

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

November 23, 2009

(Note audio tape (#3) dated November 23, 2009
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 at 6:00 pm by Chair Dennis Pickard.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bill Dewey, Dennis Pickard, Jim Reece, and Ken Vanbuskirk.

Debbie Jacobs was excused.

Staff Present: Barbara Adkins and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the June 15, 2009 and September 21, 2009 were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

June 15, 2009:

On page 7 under (#0575) it should read 'motorized commercial outdoor recreation land use'.

On page 9 under (#1430) it should read ' I feel like we're advisors'.....

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0080) Dennis Pickard opened the public hearing on the rezone request by Ridge Motorsports Group to rezone three parcels on Ells Hill Rd. from Rural Residential 20 (RR20) zone to Rural Tourist Campground (RTC) zone. He stated this is a public hearing for the Planning Advisory Commission to present a recommendation to the BOCC as to whether we think they should approve or disapprove of this request to rezone the property. This is not a land use permit hearing, nor are any final decisions being made at this time. Dennis inquired if anyone had any objections to my participation in this hearing, or any other

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

commission member that might be a party to this hearing. No one noted any objections.

(#0150) Commission member Bill Dewey disclosed that he had a telephone call last week from Matt Matayoshi from the Economic Development Council regarding this project. Bill explained to Matt he thought it was inappropriate for us to discuss it as it is a quasi-judicial matter, and that was the end of our conversation. Bill explained he would also like to express that he works for Taylor Shellfish Co., and there was letter in this week's Journal from Cheri Blake, who also works for Taylor. She is a co-worker but I am not a supervisor of hers, nor she to me.

(#0175) Commission member James Reece disclosed that he has also had discussions with citizens and business people, including Matt Matayoshi.

(#0180) Dennis Pickard inquired if it was specific to this application.

(#0185) James Reece explained it was in regards to the subject in general, and how the process was progressing. He stated that it seems from the hearing last summer on this issue when we tried to fast track this, I have been trying to figure why we haven't moved faster.

(#0200) Dennis Pickard also inquired if there was anyone else on the commission have any interest in the property at issue, or any work relationship with the parties to this application. It was noted there was no one else on the commission with any conflicts of interest. Dennis then stated since hearing the recitals from the members of the commission regarding their contacts outside of this hearing, he inquired if any members of the commission would object to hearing this matter.

(#0215) An audience member inquired what Mr. Reece was referring to when he stated they were trying to 'fast track' this through.

(#0220) Dennis Pickard explained there was a proposal before the PAC in June for an amendment to the zoning code for RR20 zone that was instigated at the request of the applicant. It was a separate matter and a separate hearing. It was not specific to any piece of property; it was a request that would have applied to all properties in the RR20 zone classification.

(#0245) James Reece added that he was trying to figure out a way that we would be hearing it sooner. At that meeting we had talked about how the petitioners could find a place to put this facility, and the attempt was to change the language to accommodate that.

(#0265) Dennis Pickard also added we were trying to add an additional use to the RR20 zone that would permit, in the rural residential zone with a special use permit, a particular type of motorized sports club facility.

(#0320) Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development, stated this is a proposal by Ridge Motorsports Group to rezone three parcels currently zoned as RR20 to RTC. The parcels are located .3 miles west of Dayton Airport Road on West Ells Hill Road, and approximately 1.07 west of the Shelton UGA boundary. The property is currently designated forest lands. There are no rivers, streams, or wetlands on the property. There is a ridge located on one parcel, which means any development proposed on that property would have to be 300 feet from any slopes that are greater than 15%. The surrounding zoning is RR20 to the north, east and south. Long term commercial forest to the west. There's access to these parcels along West Ells Hill Road. There are no utilities on the property, and improvements will be needed for any future development. There was a SEPA Determination of NonSignificance made on November 5th. The site was posted with the SEPA Determination and the Notice of Application on November 6th. There are 8 criteria that is listed in the Mason County Code for determining rezones. They address public safety, environmental protection, consistency, compatibility, public services, urban growth, and population. The 8 criteria addresses whether the rezone is being done as a map amendment or a map correction, which is not applicable here. The rezone criteria as outlined in the Mason County Development Code Section 17.05.080 are met. The proposal to rezone three parcels is consistent with the Comp Plan goals for protecting public health, safety and welfare for the appropriate zoning designation of RTC; encouraging the provision of adequate public services and consistent with the Comp Plan goals to encourage recreational and tourist uses in the rural areas. Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone these parcels from RR20 to RTC.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

What we are asking the PAC to do this evening is one of two things. Recommend approval of the proposal to the BOCC as the applicant has requested, or recommend denial of the proposal to the BOCC. There is currently on tomorrow nights agenda for the BOCC a request that they schedule a public hearing on this rezone before the BOCC for December 15th. The applicant is here this evening along with his council.

(#0500) Dennis Pickard opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#0505) Matt Matayoshi of the Mason County Economic Development Council spoke on the request. We are a nonprofit organization that supports investment into this community, as well as job creating projects. Our county has an unemployment rate of approximately 10%. We're about double where we were two years ago.

It's our mission to work to reduce the unemployment rate and create opportunities for people to live and work in Mason County. This rezone proposal will move one step closer to a commercial development within the RTC zone. If you're familiar with the site, we have the Washington Corrections Center that operates a facility that has several hundred employees that come in and out of that facility 24 hours a day. They also operate a pistol and rifle range. In the same vicinity we have a wrecking yard that dismantles cars and also does several types of steel and metal recycling. The Washington State Patrol Academy is less than two miles from the site. They run and operate a track for training purposes. They also do training for the cadets and ongoing training for their swat team. The activity that occurs there includes pistol, rifle, and also small explosives. The site is across the street from the Mason County Transfer Station; the county dump. There is a lot of traffic capacity with Dayton Airport Rd and Ells Hill Rd. Our organization is in favor of this rezone to RTC. This process is really part of several steps. Following approval of a rezone, that's when the real process starts as far as permitting. At that point, an additional SEPA will be prepared specific to a development will occur at that time, which will cover traffic, noise, and all other environmental issues. At this point the SEPA is specific to the rezone only. There have been a number of questions raised about this project and those will be answered as the permitting process starts. I'd now like to introduce to you one of the developers of this project, Rod Powell.

(#0620) Rod Powell stated he is one of the developers along with Joe Manke. We comprise Ridge Motorsports LLC. We were here in late July. The proposal, at that time, was a text amendment that was fairly specifically drawn to accommodate our project, but the PAC found that was not adequate. We then went back and looked at the rezone. There was only one zone that fit our needs adequately, which is the Rural Tourist Campground zone. We have our land use attorney here tonight, Bill Lynn. He can answer any questions you may have.

(#0700) Dennis Pickard opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#0710) Jim Hunter stated his family owns the adjoining property and he stated he would like to have more information regarding what their plans are for the project. You stated that will come later, but before this goes before the BOCC, the public should know what they're planning to do. I see problems with noise and that concerns our property. There's only a 50 foot buffer, and that is very small. I feel it should be further out in the country, not a mile from the UGA.

(#0775) Barbara Adkins explained this is the first step. The applicants have been to the county before and we have an understanding of their ultimate goal. The next step in this process would be another public hearing. There is currently a development moratorium on two of the properties. That means in order to lift that moratorium they would need to go through a hearing process before the Hearing Examiner to have that lifted. If that goes through, the rezone goes through, then they would move on to another public hearing for a special use permit, which is also before the Hearing Examiner and let the Hearing Examiner determine whether he's going to approve that particular use under that zoning. When an actual project is proposed, that is when the reports, studies, analysis, and environmental impacts will be evaluated.

(#0850) Ken VanBuskirk inquired why the moratorium is on those two parcels.

(#0855) Barbara Adkins explained it has to do with timber harvesting on the property.

(#0900) Bill Dewey noted Dennis has made it clear that the hearing tonight is about changing the zoning on the parcel. However, when you gave your staff report you didn't provide any detail on what's allowed under

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

the current zoning and what would be allowed if the property was rezoned. It's important that people understand that in the background here we understand that there's potentially a motorsports project. All of these other uses that Barbara will discuss, once that property is rezoned, all of these other uses that are applicable could be done on that property. The motorsports people could decide to go elsewhere, or if they sell in the future, all of these other uses could show up on this property in the future.

(#0965) Barbara Adkins explained we are not avoiding discussing their proposal. What we're trying to do is when you look at a rezone, you need to really look at all the types of uses you could allow. Anyone can request a rezone, for an example, for an RV park and then decide not to do that and someone else could make it a different use under that zone. You have to be prepared for anything that is allowed. Right now it's currently Rural Residential 20, which is one housing unit per 20 acres. You can also have a hobby farm, (which includes small scale commercial agriculture, including aquaculture and wood lots), churches, local community and recreation centers, group homes, cell towers, fire stations, fish hatcheries, and public utilities. With special use permits, the following uses are also permitted within this designation: essential public facilities, schools, commercial day care centers, cemeteries, and home occupations and cottage industries. Under Rural Tourist Campground, it provides that you can have overnight lodging facilities, including RV parks and campgrounds, golf course, retreat centers, and commercial or nonprofit recreational activity facilities, (such as water parks, bicycle courses, and racquet court sports); and accessory uses to include employee housing, motel and bed and breakfast; and marina sales and service. Also includes retail, gas, self storage, restaurant. With special permits, the following uses are also permitted within this designation: motorized commercial outdoor recreation and rifle ranges.

(#1050) Rod Powell explained what they are proposing is a club motorsports facility. To differentiate it between club racing and professional racing it is as follows: what you see on television is professional racing. They're typically tours that go through various locations throughout the United States and also the world. They are a large spectator draw, and they are certainly large economic engines, but they create their own set of problems. This is exactly the opposite of that. The facility we are proposing is built to support club racing. The primary use is actually driver and user education. The club racing only comprises approximately 10% of the use. The other 90% of the use is driver training sponsored by manufacturers, or other user groups. We have a gentleman in the audience tonight from California that runs a very well renowned driving school. Anyone in this room would be welcomed with any type of vehicle. They enroll in the class, go out on the track and do exercises, then come into the classroom for debriefing throughout the course of the day. The facility itself is actually a rental facility. We put the facility in and then rent it to the clubs. That is why it's called a club motorsports facility. It is not spectator driven. The spectators that will show up at these events are typically your family or friends. It's no where near the proposal that was put forth some years ago by NASCAR.

(#1135) Bill Dewey noted at the last hearing, we were asking about the range in number of the people that may attend any event. You stated a typical crowd was approximately 60, and then you might have an event that may draw as many as 200.

(#1150) Rod Powell responded the typical schedule would begin in April. You'll start the driving schools first, and on an average day you're going to see between 30 and 60 participants. The racing season, be it motorcycles or cars, would begin a month thereafter. Most of the racing clubs travel to many, many different tracks during the season. They don't headquarter and just race at one track. We'll currently race one race in Seattle, wait two weeks, and then go to Portland. After they we'll go to Spokane, and then up to Canada. The particular club I race with would only show up twice a year. The bulk of the business is during the week, and it's more akin to driver education. It's not a big rush in the gate, and then a big rush out the gate at the end of the day. It's more of a trickle in in the morning and people leave during the day as they're through with their activity.

(#1230) Rick Blake stated he is against the rezoning of the property. I have property at 151 Chase Ln. With the whole proposal that I've seen is that there's a possible drag racing track and a 2.5 mile oval track, which might not be too bad, however, a dragster would not fit the environment for noise. I think the property should stay at RR20.

(#1275) Amy Braackman discussed the moratorium. She stated Section 11.04 is very clear that while a

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

moratorium is in place, no development can go on. The County Code also defines a development as a 'site-specific rezone', which is what today is. The moratorium will be lifted in 6 months, but they have not gone through any of the proper channels to have that lifted, so I don't understand why we're even having this conversation this evening.

(#1300) Dennis Pickard reiterated this is a public hearing on the merits of the rezone and to forward a recommendation to the BOCC so whether we forward this proposal with a recommendation for approval or not, if there are conditions that it can't be effective until some future date, then that's what will happen.

(#1310) Amy Braackman stated even if they went through it, with the waiver, it's only for single-family residences or outbuildings, and the development shall be no larger than 2 acres in size.

(#1335) Karen Cannard stated she is also a neighbor residing at 671 West Honeysuckle Lane. She stated that most of the neighbors have dogs, horses, and kids. In looking at the RCW's that have to do with changing this zoning it says very clearly that it shall protect the rural character and not be in conflict with the surrounding areas, uses, residences, etc. It also says there is a need to preserve the character of the existing natural neighborhood and communities. It also goes on to talk about urban growth; they may not make changes to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of the land. The primary use of the land in the neighborhood is families; it's horses; it's kids and dogs. A racetrack does not belong there. Neither does a Rural Tourist Campground.

(#1390) Tom Bolling stated that he is caught in the middle. I live in that area; I know almost everybody in the room. It says in the criteria that no rezone shall be approved if, either by itself or together with other rezoning and/or development, whether actual or potential, the cumulative impacts of such zoning would be to materially increase sprawling, low-density rural development, or to significantly increase uses incompatible with resource-based uses in the vicinity, and he inquired why we don't have the development plan to look at for this project. He stated he doesn't understand why we don't have something to look at. We're talking a rezone, and an admission as a proposed development, yet they are not supplying us with the information on that development. How can we even look at the rezone? How can we even look at the SEPA and determine nonsignificance without having this dream plan to look at? I think this meeting is a total waste of time. I say this not in defense of my property, not to stop this development from happening, but this is what GMA was brought in for. When GMA came in, I went to the meetings and I was dead set against GMA. I still am, but there are reasons for it and this is one of those reasons.

(#1530) Nata Hurst stated she believes the change from the rural residential to the rural tourist campground opens up a whole venue of things we probably don't want out there that really change the character of the land. I am against it overall. I find it to be something you should not approve.

(#1550) Kevin Cronquist stated he is a business owner here and a Mason County resident. He stated we rarely have opportunities to change zoning in areas to help benefit a lot of people in our county. In this case we don't know what the benefit is going to be, but it could be a number of different things. I am 100% in favor of the rezone as I would like to what some of those benefits could be. I never want to stifle growth or business opportunities that come into the county. We're not approving what they want to do at all. You can't see what they want to do until you approve the zoning. We're just getting another step towards that direction tonight.

(#1600) Alex Grineatco stated he is a Mason County resident. He noted one of the objections we're having here is that the reason why we moved to is because the rural area is country, away from the city, but close to shopping and services. We already have motorized vehicles in our development going back and forth with the quads and dirt bikes, we've already got the prison with their rifles going off. The State Patrol has a driving facility, it's a world class facility that many use. If you're going to do skid plate training or defensive driving, that facility is all you need. I'm against it because we already have enough outdoor sports there as it is, and we have horses, and the more noise we have the more the horses will panic.

(#1665) Alan Easton stated he is a Mason County resident who has friends who own property in the vicinity of the proposed rezone. For 20 years I have enjoyed the rural atmosphere out there and I would like the record to show that I agree Nata Hurst's comments.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

(#1680) Glee Spicuzza and I've been a resident out there since 1992 or 1993. I bought property out there because it is rural and there's no neighbors and not much noise. I'm against the rezone for that reason. I think it would be a great facility to have somewhere else where it's not going to affect so many people and change our community.

(#1700) Wendy Matthews stated she lives at 171 W Weaver Creek Lane. I live about 5 miles away from this project and I'm already concerned about noise. I want to point out that this is a designated aquifer recharge area and that any uses that go on in this area should consider what kind of impacts it might have. My concern is having auto activity of that nature that could include oil spills and hazardous materials. I'm seeing there is a lot of business opportunities there already with the RR20 and we haven't even looked at any of those and we're already talking about rezoning and making changes to what we just recently amended with the Comp Plan. I'm also concerned that it's 170 acres, and that's a very large area. I would also like to say there are a couple of items in the DNS that do not address the conditions that might occur.

(#1800) Dave Bowers stated he is the treasurer of an offroad motorcycle group called Puget Sound Enduro Riders. We're a non-racing club. We put on poker runs and timed events at the Mason County Fairgrounds. None of our members know the Powell Family or the Manke Family but we're here to support them. We feel the land that's across from the Transfer Station will never sell to a homeowner. The best we could ever see would be maybe a cemetery. We think it is a great use of the property. We don't even know if it will support our activity but even if it doesn't, the whole club is in favor of this rezone.

(#1840) Kathleen Wilson stated she lives in the Dayton Trails development. She is objecting to the rezone for several reasons, mostly because of the noise. We already have plenty of noise out there between shooting at the prisons, rock bands on holidays, motorcycles at the gravel pit, and we sure don't need any more noise.

(#1885) Christine Hoyt stated for two years I've helped these people. I even questioned the BOCC's to see how they wanted to vote. The group was willing to let me help them out and every time I keep asking them 'where do you want to have it?' Nobody wanted me to know because I have horses and I live within 3/4 of a mile where this may happen. So everyone in this small organization thought it was okay to utilize me and now I have to defend my property after going out and supporting this. I am in support of this as my husband and I were on the front lines for two years helping this ordeal and the repayment is a stab in the back. We want to conserve wildlife. There's deer, elk, eagles, coyotes, donkeys, horses, and birds. I am for a racetrack but it doesn't need to be where people have kids and horses. There's so many pieces of land out there where it would have no impact on people. I moved out to the country with my horses because some people don't want horses next to them. This is a safety and compatibility issue.

(#2080) Vern Honstain stated he has been a Mason County resident since 1942. I'm for the rezoning because we and the whole county need it. What I'm hearing here tonight is everybody is all for it, but 'not in my back yard'.

(#2120) Bill Busacca stated he has been a resident for 35 or 40 years. He stated he is in support of the racetrack because he is a motorsports person, but also because he feels the economic development in this county is really important. There's almost no where left that's rural anymore. The real irony of this meeting tonight is that the GMA should have kept people from building houses way out in the boonies in the first place. The whole idea behind GMA was to keep urban areas urban, and rural areas rural, and the more we try to mix it, then we have this problem.

(#2175) David Ram from Danfield, California testified that he is on the Board of Directors for Thunderhill Raceway in Willows, California. He stated he was on the committee that tried to build a track in northern California. It took 5 years to find an appropriate site. He stated that these folks have done their homework, and what I would like to report on is what a tremendous success Thunderhill Raceway is. It was a very similar environment with neighbors a mile and a half away. The person who sold the land to the Sports Club of America to build the track was an angus rancher and he only sold off about a third of his property and lives about 200 yards from turn 8 on the road course. We haven't had any problems with them. The angus are roaming the lands right next to the road course and we have not had one problem with livestock or animals in that area. There have been no neighbors upset or move. The track has won the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

business of the year a couple of times as a positive impact on the overall community. I trust Rod and Joe that they are going to do the right thing, and I'm in favor of changing the zoning.

(#2300) Terri Jeffrey, Executive Director of the Shelton-Mason County Chamber of Commerce. She stated it is her pleasure to testify in support of the proposed rezone before you on behalf of our members. We think this proposal is consistent with county rural land use objectives, and meets the objectives of the county's economic development element. Specifically goal 17 of that element which states 'The county will promote the development of tourist and tourist related activities as part of the economic diversity strategy providing employment and business opportunities in Mason County'. This proposal before you promotes the development of tourist related activities and it meets the criteria for consideration of alternative land uses, especially given, from what I understand, are poor soil conditions and lack of any water feature that would attract wildlife. The Mason County Chamber of Commerce works really hard to promote tourism because of the positive economic benefits of this industry and are efforts are lead in part on the county's emphasis in tourism development which is outlined in the economic development element. Approximately 1 in 3 jobs in this county are dependent on a healthy, thriving tourism industry and this number could grow if we could grow year round tourist activities. Increasing the number and diversity of activities available for the visiting public is critical to successfully compete in this highly competitive industry. If we want to grow our economy, we've got to increase some of these uses in the appropriate places. Large scale facilities need large scales of land. I urge you to recommend this proposal to the BOCC.

(#2400) Sam Valley is a Mason County resident. He stated is in favor of the racing and we have to get the kids off the street. Better to have them up there on a Friday night and Saturdays instead of out here up and down the back streets.

(#2450) Bill Lynn, attorney for the project, stated the inability to talk about the project in specifics is as difficult for the applicant as it is for some of the people in the audience. There would be nothing better for the applicant than to tell you we won't have this kind of fuel there, or we'll have these measures in place to protect water quality. Those things will come down the line, however, it is frustrating from our standpoint as well not to be able to talk about some of these things. The special use permit process is by no means a slam dunk. I keep hearing comments about once this is done this is a foregone conclusion. The special use permit process is difficult. There will be an environmental review and we will have to go before the Hearing Examiner and we have to show the Hearing Examiner that we meet very specific findings, like compatibility and will not cause future commercial growth in the area. It's an important step but by no means is it over if the rezone is forwarded onto the BOCC. This site is ideal for a use like this one. It is close to transportation corridors, yet it's isolated and has neighbors already not totally rural in character. So what better place to put this.

(#2550) Rob Drexler stated he is a Mason County resident. He spoke in favor of the rezone. We need this; we need this in the county. We need this to grow and continue moving on. That is the highest and best use for this piece of property when you take into consideration what exists around it.

(#2575) Richard Nelson and he has been a Mason County resident since the 60's. I think the property is well suited for this type of endeavor and he's thankful these folks are going to give us this type of facility of this caliber in our county. Economically it makes sense for the whole county.

(#2610) Kristy Buck stated she is business owner and a second generation life long Shelton resident. She also spoke on favor of the rezone. As a real estate in town she agrees with Mr. Lynn regarding the rural area and doesn't feel people would be excited to live next to a prison and a dump and a wrecking yard. This is a great use for this property.

(#2640) Peggy Zamzow stated she is a life time resident of Mason County and supports the rezone. She has letters of recommendation from residents for you. She acknowledged their presence in the chambers, however, they did not wish to speak.

(#2670) Bob Love stated he is a resident of Grapeview and owns a small business in Mason County. He urges the commission to recommend approval of the rezone. It is in the best interest of the citizens of the county to help the economy grow and diversify. The uses proposed in the rezone request are compatible

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

and consistent with the uses in the nearby areas.

(#2700) Kay Pierson of Honeysuckle Lane spoke on the issue. She stated living near the Corrections Center to people that don't live out there is a statement that doesn't make sense. If you live where I do, living by the Corrections Center only means that occasionally they do shooting. They put notices in the newspaper before they do shooting. You're aware that it's coming. As far as living near the Corrections Center, they make great neighbors. They're quiet, you can't park out in front, etc. As far as living by the dump; it's a transfer station, not a dump. It doesn't stink and it's not nasty. The only time it's nasty is free dump day and it takes an hour and a half to get home on free dump day. The wrecking yard is just fine; it's not an offensive thing. In regards to not in the boondocks, my house is 4 blocks from Highway 101. That is not in the boondocks. That was critically research by me to live in the country that close to town. When you are talking about a specific plan that we can't talk about, we go back to the beginning of what happens when you rezone. When, or if, this is rezoned they're just the first in a line of people that can do whatever is open to being done under the rezone. When they're saying they're just going to do this and this and this, how much more difficult is it, once they get it rezoned, to bring it back to what I was investing inn?? You're opening a can of worms forever. I am speaking tonight with the hope that my works will help you understand the negative impact the proposed zoning change will have not only my property value but also the quality of my life. I'm a writer. All my life I've planned to own property in the woods where I can enjoy peace and quiet while writing my stories. Sever years ago, after a lifetime of dreaming and months of searching and researching, I chose to buy land on Honeysuckle Lane. Since then I have put every penny I've got, plus all the blood, sweat and tears that it takes to build what I call my sanctuary. Believe me, had I ever thought something like this would be proposed, I would have never purchased property there. But I did and I love it, it's my home. But right now it feels like it's being invaded and the only way to stopo the invasion is to ask for your help. A zoning change will have a negative impact on all of us. I'd like to emphasize to you, there's a reason we chose to live in the country where we do. This change will affect the quality of our lives: (Noise) I hear vehicles drive up Eells Hill road on a normal day. Imagine how loud the road of drag racing will be. (Economic impact) If approved, the property value in this area will drop. (Traffic) Highway 102 and especially Eells Hill Road cannot handle the volume of traffic that will come with drag racing. (Fire Danger) Last summer I was evacuated because my home was in the direct line of a forest fire that was started by a person camping just west of Eells Hill Road. The year prior, there was another large fire, also man caused. Please just say no to a proposal that will so adversely affect the safety, quality, and prosperity of our lines. I plan to live in my home on Honeysuckle Lane until the day I die. Beyond that I plan to give it to my children, so in closing I ask you to please not approve this zoning change.

(#3130) Richard Beckman stated he is a small business owner and he lives about 5 miles from the site. He stated he is all for the plan. We need growth in this economy; we need more jobs. We have a private investor who is willing to come into this county and invest a substantial amount of money into this project. This project may not even come through, but the fact is, we need people like this who have the funds that are looking to invest in our community. The economic benefit far out weighs a little bit of noise.

(#3200) Patricia Ott stated she lives on Honeysuckle Ln. We were evacuated when those fires broke out. This project is not a good idea. We already have people dragging up and down our road. We have children out there with special needs. All three of my kids are handicapped. I don't need them killed by this. They can't hear and they can't see very well. We moved there because it was peaceful. It had the same environment that we were looking for; horses, farms, dogs, cats, wildlife. You can't say it won't affect the wildlife. It's just not a good idea.

(#3300) Robert Ott stated he lives on Honeysuckle Ln. Be careful of all the double talk. Everybody is concerned about adding jobs to the economy. It's a rental facility. How many jobs do you think a rental facility will cause? It's ridiculous. It's not going to add anything to the economy. Everybody says it's the best thing for Mason County. Maybe for you guys, but what about the other half of us that are here? Our road is a very windy road, and they catch people dragging down that road all the time. I don't think it's a good idea.

(#3400) Louie Cafoni stated he lives on Snowcrest Ln. I've lived here for 9 years. I've heard a lot of passionate speeches about not having this in my back yard. I've heard people say there are other places in Mason County for this project. I's like them to step forward and supply 170 acres that no one will be able to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

hear a car. The old saying of if a tree falls in the forest no one hears it. It's pretty hard not to hear something in this county. I live on a street that's in residential. How dare you people!!! I'm in a constant fight with Mason County. There's a gentleman with 30 junkies on our street in a residential area, and it's a business; it's junkyard. So how dare you people tell me about taxes. I'm in a money fight with this county to give me some kind of relief. I'm told by the state and county that this is the way it is and if you don't like it, move out of town. I don't want to move out of town. I want them to do the right thing, and so far, little has been done.

(#3550) Shelley Smetzler stated she has just recently bought property at Bear Grass Ln., and we bought that property because of the quiet area, and we would never have bought that property if we had any idea that something like this could just be thrown in. It's quiet, we have children, we have animals, that's why we want to live out there and to think all that can change because somebody else comes in with money I understand our community needs jobs and we need income coming in, but it shouldn't affect people who have made their decision on buying property and living in an area because somebody else thinks they have a better idea. There's not just one, two or three of us that live out there. This will affect everybody that lives off that road. She inquired if they were going to be compensated taxwise for the loss on their property values. Once we open that door it sounds like we could have all kinds of different things, not just a race track. It could be a rifle range, or a campground, and there are a lot of ecological impacts that could be made by any of those things. Not just specifically what they're proposing.

(#3700) Dennis Pickard closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#3720) The PAC asked for a recess to read the public comments that have been submitted. Dennis thanked everyone who took time out of their schedules to attend the hearing. He also expressed his appreciation for the passion but also consideration that everyone expressed towards everyone else and towards the group as a whole.

(#0105) Ken VanBuskirk stated this issue is on the consent agenda for tomorrow night before the BOCC. He inquired why they want a hearing so quickly.

(#0110) Barbara Adkins explained this is just the set the public hearing for a future time. It is merely a request of the BOCC to schedule a public hearing for December 15th. If you would prefer not to offer a recommendation tonight, or need more time, I would just ask that that item be removed from the consent agenda so that they do not schedule their hearing.

(#0170) Bill Dewey noted at the earlier hearing when we were considering changing the DR's, one of the PAC's recommendation was in the RTC campground designation, the special use language is a bit vague in regards to the Motorized Commercial Outdoor Recreation. We suggested preparing a code amendment revising RTC to specify club motor sports with appropriate standards.

(#0200) Barbara Adkins explained we have not revised that. In order to make a revision like that proposed by the PAC, we would need to craft the language within the group and workshop it through. At that point all the process stopped.

(#0210) Bill Dewey inquired about the development moratorium that is on the property. Is considering a rezone actually a valid activity for us at this point?

(#0235) Barbara Adkins stated the way that code reads defines a rezone as a development permit under that particular section of our code. I couldn't say if that was consistent with the way we define a development permit throughout the rest of the land use regulations. I would will try to get legal interpretation of that tomorrow. If it should be that it does qualify as a development permit application, it would put this process on hold before it went to the board until the moratorium was resolved.

(#0270) Jim Reece inquired about the lifting of the moratorium process.

(#0275) Dennis Pickard explained it's a six-year time frame from the date of the approval of the forest practices application. There are two different procedures involved. One would be with a waiver and a

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

removal, which are two different procedures that could impact whether that extended for the full six-year term from that original application. Since this body is not charged with the approval or denial of the zoning, but rather, we're having a public hearing and making a recommendation, that making that determination and complying with any restrictions based on the moratorium would be the responsibility of the BOCC and not this body. So we would be safe to proceed with making a recommendation without that issued being resolved before us.

(#0305) Bill Dewey noted he would like to make sure that information is in the record.

(#0310) Discussion regarding how soon the minutes from this meeting could be made available for the public to review before going to the BOCC hearing. A number of limitations might make the minutes unavailable for review before the next hearing.

(#0375) Dennis Pickard stated this is an area that is relatively well suited for the proposal given the existing uses in the immediate vicinity. There are, however, legitimate concerns expressed by the property owners in terms of project specific impacts.

(#0395) Jim Reece stated all of the RTC items that are permitted seem appropriate for the site. He noted he visited the site and the standard items that are included in this rezoning seem appropriate. Whatever facility is built on the site, the safety and concerns would be better monitored than having people using the land as it is today. In the area, I think the rezoning would be correct to change it to RTC. He explained his background comes from the auto industry and improving grounds that Chrysler had in Michigan. That was in the farmlands and the farms around it and all of the street legal cars that ran there did not cause any problems. His only concern would be to run race vehicles for LeMans, Sebring and others that were heard from a distance.

(#0435) Bill Dewey stated he also visited the site and stated this is a challenge. GMA encourages you to think proactively and zone the county so that you avoid use conflict like we have arising around this particular proposal. If you think about it when it comes to the RTC zone it's not something the county is going to go out and do proactively. Almost all of these are going to come to us as rezones because you can't think throughout the county what sites somehow be appropriate for it and zone it that way. We have to try to consider all of the other uses that are listed here that if this proposal never comes forward and we approve this rezone could potentially happen out there. Some concern to me is where do you get a water park or something that is a very high volume use from a traffic standpoint. I could see it having an impact on infrastructure. He stated he is also concerned about the vagueness of the statement 'motorized commercial outdoor recreation'. If this becomes a potential dragstrip or the type of racing that's going to have a lot of noise impact out there, that's going to change the character of that area. We talked about the consideration of spot zoning, but that's one approach to potentially dealing with a proposal like this. Or another idea is 'contract zoning', which is actually a rezone that would be approved specific to this use. That way you could put some criteria on it to try to address some of the concerns that are coming forward.

(#0535) Dennis Pickard stated we had a prior application where that issue was raised and had an applicant willing to submit to some form of limitation on the rezone and I don't know what happened with that after our involvement with that particular matter.

(#0550) Barbara Adkins responded it was a conditional rezone and it was adopted with the conditions.

(#0555) Dennis Pickard stated so there is precedent for something of that nature.

(#0565) Bill Dewey stated he is just trying to present options as I've looked at the proposal and listened to concerns raised tonight. I'm not totally uncomfortable with the proposal as it stands right now.

(#0586) Dennis Pickard stated he also has concerns and the issue we run into is essentially when we did apply zoning to the rural areas of Mason County we had no way of knowing what areas might be used for other rural uses other than residential, so to the best of my knowledge, there are no undeveloped parcels that carry the zoning classification as RTC. It's not a position that I'm particularly comfortable being in, in terms of having to rezone any parcel that wants to engage in a rural permitted use that is not residential. Maybe in some future date we can look that as an issue before the commission. Because there are no other vacant

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

parcels that are zoned appropriate for this use we have to look at this request for a rezone and the requirements of the GMA that provide for economic opportunities.

(#0665) Bill Dewey noted the close proximity to the UGA and the services they offer within a reasonable distance for the people who would be coming to use the track.

(#0685) Ken VanBuskirk stated he is concerned about the fact that the RTC designation speaks to small scale recreational and tourist related activities. He stated he's not sure what that small scale means and how this particular proposal would fit with that. That definition might need to be tightened up. He stated his biggest concern is that it looks to be setting a precedence. There are quite a bit of other RR20 in the vicinity and that creates pressure for other folks to rezone their property. He disagrees with staff on their findings on criteria #7.

(#0725) Bill Dewey further inquired of Ken how so. Bill Dewey further explained RTC zone is sort of a project specific requested rezone.

(#0745) Ken VanBuskirk explained last month we had two other RR20 requests come before us ..

(#0750) Bill Dewey noted but not for an RTC zone.

(#0770) Ken VanBuskirk noted someone in their testimony mentioned there was a critical aquifer recharge area, and inquired if that information is available.

(#0780) Barbara Adkins responded we do not have that map available at this time. All that will come out of the studies for the special use permit.

(#0800) Bill Dewey noted his concern with consistency. I try to make sure that we are consistent with similar decisions. I talked to Allan Borden of the Department of Community Development staff about prior rezone requests for RTC zone. The only example I could find where we really proposed to reject it was an event oriented rezone. It would have put a burden on infrastructure, which I don't necessarily see happening here with this particular proposal. I don't sense an undue burden on infrastructure. Some of these other uses in RTC I could see putting a burden on the infrastructure out there.

(#0850) Dennis Pickard stated that is a concern he shares in terms of the broader range of uses that are possible with the zoning. There are very legitimate concerns of the neighboring community in terms of the issues that may be presented by some of those specific uses. He noted he doesn't know how much emphasis the Hearings Examiner process places on limiting perhaps otherwise permitted uses to those that are specifically compatible with the surrounding community.

(#0870) Barbara Adkins explained the special use permit would be specifically for that project so he would be evaluating just that project and it's compatibility with everything. He or she would hear the specific issues on the project he was presented with, including all the details regarding land use, traffic, noise, etc. They can condition the project and restrict it in any way.

(#0925) Bill Dewey inquired if a proposal was to come in for a club racing facility that included drag racing, who would make the determination whether that qualified as a motorized commercial outdoor recreation use.

(#0975) Barbara Adkins responded that she would be the one making that decision. I would determine that it would need a special use permit because it didn't qualify under any of the other ones.

(#1005) Dennis Pickard wondered if the opportunity to address your concern might be to suggest that we forward any recommendation forward for approval with perhaps a limitation as we did with the private request that any outdoor recreation facility also be subject to a special use permit. Bill's concern is we're not certain that's is what is going to be applied for. That additional review and the opportunity for the public to comment on any specific proposal that comes with any rezone of this parcel would be beneficial to both the proponent and opponents of this proposal.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

(#1075) Bill Dewey stated that would raise his comfort level considerably. I make a motion to recommend approval to the RTC zone with the provision that on these particular parcels any outdoor recreational activity be required to get a special use permit.

(#1125) Barbara Adkins stated you may not be able to do that because it specifically outlines what needs to go to the Hearings Examiner and what does not need to. You're trying to change what the Hearings Examiner can do which is outside of what he would normally review. I don't think you can change it to any outdoor activity has to go through a special use permit as that basically changes the way the code is written. Conditional zoning that went through was for a commercial use where there were a long list of items that were allowed uses within that new zone. It was all those uses that were allowed that was of concern to the community. They didn't change the way the code was read; they just limited it. What you're doing is actually changing what the code says.

(#1185) Dennis Pickard noted that you're saying we have precedence for limiting the uses but not add additional requirements. We could potentially limit the rezone to permitting only those uses requiring a special use permit. That would accomplish what you're saying.

(#1210) Barbara Adkins stated then you would be taking out everything except two uses that would only be allowed under a special use permit. That would severely limit the use of the property.

(#1220) Ken VanBuskirk stated he is uncomfortable making any decision until I know how that development moratorium applies to this. That is specific to those parcels as well.

(#1250) Dennis Pickard stated he is not overly concerned about that in terms of this hearing as we're not approving anything at the hearing. We're just forwarding the recommendation to the BOCC.

(#1270) Ken VanBuskirk stated we have two different property owners, but only one applicant.

(#1300) Barbara Adkins stated that is correct.

(#1310) Ken VanBuskirk inquired if that was typical that one property owner asks for a rezone.

(#1315) Barbara Adkins responded it's probably the majority of the property owners themselves who are asking for the rezone, but it's not atypical for someone else to ask for it with the permission of the property owners.

(#1345) Joe Manke, one of the property owners, stated they are not going to buy a piece of property until they find out if it's possible for them to rezone it. We don't need any more property in that area, and we have a tentative agreement with them in that if it can be rezoned, we will make a trade, and they have agreed to that.

(#1400) Barbara Adkins stated she did not want the PAC to feel pressured to do this tonight. I have put it on the consent agenda already because of the time it takes to get items scheduled for hearing. I don't want that to impact your decision making process that you're got a clock you're racing against. If this commission is not comfortable tonight making a decision or a recommendation, I don't want you to feel that staff is trying to pressure you into one, or to try to hurry this up at all. That is not my or the applicant's intention.

(#1450) Dennis Pickard asked the PAC if they needed more time for a future discussion, or were comfortable making a recommendation based on the information we have before us tonight.

(#1465) Bill Dewey stated he was comfortable making a recommendation if we could limit the uses that require a special use permit, as well as being contingent on clarification from the Prosecuting Attorney that rezoning is an appropriate action with the moratoriums that are in place. Bill made that into a motion stating he would move that we approve the rezone to RTC for only those uses which require a special use permit, and contingent on the Prosecuting Attorney's clarification that rezoning is an appropriate action with the moratoriums that are currently in place. There was a second to the motion.

(#1500) Jim Reece stated that would render the property only usable for two items.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

(#1540) Dennis Pickard stated that is not an ideal situation.

(#1545) Bill Dewey noted that was not his idea of an ideal solution, but was trying to address the concerns that some of those other activities in RTC might have more severe impacts.

(#1550) Dennis Pickard inquired what types of permits would be required, and how much public input would there be in the process.

(#1565) Barbara Adkins explained there would be building permits, undergo the plan review, aquifer recharge, critical areas. There are no shorelines. It wouldn't necessarily go before the Hearings Examiner.

(#1600) Dennis Pickard inquired about an EIS statement and the concerns expressed with that.

(#1625) Bill Dewey added that would come in the SEPA review process. You will have a project specific SEPA review. If that SEPA review comes up with a determination of significance, then that triggers and EIS.

(#1635) Dennis Pickard noted that would likely generate a determination of significance, which would trigger a requirement for an EIS.

(#1645) Bill Dewey responded not necessarily. You may not have an environmental impact but you may have an infrastructure impact.

(#1665) Dennis Pickard stated he feels they're at a point where there are some concerns that we're not in a position to adequately address at this time. The broad brush limitation doesn't seem to be a solution because we would be imposing it without necessarily having input and consent of the property owners that are involved. We don't know whether we can impose the kinds of conditions that would more directly address our concerns about other possible uses of the property. I sense there's a lot of reluctance on the part of the PAC to act on this without some further protections for the public in terms of any project that goes forward on the site. Dennis inquired if there was an adequate comfort level if they approve this rezone as is without that limitation.

(#1735) Bill Dewey stated he is uncomfortable with some of the broader uses. He feels like a special use permit for a commercial motorized outdoor activity would address his concerns. He inquired about a contract rezone.

(#1765) Bill Lynn stated the applicants would agree to a contract rezone, or a recommendation by you that the BOCC develop a contract rezone that would limit the uses on the property to the recreational motorsports together with any accessory uses that the Hearings Examiner might approve. That would have to be negotiated between the Prosecuting Attorneys office and the applicant.

(#1825) Bill Dewey withdrew his earlier motion, and the second was withdrawn, and move that we recommend the BOCC consider a contractual rezone for Ridge Motorsports Group LLC for a club motorsports facility and accessory uses contingent upon the Prosecuting Attorney's clarification that rezoning is an appropriate action with the moratorium in place. There was a second.

(#1950) Jim Reece noted this would put this zoning and use only on this land if it goes through.

(#2000) Bill Dewey inquired with this zoning would they still need a special use permit.

(#2005) Dennis Pickard explained, yes, because the change in the zoning would be to RTC subject to the limitations imposed by the contract.

(#2020) Barbara Adkins inquired of Bill Lynn if you put these limitations on this which limits it only to the special use permit and then the special use permit gets denied, is this going to be three parcels that absolutely have no use because nothing would be allowed on them now.

(#2025) Bill Lynn explained the contracts provide that the zoning gets reversed back to the RR20. That

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 23, 2009

would be part of the agreement.

(#2050) There were no other comments or discussion so the vote was taken and the motion carries, with 3 voting for, and 1, Ken VanBuskirk, voting against.

Meeting adjourned.