's case if they're going to do any significant expansion of that UGA. If they're not going to do that then there's no sense in expanding the UGA boundaries.

(#1530) Steve Clayton: Back to the original question. Do we want to pass onto the BOCC to put a date certain on this?

(#1532) Tim Wing: I used the word 'urge'. I would just like to go on record to urge them to revisit the shape and size of the UGA's by the end of 2006.

(#1548) Allan Borden: The BOCC can't act on a proposal unless the community comes forward with a justifiable sub-area plan and whether there's a need to revise the zoning and zoning standards. I think it's realistic that we're going to have to extend the zoning code past March, but maybe by the end of June the community can have a draft plan and regulations for the PAC to review. When you get to August, September and October of next year you already have a work program that has eleven items on it excluding Allyn. The idea of having that early on ... you don't want to get caught at this time next year reviewing the Allyn plan. It's imperative that the community move forward in a cooperative effort for you to review.

(#1600) Tim Wing: I see the BOCC as the leaders of the county and they can go to Belfair and/or Allyn and meet with community groups and ask for their input and if they want to get going on a revision to the plan they can help assist in doing that.

(#1615) Allan Borden: The community really ought to get started on it December 1st.

(#1620) Steve Clayton: Is that a motion?

(#1622) Tim Wing: I would move that we make a recommendation to the BOCC and urge them to commit to revisiting the shape and size of the UGA's by the end of 2006 considering new development for roads, sewers and population growth.

(#1638) Jay Hupp: I second that motion.

(#1642) Bob Fink: There will be a countywide study of industrial and commercial land needs as well so you'll probably end up revisiting all of them.

(#1655) Steve Clayton: So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Next is the Health and Human Services Element.

(#1700) Steve Goins: I'm Steve Goins with the Department of Community Development. I have a new draft for you. What I attempted to do with this version is address the comments that were made at the public hearing last week, as well as some comments I received through the briefing with the BOCC. We also met with environmental health staff and through that process came up with some revisions as well. On page 2, we added some information that pertains to some of the social conditions in the county which we thought was good background information. On page 3, we added some text that confirmed some findings about the number of doctors in the county. I thought this was worth mentioning. The US Dept of Health and Human Services does an annual analysis of all counties and through their gathering of data makes this determination.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

Mason County for a number of years has been determined to be part of what they call a professional shortage areas. That's based on population. On page 5, we changed the structure of that paragraph and enhanced it and itemized the items that we were trying to address in some of those strategies which did include the medical savings account plan and a consideration for the establishment of a Federal Qualified Health Clinic in Mason County. In the case of the second one that was something that would be helpful to help us shore up conditions where people are using the emergency room to get basic health care done. That adds stress to the financial structure of Mason General Hospital. Addressing some of the comments that were made by the PAC, in the last paragraph we elaborated on some of the conditions on the wells which we discussed. What we wanted to do was explain or give some reasoning behind the policy that we are contemplating as well as to remove some of the language that made it sound like what our policy was trying to do and that was to limit or eliminate the private wells. That wasn't our intention of that policy. On page 7, we rephrased strategy 'B' so that it better states what the policy's objective is and that is to improve water quality by encouraging community water supply. We also added this fourth objective considering periodic updates to the countywide storm water management policies and programs that would address urban style development impacts. In policy 'C' we address the comments that pertain to trails countywide. What we wanted to add to this is to instead of just encouraging trails anywhere at any time, to focus and have some analysis done to determine where trails might be most appropriate. That summarizes the changes that were made from the last version you looked it.

(#1800) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#2066) Jay Hupp: I'm comfortable with the way you reworded the subject of the wells.

(#2070) Wendy Ervin: And I'm comfortable with the way you reworded the subject of the trails.

(#2075) Steve Clayton: Do we have any public testimony? We'll close the public hearing portion. Any questions for staff? Any discussion?

(#2080) Diane Edgin: I make a motion that accept this as written.

(#2085) Jay Hupp: I second the motion.

(#2088) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. On to Harstine Island. Do we have any public testimony? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing portion.

(#2130) Wendy Ervin: I make a motion to eliminate the wording as the staff has recommended on forest land uses.

(#2135) Jay Hupp: I second the motion.

(#2138) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. We'll now move on to the Transportation Element.

(#2160) Steve Goins: Last week there was memo from Tim Wing regarding some suggestions for policy considerations that Emmett drafted. Staff did look at those and in summary, the Public Works Dept didn't necessarily agree with all of those. There was some elements of that that they could support, for example, they thought it was a good idea to include language that would create a joint process where the PAC worked with the TIPCAP in the review of the six year plan. There was some other funding proposals in there that there was less support for. At this point, Emmett was looking for some direction from this committee about whether you wanted to see some additional changes in policy or if you wanted to move this forward as the draft that was last presented.

(2268) Tim Wing: I'm in favor of incorporating virtually all of this language that Emmett drafted and in addition, a couple of other paragraphs. I'm not expecting the staff to agree with them but I would like to see it included. First of all, I want to make sure people know what I'm talking about here. This is a memo to me from Emmett, which was the result of a discussion we had. In addition to the things that he penned, I would also like to see two paragraphs inserted. They are as follows: 'The county will embark on an aggressive effort to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

re prioritize future road expenditures with particular attention to improving road infrastructure within the UGA's'. 'In evaluating road needs within the county, congestion and safety issues on all roads (state and county) will be considered'.

(#2330) Wendy Ervin: I agree with both of those.

(#2332) Jay Hupp: So do I.

(#2334) Steve Clayton: On the first page of Emmett's memo it talks about dedicating 12.5% of all year end current fund balances to future capital improvements. I haven't reviewed that. Is that something you've reviewed and find acceptable?

(#2345) Tim Wing: I don't quite understand what the impact of that is but at the end of the year certain budgets have money left over and it creates a surplus of account and he suggested that perhaps some of that money could be allocated toward improving the transportation network and create economic development. I'm all in favor of those issues so I don't have any objection to that. It's certainly not my intention that that would be the only monies spent on improving the road structures.

(#2400) Wendy Ervin: I would like these two very last things regarding trails that are in the Health and Human Services Element be put into the Transportation Element. But this whole trails things needs to be looked at for money, usage and demand.

(#2410) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#2525) Steve Clayton: I have two specific recommendations in the plan. On page 2.1 under the Public Participation Policy. We have some carry over language from the previous plan where it says that 'This transportation element was developed with the assistance of the Growth Management Advisory Committee established specifically to help prepare the Comp Plan'. It goes on to say 'Mason County will continue to use a similar committee to advise and periodically update the plan'. I would like to see those two sentences deleted. The particular paragraph continues on and I would like to see that remain. The only other thing was on the figure that you passed out which shows potential new roads. I would like to see the 101 Connector put back on that. It was in the draft plan and we spent money on the initial studies and it was in the initial draft.

(#2600) Jay Hupp: I think politically that's a dangerous thing to do. There's so much public confusion about what the Belfair Bypass and the 101 Connector are. As long as we've got the money identified for the Belfair Bypass I think we should not even raise the potential of confusing the public mind on the connection between the Bypass and the Connector.

(#2640) Tim Wing: I tend to agree with that and I would add that I don't think that road is as critical to our next twenty years in this county as getting the road systems built inside the UGA's.

(#2685) Jay Hupp: I think put it back in at a time when it's no longer politically dangerous. After the Bypass is locked in.

(#2695) Steve Clayton: I can live with that.

(#2705) Tim Wing: I think the page that Emmett penned is the part that Bob is saying they favored because they like the idea of having our commission and the TIPCAP people work together. Are there things in this list that people object to?

(#2750) Steve Clayton: Steve, you made mention that Public Works had problems some of Emmett's things.

(#2765) Steve Goins: Yes. For example, in the last paragraph, I think they were comfortable with a co-planning effort on the 20 and 50 year plan, but in their mind, that was TIPCAP's charge to develop that 6 year plan and they wouldn't object to an opportunity to comment on that but they feel that it's ultimately their charge to come up with that. They also had an issue with the funding source. It may not be feasible to do that for a number of reasons. One might be, for example, those funds might be particularly allocated for one

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

specific use and it might be inappropriate or even illegal to appropriate them for another use.

(#2850) Steve Clayton: So we'll just strike the '6' out of the paragraph.

(#2888) Tim Wing: TIPCAP has been told what to do and that's just fix existing roads. There aren't any existing roads inside the UGA's. So there's nothing on the 6 year plan and that's my point. They need to have a different charge.

(#2900) Steve Clayton: On the first paragraph on the second page I think we should add to the end that we should be given an opportunity to review and comment on the annual 6 year TIPCAP project list before it is submitted to the BOCC.

(#2975) Tim Wing: I'd be comfortable with that. But I also think that separate paragraph should be added regarding the creation of a new process to develop the road network. It prioritizes how this is going to be done. The road system and the overall plan for the county has to melded together. It doesn't make any sense to have the TIPCAP group doing what they have been doing, even though they were told what to do, but all they're doing is repairing rural roads. We need to focus considerable money and attention in the near future so that urban areas can take that growth. I'd also like to change the date of '2010' to '2007'.

(#3000) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#3200) Steve Clayton: I'd like to see us work together to develop the direction to go but not get into the minutiae. They do a good job.

(#3225) Tim Wing: I follow you and some of the discussions I've been a part of or heard about include that the BOCC could decide to have the TIPCAP do exactly what they're doing but have a portion of their budget devoted to rural roads and have another portion of the budget to go in urban roads. It has to change and the way to have that done is take their leadership responsibilities and go in and revise the charge to their group and our group. I think that can be done.

(#3300) Steve Clayton: Do we have any other comments?

(#3310) Tim Wing: Let me review the comments. I'm proposing that we adopt everything except this last one on page one that has the allocation of the funds. Apparently that's not a good idea at this time. At the top of the second page where Steve added that we should have an opportunity to review the plan before it goes to the BOCC. On the past page with the large paragraph, I'm proposing that we change the date from '2010' and 2007'. And then add the two hand written paragraphs at the bottom. I move those be incorporated into the Transportation Element.

(#3400) Wendy Ervin: I second that motion.

(#3410) Steve Clayton: Is anybody in favor of removing the two sentences about the Growth Management Advisory Committee?

(#3415) Jay Hupp: Yes.

(#3420) Wendy Ervin: I'll make that motion.

(#3450) Tim Wing: I second it.

(#3435) Steve Clayton: So we have a motion and a second to add those to the plan. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Any other correction or additions?

(#3468) Wendy Ervin: I'd like to incorporate into the Transportation Element those two sentences about the trails in the Health and Human Services Element. They need to be tied together. So that's my motion.

(#3550) Tim Wing: I second that motion.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#3565) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Do we have a motion to accept the draft Transportation Element as amended?

(#3590) Tim Wing: I so move.

(#3595) Wendy Ervin: I second the motion.

(#3600) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second to accept the draft Transportation Element as amended. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Let's go on to the Land Use Element.

(#3700) Barbara Adkins: I'm Barbara Adkins with the Department of Community Development. I have another updated version of the Land Use Element to hand out to you incorporating most of the things we talked about last week. On page 7, the table 206, the unincorporated area also has the UGA's population broken out of that. On page 11, we now have numbers for area growth projections. On page 16, we corrected the acreage of the Allyn UGA. On page 19, we have the table for Land Supply Summary for Belfair UGA. On page 20 is the table for the Allyn UGA Land Use. On page 21 is the table for the Land Use Analysis for the Allyn UGA. On page 22 is the table for the Shelton UGA Land Use. On page 24 is the table of the Rural Land Capacity Summary with the footnotes that we previously discussed. There are a couple of small corrections on page 36, page 40, page 41, page 42, and page 43. On page 42, the waters now have letters associated with them. The feet of the ordinary high water mark of each of these has been changed.

(#0265) Jay Hupp: The point was when somebody reads through this they've got to be able to understand what we're talking about. Whatever type water it is, it has to be consistent. When you're going to put a setback figure with an animal they have to understand what that animal is.

(#0400) Bob Fink: In order to help with the confusion I think that on page 42 and 43 we should take out the actual numbers and just give the framework for the areas that should be regulated in order to implement these purposes and not try to give the exact number of feet and all the if's, and's, and but's. People aren't going to be able to rely on the Comp Plan. You're actually regulating it through the regulations and not through the Comp Plan. The Comp Plan just sets the framework.

(#0420) Jay Hupp: You can do that but there was information that referred me to a WAC. If you're going to do that, refer me to something I can get my hands on. We need to make it easier for the people to deal with and understand.

(#0450) Tim Wing: I agree with your idea of taking it out of this document. But going along with Jay's concern, it seems like that might be a nice little county brochure to be able to hand out.

(#0465) Bob Fink: It's always been one of our goals to actually have that information in brochures but they were changing so quickly it never seemed quite the effort to get them out because they were always outdated by the time they were done.

(#0500) Barbara Adkins: There were also some changes on page 56. I met with Wendy last week and got some new comments regarding the policies that were not changes but just tightening up of the language.

(#0525) Wendy Ervin: When we went over those there was one thing that could not be put in the current draft because it was actually a change.

(#0575) Jay Hupp: I'm still troubled with this rural character on page 68. Somewhere in this character we need to articulate that that 62% of the businesses in this county are outside the UGA's and the RAC's. That is a striking character.

(#0610) Bob Fink: I thought you already approved a motion to do that.

(#0615) Barbara Adkins: You did, but it just hasn't been changed yet.

(#0625) Wendy Ervin: I have made suggestions to Barbara about changing the Mason County Planning

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

Policies so that they were much more condensed. I cut them from 30 to 14. In those were two dealing with the industry and building and employment that I would like to urge us to come back to and discuss when the time is right to make changes to. She's going to come back with my suggestions at a later date.

(#0666) Bob Fink: We'll be at a point later in the year when we can come back to some of those things that we've been working on. That wasn't one of the things on the work program previously.

(#0670) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#0750) Jay Hupp: The reference to the Sustained Yield on page 54 needs to be taken out of there. It is now defunct.

(#0760) Allan Borden: You could leave it in there as a historical fact and end the paragraph by saying it's now defunct.

(#0800) Jay Hupp: There's a reference here on page 49 that says that DOE has said that there's a hydrological connection between streams and the aquifers. Has DOE actually made a connection?

(#0850) Barbara Adkins: This is old language so I'd have to investigate that.

(#0880) Jay Hupp: If you can't prove that that statement is correct, I'd take it out of there, because it has far reaching ramifications.

(#0910) Wendy Ervin: Looking back at this forestry paragraph on page 54, I think we should just take the whole thing out of there.

(#0925) Jay Hupp: I agree with that.

(#0940) Steve Clayton: We'll now open up the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#0950) Dave Overton: I'm Dave Overton. On the section you commented on with the Simpson issue, you might look at 'forest products' instead of 'forestry' as the title there. In the second sentence just replace 'forestry' with 'forest products'. It better represents the true industry. Forestry is the science and art of growing trees, and it doesn't well represent the manufacturing side. I would also encourage you to incorporate some of this language in the Economic Development Element. There was an over representation on health care and tourism, rather than the traditional manufacturing base in Mason County. As a total package, this element is very well written. In looking at this process from the outside, staff has done a great job in putting this information together.

(#1010) Steve Clayton: David, we've already passed the Economic Development Element on to the BOCC.

(#1025) Jeff Carey: Jeff Carey, President of the ACA. On page 9, the two tables seem to be overlapping because somehow they're not lining up as far as the years go. At least at this point I can see where the analysis is so now we can discuss them from this point forward. On the one land use for Allyn you corrected one but we were going to correct this other one on 3-5 needs some work. The fundamental thing is the closer we can do some cross checks on them the better.

(#1150) Tim Wing: If you have some specific numbers just give them to Barbara and she can cross check them.

(#1175) Steve Clayton: Any other public testimony? Hearing none, we'll close the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#1200) Wendy Ervin: On page 36 the second sentence isn't clear to me.

(#1225) Barbara Adkins: The seismic hazard section of the code focuses on the effects. That's what it should read.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#1240) Steve Clayton: So we have throughout the plan various grammatical things Barbara is going to fix and then work with Jeff on some of the numbers. Barbara's going to check on page 49 on the critical aquifer recharge areas on the reference to DOE. On page 54 do some grammatical things as Mr. Overton had stated regarding forestry products. Delete the paragraph that references sustainable yield. Any other corrections?

(#1280) Jay Hupp: I'm still troubled with the methodology that was used to come up with the number of parcels and the acreage as it pertains to the various categories. I'm referencing page 15. I understand why it was done but in dealing with the Assessor's Office you come up with a distorted picture of what happens with business in this county. If you look at that table, the percentage of total county land that is devoted to commercial and industrial you come up with less than 1%. If 56% of the businesses that have employees are located outside the UGA's and there's 20,000 employees then roughly 10,000 employees are located in businesses located in the rural areas. A rule of thumb is that it takes 4 acres to support an employee in commercial or industrial. So the rule of thumb would say that you've got something in the neighborhood of 40,000 acres used out there just to support the jobs that are there. That 40,000 acres equates to somewhere in the neighborhood of about 10%. I'm not saying that we really need to go to the point of proving what I've just gone through laboriously but somewhere in here we need to recognize that using the Assessor's records to come up with less than 1% of the land in this county that's devoted to commercial and industrial may not be an accurate assessment. Maybe the best way to handle that is in a footnote of some way.

(#1400) Barbara Adkins: If I put something in there that says that we have an issue with the Assessor's numbers, then that throws off every other number that I've used that the Assessor has given me.

(#1415) Bob Fink: We don't have any basis for different numbers. Only for a number of business. We could cite as a cautionary tale your numbers for business. The study was done and identified so many businesses...

(#1428) Jay Hupp: If you just referred to another study that points to other figures that covers it. I'd be comfortable with that. I think you should cite the EDC Business Demographics Study of 2000.

(#1435) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#1580) Tim Wing: We could have a footnote that says 'It is recognized that many, if not most, rural home based or small business sites are likely not included in these figures. It is the case that over 2,000 businesses are located in rural Mason County'. Then footnote commercial and industrial with an asterisk.

(#1590) Jay Hupp: That's fine.

(#1600) Wendy Ervin: The Olympic Park is not in this chart as a percent of total county.

(#1605) Steve Clayton: Shelton is not included either.

(#1625) Bob Fink: You're right, it should be clear that this is excluding Shelton and the Park.

(#1630) Wendy Ervin: I think it's important to include the size of the forest in everything that you're saying because it distorts the whole view of how much of this county is emptiness that is never going to be developed.

(#1655) Steve Clayton: How about if we include what Barbara has on page 14 into the chart. And also the Tribal lands.

(#1665) Wendy Ervin: Yes, we need to do that.

(#1680) Bob Fink: Some of the Tribal lands are included. It depends on if they're fee owned. If they were never fee owned they won't be on the Assessor records. You own the fee title.

(#1715) Wendy Ervin: When we were going through the Open Space Element we inserted at the very top the sentence that was talking about the designation of open space is not to infer any right to trespass. I would like to have that sentence inserted into this open space provision.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

(#1765) Tim Wing: I'd like to make a motion to accept this as amended.

(#1772) Wendy Ervin: I second the motion.

(#1775) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Next is the Housing Element. We closed the public hearing on this last meeting.

(#1835) Barbara Adkins: We made a couple changes to the Housing Element. On 1.2, housing recommendations has been deleted on the request of Steve that maybe we shouldn't get into these recommendations from the Housing Needs Assessment until such time as we can explore them better. There were questions on page 3.9 about year structure built. So I went back to the census to pull it out and they don't match on the census. So I printed out the tables and maybe between 1990 and 2000 when they redid numbers they were wrong then. On page 4.10, I changed 1.94 people into 2.5 people to be consistent.

(#1975) Tim Wing: I move we accept this with the proposed changes.

(#1978) Jay Hupp: I second the motion.

(#1980) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second to accept the Housing Element as proposed. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Lastly we have the Master Development Planning Policies.

(#2000) Steve Goins: I'm Steve Goins with the Department of Community Development. I'm going to pass out to you some comments that were received by email the last couple of days on this item.

(#2045) Break in meeting for PAC to review comments.

(#2380) Steve Goins: This item has not been before you previously so I will provide some background on this for you. As you may be aware as the work plan for this years effort was considered incorporating Master Development Planning was added at the eleventh hour and there wasn't a lot of time to address this. What eventually was decided was that the county would hire a consultant which we did. We decided what would be a good approach to this was do this work in two phases. We're attempting to accomplish the portion of the Comp Plan Policies as part of what you're considering tonight that would be part of this years update. The DR's side of Master Planning will not be done at this time and is not included in what you're considering. There would be an additional public process where the DR's would be developed in 2006. This is our Comp Plan Policies for Master Development Planning. We didn't have opportunity to do an exhaustive public effort because of time constraints. What we thought would be a good approach considering what we had to accomplish is to do a sampling of what the public would anticipate saying about this and also analyzing our current policies plus doing case studies of what other jurisdictions have done in this area. We worked with the consultant and came up with a list of folks that would be part of our focus group. There's been a lot of question over who those folks were. Two of those folks are two of the PAC, Bill Dewey and Terri Jeffreys, Rick Anderson from Lakeland Village and Richard Bell from Windermere were part of the focus group. Patti Case was invited and she did not attend the focus group but we did invite Green Diamond Resources, Warren Dawes, Norm Eveleth, David Overton, and Celia Parrott, as well as Tri Vo who is contemplating a large development in the Hoodspout area, and Jim Hunter. They took part in some capacity in the focus group effort. We felt that was a broad range of interests and we could get a sampling of what the community feel might be for the policies. That summary of the comments that were generated from their questionnaire is part of the technical memorandum. The consultant used that to bring forward the policies that we have. The idea with this is to create DR's that would allow master development planning. As the information indicates, this is not intended, nor would staff support this, as a means to circumvent the GMA. It will be used as a tool in the guise of working with GMA. Staff considered this as something we should be looking at as having two sets of policies. We felt that having separate policies for the urban areas was very important because that's a different type of development pattern than you're going to see in the rural areas. It's not intended to deviate from what's adopted in a sub-area plan or be at odds of the community desires. It serves other purposes and some of those include being able to bring forward innovative design elements into your plan to plan for a large area more comprehensibly. Typically these types of developments have a development agreement as well

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

and that component alone has value to both sides. It gives the developer some assurance as to what the county will approve long term and allows some rather unique funding mechanisms to occur where if a party is putting in infrastructure there is a reimbursement worked into that agreement. One other aspect is that staff felt this was a very good fit with what could be a future FCC, which has been a consideration in the Plan for a number of years. We recommended any future FCC be Master Planned. That alone is one area where development like this in a rural area would occur and we would support that being Master Planned. What we've brought before you tonight is the Comp Plan Policies with the second phase of this to have a further dialog with the public as we develop the DR's for this. Many of these policies deal with infrastructure issues. We felt this was an opportunity to promote LID standards and that's a key part of what we're recommending be a part of the policies. In reviewing the comments Bill Dewey had a number of comments which staff didn't have a problem with the exception of the last one. I'm not sure I understand what his comment is. I don't know how he would propose changing the policies as they're written based on his comment. I'm referring to the sewer and utilities comments he made.

(#2850) Wendy Ervin: I think we need more time to review this and come back with our comments.

(#2860) Tim Wing: Is this something that needs to be done for the Comp Plan update deadline?

(#2865) Bob Fink: This is something the BOCC have committed to. It's not a mandated change. The BOCC has expressed a very strong commitment to try to get these plan policies in place when we do the plan this year.

(#2900) Jay Hupp: Rather than plow through this tonight I'd rather come back next week.

(#2935) PAC: We agree.

(#2980) Steve Clayton: We have some public here so let's take some public comment.

(#3000) David Overton: I'm David Overton. I was in front of this board when you went through the work program to ask for this item to be included. My intention was not to cause more controversy or add more work program to an already heavy schedule. It was to address something that has been in the Comp Plan as a heading but never had any text behind it. It is a critical piece to do good planning on large parcels in Mason County. In reading some of the public testimony that you've received you will see that my local and vigorous fan club likes to create a lot of imprints and source to their personal frustrations. My commitment here as a resident and business owner in Mason County is in partnership in solid and good planning for community benefit. Development does change communities. It raises the ire of a lot of folks but it also provides places for people to live and I think some of the work this commission is doing here is some of the most valuable work in the county. This is good work and it's a piece of planning that needs to be in place to match similar types of high quality development that happen in Western Washington but do not happen in Mason County. Without a Master Planning process in place you won't get high quality development. You'll get piece meal development that is not good long term planning. It will actually create some affordable housing in the community. I applaud the work that staff and Jones and Stokes have done. We had very limited input. We were a stakeholder like anyone else and provided our comments directly to staff and the professional planners. So I really do hope you will take some time to read this and understand it because I think it is a very valuable tool.

(#3160) Jeff Carey: I'm Jeff Carey. No problem in bringing in another piece. It's always the context and the whole baggage that goes with it. I'd just like to see a fair playing field when others bring in something in the future years for you to review. I'm not saying this shouldn't be done. I have concerns because there's a whole lot of unknowns and it hasn't been talked about until tonight.

(#3245) Steve Clayton: Any other public testimony?

(#3265) Bonnie Knight: This Master Planning thing took me by surprise that it was dropped in at the last minute. We have been looking at Lakeland Village when we were doing our plan. They have such different standards that we didn't even presume to try to zone them because they were already done. We had understood that Overton's piece was going to be another Planned Unit Community and we knew that the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 14, 2005

regulations were coming. As far as the content, there were some things that jumped out at me. The only thing I would ask is hopefully it would be mindful of the Belfair and believe me I understand where David is coming from with his comments. Our thing was that Lakeland Village met or exceeded the standards we were looking at for Allyn and knowing the Overtons I believe it's going to be a quality development. The timing was a little problematic for me. Whatever standards are there they recognize the standards of the Town of Allyn and meet or exceed those.

(#3360) Tim Wing: Are we going to continue the public testimony on this?

(#3375) Bonnie Knight: I haven't really had a chance to look at it.

(#3395) Steve Clayton: So we can leave the public testimony open and just continue the hearing.

(#3450) Steve Goins: The emails I provided you I wanted to make sure were included in the public record. They were written prior to these parties having an opportunity to read the document. I think a lot of their concerns were addressed once they had a chance to look at it.

(#3500) Steve Clayton: So we're continuing the public hearing on the Master Planning Policies until next Monday which is the 21st. I can't meet on that date. Bill may not be here either. So hopefully we'll have a quorum.

Meeting adjourned.