

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes
June 19, 2006**

(Note audio tape (#2) dated June 19, 2006
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

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

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the May 15, 2006 meeting were approved as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0050) Steve Goins presented the proposed revisions to the Allyn Interim Zoning code to include Planned Unit Development regulations, and also considerations of the Allyn Interim Zoning map changing land use designations for portions of the VC Village Commercial District to R-2 Multi Family Medium Density Residential District. Steve started out by giving some additional background on these issues. Several months ago, an applicant applied for a pre-application meeting with the county for a pretty substantial development in Allyn in the R-3 area. In reviewing the application, we found some areas that the project didn't comply with the zoning as it was written, and subsequently we took the project to the Allyn Community Association's Planning Committee to have them look at the project and review with them the issues we were having with the project based on the interim zoning in place. Through that process we determined that the easiest way to accommodate that project and allow it to move forward in a expedited fashion was to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) regulation. The committee liked the proposal and it seemed to meet the intent of that zoning, but for various reasons, the zoning wasn't written to accommodate it. Planning Unit Development Regulations were intended to be included in the Allyn zoning but were not prepared or adopted

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

at the time. Staff prepared the draft regulations that you have before you and we reviewed those with the Planning Committee in Allyn, in addition to a number of people in the development community, and the proponent of the project, for their comments. There didn't seem to be any issues with the regulations as written. The Allyn Planning Committee supported adopting these regulations to help move the project forward. Due to the timing of this, the other alternative we had was to wait until we completed the Allyn UGA plan and then go back and fine tune all of the zoning regulations for the Allyn area, which would probably take the rest of the year. The applicant didn't want to wait that long for his project to move forward. So we used this method as a way to accommodate that project. In addition to that, issue with some of the land use designations came along around the same time. (*Steve shows area on map*). The Austin family had some concerns about this area being zoned VC Village Commercial. There was some misunderstanding as the zoning process went forward as to what that zoning was for this area. Researching, we found some old maps that were part of iterations that were prepared prior to the adoption of the interim zoning that showed that area residential. Somewhere along the way it was converted to commercial. The Austin family asked that we consider changing that back to residential. We took that back to the Allyn Planning Committee. After some debate, it was determined that it was something they could support and I can speak to more of the reasons surrounding their decisions. We decided to couple these items together and bring them before you at this time. These regulations will might allow other development to be applied for that doesn't necessarily meet the specifics of the regulations in their interim state.

(#0200) Steve Clayton inquired about the wording which reads, 'PUD's shall be required where this overlay zone appears on the UGA zoning map.

(#0230) Steve Goins responded that we're not proposing to place a PUD on the map, other than one particular site.

(#0240) Steve Clayton stated that he would like the word 'county' deleted under 17.11.740(7)(iii).

(#0260) Wendy Ervin inquire if these PUD's are strictly residential.

(#0275) Steve Goins responded that they could be applied to the VC zone as well because residential use is allowed on a second floor.

(#0285) Wendy Ervin inquired that in order to avoid confusion, when somebody looks at the reference 'PUD", she feels they automatically think about the public utility district. She stated that this is going to confuse a lot of people and is there some other nomenclature to be used for this.

(#0300) Steve Goins responded that we could refer to is as a planned residential development; that, however, refers that it is a straight up residential project.

(#0305) Wendy Ervin stated that perhaps it could be called a Planned Development (PD).

(#0310) Steve Goins responded that could work. He stated that if we use that term we could also define, for the Allyn zoning, what that particular meaning is.

(#0325) Bill Dewey inquired if this document was specifically for Allyn, and not for application elsewhere in the county.

(#0330) Steve Goins responded that was correct. Steve referred to the Allyn Interim Zoning Regulations where it showed a placeholder for PUD regs, but were never put in place.

(#0335) Tim Wing inquired if this proposal would have any influence on Steve Payson's plan for development there.

(#0342) Steve Goins responded that it would accommodate his anticipated project.

(#0345) Tim Wing proceeded to make a public disclosure for the record of his financial interest in the Payson project.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

(#0360) Steve Goins stated that this application isn't specific to a single piece of property. There are zones where this isn't applicable, but for all of the zones that are listed on the first page, these regulations would apply, and those could be hundreds of parcels.

(#0400) Wendy Ervin inquired about the wording under 17.11.720, Overlay Zoning District. It talks about the fact that the overlay zone, the uses, are limited to those that are allowed in the underlying zoning district. So you've got an overlay zone that allows certain uses and you're laying that on top of an existing zone and you're limited to whatever that zone ... She went on to inquire what the advantage of doing that was.

(#0410) Steve Goins responded by saying that the PUD doesn't change the allowed uses. It changes things like, for example, the underlying zone has a minimum lot size of 6,000 or 7,000 sf and you have a town house development that's being proposed; you have attached products, you don't have setbacks, you have zero lot lines. The underlying zoning doesn't allow that type of building product, but the PUD regulations would allow you to deviate from those standards but it doesn't change the allowed uses or the density.

(#0440) Terri Jeffreys inquired about the proposed reduction of up to 20 percent of the minimum required setback with five feet setback being the minimum. Why can't there just be the five feet minimum and not the reduction percentage in there.

(#0455) Steve Goins explained that it is specific to the boundary of the project. If your project is laid out so that the rear yards of the PUD project abuts the rear yard of a project that's outside the development that's on that boundary. This would establish a 20 foot less than the rear yard setback than would otherwise be required so that that project that's outside the PUD area isn't affected by the decreased setbacks.

(#0500) Bill Dewey stated he would like to request an addition under 'Purpose'. He is requesting and additional '6.' that might say 'to encourage Low Impact Development (LID) practices and other innovative means of reducing environmental impact'.

(#0510) Steve Goins responded by saying that we could add 'encourage' and list what those encouraged practices consist of. Like reducing permeable surfaces, treating stormwater, etc. That's something that staff could support.

(#0555) Diane Edgin mentioned porous concrete.

(#0568) Emmett Dobby gave some examples of where porous concrete has been used successfully.

(#0600) Terri Jeffreys inquired if there was any discussion with the ACA about offering density bonuses if you're requiring open space.

(#0605) Steve Goins responded 'not in Allyn'. Particularly with the R-3 zoning, which is a large chunk of the multi residential designation. That underlying zoning is 20 units per acre, and that, for Allyn, is going to feel really dense. They didn't have any interest in further increasing density in this district. There are also height limits in Allyn that probably will preclude the ability to develop at that kind of density. They don't want three and four story structures there.

(#0630) Wendy Ervin inquired about 17.11.780, Appeals. It states that the decision of the hearing examiner shall be final unless appealed to the Board of County Commissioners, and she inquired if that is correct.

(#0650) Allan Borden stated that phrase is inconsistent with Title 15. That would need to be changed.

(#0675) Terri Jeffreys inquired about the applicability in the zones in Allyn.

(#0675) Steve Goins stated that it's not allowed in the R1-P or Highway Commercial or Commercial Manufacturing.; it's allowed in all the other zones. The logic behind the R1-P is that's the platted portion of Allyn that they already have restrictions among themselves among the different divisions.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

(#0695) Terri Jeffreys inquired about the density in R-1 and R-2.

(#0700) Steve Goins responded that R-1 is 4 units an acre, and R-2 is 10 units an acre.

(#0720) Terri Jeffreys inquired which of these districts between R-1, R-2 and R-3 show the most promise of available lands for this kind of development.

(#0725) Steve Goins responded that would be R-2 and R-3.

(#0735) Terri Jeffreys inquired if the R-1 is already platted.

(#0740) Steve Goins responded in the negative, and added that it wouldn't be as difficult to meet the interim zoning regulations in the R-1.

(#0800) Tim Wing inquired about the R-3 designation and what the minimum amount of dwelling per acre there could be in an R-3.

(#0845) Steve Goins responded that there is no minimum; just a maximum density.

(#0900) Tim Wing inquired about Village Residential and it's meaning.

(#0940) Steve Goins responded that there's not a lot of distinction between what has been developed as an R-2 zoning regulations and the VR; they're very similar. There has been some discussion about getting rid of the VR designation and calling it R-2.

Steve Goins added that it was the Austin Family's request that started this request about the rezoning of that area.

(#1000) Bill Dewey asked for some clarity. He inquired if this is new language or just being amended.

(#1005) Steve Goins responded that it is all new language.

(#1012) Bill Dewey opened up the meeting for public testimony. No one in the audience choose to speak on this issue so the public testimony portion of the hearing was closed. Bill Dewey then opened it for discussion with the PAC.

(#1030) Diane Edgin stated that she would like to see something in 17.11.710, Purposes, to include encouraging LID.

(#1060) Bill Dewey added to add a #6 to say 'To include LID practices, such as', then offer suggestions and then finish it with 'and other means of reducing environmental impact'.

(#1070) Tim Wing stated that he is in favor of addressing that, as well, and while examples would be good, it might cause the language to read as though they were restricted to those examples. Maybe add in there 'including but not limited to'. Tim Wing also stated that he would like to see language that offered the developer credits or more options in other areas if he's using those techniques.

(#1100) Wendy Ervin stated that there should be some kind of a publication that talks about the cost difference to the LID and they can see a cost benefit.

(#1150) Tim Wing stated that WSU has a great one day course on LID and the cost savings with it, it looks like a 40-lot development could actually become a 42-lot development because of the LID techniques.

(#1190) Bill Dewey summarizes the recommended changes from the PAC. First, the LID techniques addition. Second, on the appeal section, making that consistent with Title 15. Third, strike out the word 'county' under 17.11.740, (7)(iii). Fourth, the term PUD should be changed to PD.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

(#1250) Steve Clayton noted that in Development Standards #1, it uses the term 'PUD' and then in the text it says 'planned residential development'.

(#1280) Steve Goins responded that is an error in language.

(#1310) Wendy Ervin makes a motion to adopt this language with the amendments the PAC has discussed.

(#1325) Tim Wing seconds the motion. Motion passes.

(#1335) Steve Clayton noted that there should be a second motion for the change in use designation and makes the motion.

(#1348) Wendy Ervin seconds the motion. Motion passes.

(#1365) Emmett Dobey started his presentation by saying that in January of this year, Doug Micheau left the county to pursue other goals. He stated that he has assumed some of the utility responsibilities that Doug had. Last Tuesday the BOCC made that work effort a part of my work effort. One of the things I've noticed is that the PAC, to no real great degree, has been involved in some of the sewer planning that's been done. There's planning going on in Belfair, North Shore, and Hoodspport. I'd like to inform you where we are in the process and what some of the next steps will be. We have started a process looking at the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) and how that's being spent, and how the capital facilities plan is put together with the idea of changing that process to have the PAC more involved and allocating how those funds are spent. In 2004, the county started work on planning for sewer development in Belfair, North Shore, and in the Hoodspport area. There have been a couple of reports that have been completed that we want to start this discussion with. One was a parcel analysis that occurred in the Belfair / North Shore area, and then another one that was called the alternative systems analysis that was done in Hoodspport.

The legislature has appropriated about \$16 million for development of sewers in Belfair. In the last legislative session in 2005, they took away \$4 million of that to develop sewer systems for the park system with the caveat that when the next legislative session came around they'd put the \$4 million back in. So there's really only \$12 available right now and there's another \$1 million available to do facility planning for the Belfair area, and another \$800 thousand dollars that's been appropriated from that \$4 million just for Belfair State Park. As this process started, CTED and DOE began to wonder about the secondary impacts from developing sewers.

In the Belfair and North Shore area there was about 1,100 undeveloped lots and they were very concerned that the secondary impacts of more roads, more impervious surface, more travel, perhaps would create a bigger issue than taking care of the sewer issues. There's really two issues with sewers. There's fecal contamination that has had great impact on the water quality, and the second one is nitrate levels in Hood Canal, which have depressed the oxygen levels in the canal. They identified early on problems with drainfields. The county initially talked about developing a very long sewer line that would serve all of the Belfair UGA and a large portion of the North Shore area. Looking at those areas, the parcel analysis that we did identified that there were three areas of concentration. One that was very severe, a second area that was likely contributing some type of contamination to the sound, and a third area that was likely not to have much impact. Our initial proposal was to serve all of those areas to some varying degree. CTED argued that the secondary impacts were greater than that and we needed to relook at that issue and see if there are some other ways we could serve that area. Two weeks ago we developed an alternative that says that we're going to provide sewer to all of the Belfair UGA, but there is an issue about serving the rest of it because it's outside the UGA boundaries. They felt sewers outside that area could create growth, and you can't extend sewers into an area that's going to cause growth. The proposal we made to them ran a sewer line out from Belfair to Belfair State Park. Our proposal was to serve all the lots, one lot depth, on either side of the road. That reduced the number of lots exposed to development down to under 50. That means that lots could be subdivided. The problem, however, is just beyond the Belfair State Park there's another small area called View Heights that really is one of the major contributors to pollution in the area. CTED suggested that we ought to at least include a look at that area and see what kind of secondary impacts that we might have there.

There was also an unallocated amount of money that has been set aside to indicate that the Mission Creek Facility is in need of some expansion. We have proposed to pick up that facility, too. We would pick up that facility with a pressure line that no one else could hook up to. Our proposal has been that that's an essential

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

public service that needs to be served with sewer. We have asked the consultant to start work on the facility plan for that; what would it take to provide sewer to the area and what would it cost. That would cost approximately \$30 million so we have approximately half of what we need to build the sewers right now.

One other issue is where the treatment facility might be located. It's going to be an upland discharge, and most likely we'll look at some membrane technology of sewage treatment. It's going to be a reclaimed water facility so we'll get the benefit of having that water for use. We estimate that planning for that project will be done sometime before the end of the summer. The idea is to have a bid out next year and have the Belfair UGA served at least by 2009 or 2010. The North Shore area, that we're not so sure of, could come right along behind that or at the same time. Coupled with that sewer work, the pipe solution, we also know that we have to start looking at onsite systems and what impact they're having to the area and how we might be able to deal with those. A task force has been put together at the county to start looking at alternative systems and how they might be used to manage onsite systems. Clustering systems or some other type of more innovative approaches to nitrogen removal. That's the Belfair solution.

The Hoodspport solution is a little more complicated. There's three parties involved in this discussion. It's the PUD #1, the Tribe, and the county. The PUD #1, in 2004, received a \$5 million state tribal assistance grant to start sewer planning in that area. They also received a \$690 thousand grant from DOE to augment that initial work. Since that time they've received another \$1 million from DOE to do the design work. There's also a \$1 million from the \$4 million that has been assigned to Potlatch State Park for sewer improvements there.

We have four areas; Hoodspport, an area in the middle that's at the top of the Skokomish Valley, the tribal area, and we have two or three different contributions that create part of the sewage problem. One is the runoff from Lake Cushman, the second is the contamination that may or may not be occurring around Union, the Tribe has an area around Sunnyside Road and we know from a recent report that the Webb Hill facility, which is a licensed facility that DOE licensed where septic sewage is taken. There's about 50 thousand gallons a day that goes there. Initially the thought was that most of that runoff was going back towards Puget Sound, but the EPA just completed a report that states that some of it is draining towards Hood Canal. There is a proposal to put in some monitoring wells to determine where that's going.

It's unlikely, because of the Growth Management issues, that we're going to be able to run a single pipe from Hoodspport all the way around to Union. We'll have to look at different approaches. We've looked at some type of centralized collection system for the Hoodspport area, to include the downtown core and the commercial area. The next area is around Potlatch State Park, and that would be an onsite facility and would not connect with the rest. In the third one, we'd be taking a look at what the Tribe needs to do, both in serving existing development and future plans for development. We would probably have to wait for the Phase 2 development to look at the Lake Cushman and Union issues.

We're now looking at how the money that comes in from utility rates and how that system is being managed right now. Recently we had a controversial discussion about sewer rates in the North Bay area. The rates went from \$48.00 a month to \$76.00 per month and after the first of the year they're going to be raised to \$86.00 a month. One of the first things I did was start taking a look at the efficiency of the utility. Right now we have four different utilities. We're discussing the idea of perhaps a single utility that might have some efficiencies in governing that and perhaps more stabilize the rates. Right now the rates vary from the \$76.00 in North Bay to \$56.00 in Harstine Point.

(#2000) Steve Clayton inquired if the O & M is stable between them, or is it mostly paying back debt.

(#2015) Emmett Dobey responded that it's mostly debt. What has happened in the past is that there's a capital facility charge that's collected the time the development has occurred. In North Bay we got in trouble because there was an accelerated rate of development that occurred at the lower end of the capital facility charge. So every time a new development comes in, they pay a rate. We allowed people to buy in early and over time we don't have enough capital to support the improvements to the system that are necessary. We were also taking the capital and paying part of the O & M cost, which leaves you even further in the hole. We know we have to create another utility for Belfair, and what degree North Shore might be involved in that. We know there may be a need to develop one for Hoodspport. So as we're looking at these individual ones, we want to take a look at the idea of managing those as one utility as opposed to the multiple utilities that we

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

have right now.

(#2080) Tim Wing inquired that combining these and managing them all together, would it be correct that that doesn't necessarily mean that the price per house is going to get averaged.

(#2090) Emmett Dobey responded that it doesn't necessarily mean that. We would still have to look at debt and there probably would be a variable rate but at least some of the things would be centralized and that would drive down some of the costs.

(#2110) Tim Wing inquired what rates are for new sewer systems in other places in this state.

(#2120) Emmett Dobey responded that Bonney Lake just put a sewer system in and their rates were approximately \$100.0 a month. Olympia pays two rates; they have a \$9.50 charge for the collection system, and a \$56.00 for the lot cost. Most of them run in the \$60.00 to \$70.00 range per month.

(#2150) Jay Hupp thanked Emmett for opening up the big picture on sewage and the issues in the county. He inquired what division of CTED are you referring to when you say they have an issues with some things.

(#2160) Emmett Dobey responded that it's the Growth Management division.

(#2175) Jay Hupp inquired of Belfair, and if we know where these failing systems are. Can there be an address put on them.

(#2180) Emmett Dobey responded that we cannot. We can give you some general areas, and they're mostly along the drainage basins. We have not done the work that is necessary to identify every one of the failing systems. Part of the problem has to do with how you define failing. Is failing a system that actually has sewage on the ground like the Health Department calls it, or is it one that's creating nitrogen that's moving through the groundwater into the canal.

(#2200) Wendy Ervin noted that several years ago there was a big project to identify failing systems all the way up and down the canal and how does that work into this.

(#2222) Emmett Dobey responded that that's how we came up with the map and identified the general areas of concentration.

(#2230) Wendy Ervin stated that there were a lot of individual systems identified during that project that were supposedly repaired.

(#2240) Diane Edgin added that there were a lot of people who would not allow theirs to be tested.

(#2250) Steve Clayton inquired about the dedicated line from the prison. That goes by Sand Hill Elementary School and that's also an essential public facility and is that going to be included.

(#2260) Emmett Dobey stated that in their analysis right now they would not be included. CTED has been very closely scrutinizing the work that we have done so far and they haven't even agreed on the prison yet. They agree that it's an essential public service but they haven't agreed that the only way to you can take care of the sewage from that is with a collection system. Adding to that to include the school would only make the argument more difficult. We've tried to minimize the area that we're going to provide a central collection system to and then maximize the area that we're going to look at onsite solutions to.

(#2300) Jay Hupp reiterated that when we get down to that we're going to have to get to addresses.

(#2310) Emmett Dobey replied that is correct.

(#2315) Jay Hupp inquired as to when that would occur.

(#2320) Emmett Dobey responded that for North Shore, it could occur as early as this year. For the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

Hoodsport area, which is lagging behind, it's in the range of 2009 or 2010 before we get into that area. It could happen as early as this year if we move North Shore and Belfair together.

(#2340) Jay Hupp inquired if we have the capacity within the county to do that.

(#2350) Emmett Dobey responded that that is an issue.

(#2355) Bill Dewey added that he thought the county had got a lot of funding to go out and do that for this area.

(#2360) Emmett Dobey responded that we're likely to receive even more funding so that's all a part of the plan. We've formed a task force to identify what it's going to take for us to go out and do the work that's necessary to bring these systems on.

(#2375) Tim Wing stated that it might be difficult to get exact addresses. He gave an example of View Ridge Heights that's above Belfair State Park and it's up on a hill. You could have a septic system there, that on the surface looks fine, but as it goes down into the ground and heads out toward the canal, you can't really figure out which house it came from.

(#2420) Emmett Dobey stated that they argued very early on that the only real solution, if you're worried about nitrate, is a centralized collection system. When we had the line that went all the way out past the Belfair State Park, and discussion of it even going further, that's when CTED said that they think the secondary impacts are too great.

(#2450) Terri Jeffreys inquired as to how they had any regulatory control over that.

(#2475) Emmett Dobey responded that it's because it violates GMA. You can't extend a sewer outside a growth management area. There is a declaration of public health, but their response is that there's other ways to take care of that public health declaration other than a centralized sewage system.

(#2500) Bill Dewey stated that there's grants and monies that are being used to test those new technology systems now. The intent is that that technology will get out and get approved and get used.

(#2525) Emmett Dobey stated that there was a bill that was passed last legislative session that mandates counties to look at these systems. There's a pilot program that's being proposed that we're trying to become involved in. They're not approved by the state but they are approved because of this senate bill and the requirement of looking at them. We are worried about the nitrogen, but our strategy is really focused on fecal contamination removal. Through that work you are going, to some degree, be taking care of the nitrogen problem. We don't think this is going to be an easy task, but as we develop these strategies that's where it's important for the PAC to be involved to help us review what those strategies are. It really is a GMA tool, and you need to be involved.

(#2700) Steve Clayton inquired about the Belfair sewer and would it be the whole UGA first or just the core. Our Comp Plan, as accepted by the county, says the UGA core.

(#2725) Emmett Dobey responded that it will be the core area. We're not trying to do anything to encourage additional growth.

(#2750) Steve Clayton inquired do you put the services into remote areas that are in open space and not going to pay their fair share. Our Comp Plan has put it in the core first and then we expand as development needs.

(#2850) Emmett Dobey responded that the development is going to pay for itself so that's the right strategy. The next step in this is the development of the facility plan, which we definitely need to bring back to you so you can see how that is going to happen. This will be really where the pipes go and the treatment facility. The initial plan talked about taking sewage to Allyn and that's off the table.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

(#2900) Terri Jeffreys inquired if along with this process would be analyzing what the rate structure would be based on the customer base.

(#2950) Emmett Dobey responded that it would, and we know we have to develop a utility in Belfair. We know that a part of that requires some type of financial analysis. So I'm very cautious to say that \$16 million is going to keep the rates at \$25.00 a month. I think that's what I can find clearly happened in North Bay. There was some promises made by some engineers on this is what it's going to take. There wasn't really a very good financial analysis to look at future capital needs, future true O & M costs, and it just got out of hand. That's why we need to have a real financial analysis done by a competent economist and we're looking at someone who has legal talent to know how to set utilities up.

(#3050) Terri Jeffreys stated that CTED's concerns are myopic. If you can't bring into the whole analysis the need for a substantial customer base to keep this a sustainable utility, then you're setting yourself up for failure.

(#3100) Emmett Dobey stated that that is one of their arguments and it hasn't been very successful. We've argued it both ways. One, financially it becomes a burden to the people that actually connect. And secondly, it may not do anything to clean up the canal. Then what you're going to have to do is come back and put a second line in to serve the rest of them at a later date and the cost is going to be much more than it is right now. So far that's fell on deaf ears. They feel that a real solution is a very limited amount of collection system and a whole lot of onsite treatment.

(#3175) Wendy Ervin inquired what exactly is the content that's released on the ground at Webb Hill.

(#3200) Emmett Dobey responded that septic septage is released there. It's what gets pumped out of a septic tank.

(#3235) Wendy Ervin inquired if it's treated.

(#3250) Emmett Dobey responded that the soil treats it. It's very clear from the recent report that there is, or likely, materials moving away from that facility. The materials are likely highly concentrated in nitrogen. They do accept septage out of a tank.

(#3450) Tom Moore stated that most of what goes to Webb Hill is septic tank pumpings, right out of the septic tank. Usually when a septic tank needs pumping, it's because there's a scum level and a solids level, and they come together to the point when it starts clogging the drainfield. The drainfield water usually comes off that middle part of it. A lot of the solids are screened and brought to the landfill, which are the materials that don't decompose. The rest of it is stabilized with lime, and then sprayed on the ground.

(#3550) Emmett Dobey stated that it is an acceptable, licensed facility but is it indeed contributing to the contamination.

(#3575) Jay Hupp inquired as to when a final on the report would be out for review.

(#3585) Emmett Dobey responded that it is being distributed for review right now.

(#3600) Terri Jeffreys inquired about how many separate stand alone systems there will be.

(#3620) Emmett Dobey responded that in the first phase there will be three. Something for the Hoodsport RAC, something to serve Potlatch Park, and then something to try to serve the tribal area.

(#3650) Terri Jeffreys inquired if there will be a membrane system in Hoodsport and being a pilot for that.

(#3660) Emmett Dobey responded that PUD #1 has already indicated that they have an interest in at least operating and managing some type of membrane filter system as a pilot.

(#3650) Terri Jeffreys inquired how that technology works.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

(#3675) Tom Moore explained that a membrane filter system is different than most secondary, conventional treatments where they do have the additional screening process, then it goes into a biological contact chamber where an environment is created for bacteria that consumed these nutrients and you create this perfect bacteria where you retain it then inside these tanks there's some form of membranes that are like gortex where it lets the water through but not the bacteria. So a lot of the pathogens and solids are filtered out, the water is sent through and the water from that point is taken and disinfected usually with ultra violet light. You can put this in a lot smaller footprint than you can a conventional wastewater plant.

(#0200) Bill Dewey stated he's happy that this issue was brought before the PAC. He stated that his involvement at the state level he's been aware of the resources that have come to Mason County and it certainly seems like it's an issue that should be before the PAC. It's exciting to see the funds that have been allocated to the county to address problems in the Hood Canal and elsewhere. We've gotten a tremendous amount of money, both to the state parks and Belfair and the Skokomish area. It behooves us to do a good job as a county utilizing those resources. He inquired if there is a comprehensive effort to sit down with the appropriate people on a committee and do comprehensive sewer planning.

(#0275) Emmett Dobey responded that the task force that was formed is looking at that very issue of sewer management. Right now the task force is comprised of a representative of WSU, a representative from the Conservation District, Environmental Health, Planning, DCD, and Engineering. We're focused on Oakland Bay right now, with the idea that the work in Oakland Bay and what we might come up with in the North Shore would be something we could use throughout the county. Once that's done there's also a state process that CTED is trying to develop around the alternative nitrogen facilities of which we're trying to participate in. Steve and I met with some people from Kitsap County to talk about what they're doing for sewage management. Debbie Riley is in the process of meeting with the Jefferson County people. Right now we don't have the technology people at the table.

(#0350) Bill Dewey stated that that would be an important piece to tell you what's appropriate to do where in the county.

(#0360) Emmett Dobey stated that part of the work that's being done in the North Shore is looking at the soil types, steep slopes, level to ground water, and trying to identify the most likely sites for the different types of systems. That's part of the engineering we're paying for.

(#0375) Bill Dewey spoke in support of CTED because he shares those same concerns. There is good research done both here in Washington and elsewhere that shows that increased development and increased impervious services you increase fecal chloroform runoff. Septic systems aren't just the issue. There's pet waste, fertilizer and a variety of other impacts that you aren't going to deal with by running in a sewer pipe.

(#0400) Emmett Dobey responded by saying that's one reason when they started out with 1,000 lots and they're now down to 50 or 60.

(#0410) Tim Wing stated he has a concern with the Belfair UGA in that if you sewer the old core of the town and you don't make sewer available to developers on the upper part of the hill, then I think you're going to cause a lot of the same kinds of problems you're talking about down the North Shore. It's well known that I've argued that that part of the UGA shouldn't even be there because of the Union River. It needs to be available throughout the UGA so that the growth can go in both places.

(#0440) Emmett Dobey state this is an issue they had with the consultant. Where do you stop it and how do you stop it, and do you locate it in places where it can be expanded, so it's a big issue that's on the table right now.

(#0450) Steve Clayton reiterated that he has a concern about the parcels that are designated open space and timberland in the UGA that would be noncontributory to the sewer system. He further stated that most of those are up on the upper level.

(#0460) Emmett Dobey responded that a lot of them have already been divided into five acre tracts.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

(#0465) Tim Wing commented that if a developer wanted to put houses there they would have to change it out of open space.

(#0470) Steve Clayton stated that they wouldn't pay a contribution to developing the sewer system and the line up there. They wouldn't be paying for the initial construction of the system nor to the pipe that runs up the hill, especially if you wait fifteen years. There's a state law that says there's no back dues you have to pay for a system.

(#0480) Emmett Dobey stated that is if you create a latecomers agreement to allow people to reimburse for the cost, but that does not preclude you from charging them a general facilities charge.

(#0490) Steve Clayton further inquired if you should run a pipe into an area that's undeveloped to promote growth, and then the growth doesn't occur, you have the people down below that paid for that pipe that doesn't get used and they're paying for this extension.

(#0500) Emmett Dobey reiterated that this is an issue and a place that you have an opportunity to weight in on because it's one that we are struggling with right now.

(#0510) Bill Dewey stated that it is an issue with identifying failing septic systems and the resistance from owners. It's one that we've tried to be sensitive to as an industry is we've pushed for stronger onsite sewage regulations from the state board of health as well as through legislation and we've tried to couple those regulations with funding and we've been successful. There was \$6.5 million appropriated by the legislature for grants and loans to homeowners for assistance for fixing their septic systems. Just recently there was a \$3.2 million from a private donor on Hood Canal will go out for loan interest loans for people to fix their septic systems.

(#0540) Emmett Dobey stated that the Hood Canal Coordinating Council has a very active program that they're soliciting people to look at cluster systems or other innovative approaches and they will pay for a major part of it.

(#0590) Constance Ibsen inquired about the Belfair core and when is that to be identified. She stated that in the first Belfair core designation, the high school and the middle school weren't in the core.

(#0650) Emmett Dobey stated that they are defining the scope of work now and the reasons we haven't defined it yet is that it includes both Belfair and North Shore and how far do we go out North Shore. Do we stop at the park or continue to pick up the other subdivision. We know what the impact is if we go to the park but if we go past the park we're not sure what kind of secondary impacts we're going to create.

(#0675) Constance Ibsen stated that since 1993 there was a consent order with DOE with the county that they were to build a sewer system for the core of Belfair because there was a dire emergency. That whole consent order has never been done so fifteen years later we're still working on this. She stated that she would like to see that get done but she's concerned that there doesn't appear to be a way for the community to methodically weigh in on this.

(#0700) Emmett Dobey explained that the task for is simply to put together a scope of work and part of that scope of work is education and part of that work is public outreach. All we're doing now is defining what we need to be doing. We're not making final solutions on how to sewer things. It's simply what process are we going to follow to make decisions about sewerage.

(#0725) Constance Ibsen noted that Emmett has just had this job dumped on him ...

(#0730) Emmett Dobey explained that he was willing and happy to do the job.

(#0740) Constance Ibsen continued on by inquiring about what Emmett's department looks like and who is going to be reporting to him.

(#0745) Emmett Dobey explained that his job is to do both Community Development, which includes the Permit Center and closely working with Environmental Health in issuing permits. The other part is Community

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

Development, which is the Planning Division.

(#0765) Constance Ibsen inquired if the onsite advisory committee is functioning at all. Those are the people who are the designers and installers and they do a lot of good work. It's the people on the ground that do it and they come to know what's happening. That committee should be up and running again. Constance also inquired about how the public could provide input on this issue.

(#0800) Emmett Dobey stated that they're trying to design what that process is going to be. The next step is to have Murray Smith and Associates, who are working on the facility plan, to finish that and have a chance to review that.

(#0840) Brian Petersen inquired if Emmett was going to be involved making sure that that process works with DOT in terms of the alignment.

(#0845) Emmett Dobey responded that they have worked very closely with the consultants to try to mesh these two projects. We don't want them to put the road in and then we come along and put a sewer line down the middle of it and tear it all up. They have pushed their schedule back a little bit and so we're actively trying to get them to push the schedule back so it coordinates with that.

(#0900) The PAC thanked Emmett for his presentation and information.

(#0950) Steve Goins discussed the upcoming PAC schedule. Currently we anticipate bringing forward the rezoning application from Simpson Timber Company, as well as the hearing on the Skok Valley issues. We will have a meeting on the 10th and 17th of July. We anticipate bringing forth the Master Development Plan Regulations that we established policies for last year for consideration at a public hearing on the landslide hazards as part of our critical areas update.

(#1000) Steve Clayton stated that he borrowed from Bob the old Skok Valley Plan and he handed out copies of the executive summary for people as background information from the 1996 plan. It's going to be important what the current consultant has.

(#1035) Steve Goins handed out to the PAC updates of the critical areas proposed language for the PAC to review. Steve stated that Bob Fink will be looking for comments on the critical area regulations. Steve inquired if there was any more discussion about the transportation letter.

(#1100) Tim Wing stated that generally he liked the message in the letter but wasn't convinced that it went quite far enough in terms of what the county needs to face in terms of the UGA's. Tim further explained that he still hears a lot of people talking about how there's no money to build those roads because we build those roads with matching money. However, when you find out how much matching money they really use (3/4 of the money is matching money) and so 1/4 of the money they're using to build roads apparently isn't matching money and he doesn't understand why they can build twelve miles of Grapeview Loop Road using matching money but they can't seem to build 1/3 of a mile of Wheelwright with 1/4 of their money that isn't matching money. Tim explained that he finds the letter lacking in terms of its direct comment that this cannot, in my opinion, be denied. The UGA's need infrastructure to take care of the future growth. To deny that, in my opinion, is a violation of GMA. Otherwise, I feel the letter was well written.

(#1150) Steve Goins explained that the intent was to try to promote some of the discussion that the PAC had from last year and the letter is intended to be your letter. We want it to say what you want it to say so we're asking for your input.

(#1175) Bill Dewey stated that he had the same feelings as Tim. He stated that he appreciated the discussion and how it captured what's transpired to date. He further explained that when he got to the recommendations he felt that time could be spent talking specifically about those. The funding has been a focal point of our discussion where existing funding sources are oriented towards repairs and safety but not new road development. In the discussion there's talk about having staff look into this but perhaps an additional recommendation might be for staff to develop recommendations to the planning and building of new roads, particularly in the UGA's. Also, recommend specific areas where funding might be available so we have recommendations of where funding might be available to accomplish that.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 19, 2006

(#1200) Jay Hupp inquired to Bill Dewey if, at this point, might it be appropriate for the PAC to take this at it's presence status and play with the wording. Jay also stated that he feels it's not quite strong enough.

(#1230) Steve Goins stated that one avenue to finalize that is if the PAC would forward us your comments by email whatever revisions you might like to see incorporated and we could put those into a document that shows those revisions and bring it back to you and review it.

(#1250) The PAC stated that would work for them.

(#1270) Bill Dewey also had another comment regarding the letter. He inquired the reasoning behind the sentence 'Identify two or three new transportation routes within the three UGA's' ...

(#1275) Steve Goins responded that staff has been moving forward with an approach to developing what we're calling a transportation network countywide and that is where that evolved from.

(#1300) Bill Dewey explained that his question was directed at the way it was worded. Bill stated that he would opt for taking those numbers out.

(#1330) PAC agreed with that.

(#1340) Steve Goins stated the part of the thought process stated that identifying numerous new route would become so problematic that it never gets done. We've identified three routes in Allyn that we're looking at as Phase I to help solve the lower Allyn issue.

(#1360) Bill Dewey offers a suggestion that the PAC commits to providing comments to Steve before the next meeting so revisions could be made.

(#1150) Terri Jeffreys gave an overview of the American Planning Association meeting. Terri stated that there's a lot going on regarding Initiative 933 and about how to prep for that. There was a recommendation from the Association of Washington Cities that our planning staff prepare model ordinances in preparation for possible passage of this ordinance. She continued on about the revitalization work that is going on in Bremerton and a lot of public / private partnership going on there. She stated that we should take a close look at identifying the areas that have the really high function of values in our county and concentrating our protection efforts in those specific areas that can continue to be preserved over ordinances that sweep across a one size fits all. Kitsap County is trying to move in that direction and that is worth considering.

(#1580) Steve Clayton stated he went to one session that was a Planning 101 and covered quasi-judicial versus legislative and stated that it was quite a good session. He stated the session on critical habitat was a good session as well.

Meeting adjourned.