

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

November 18, 2013

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

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jim Sims called the meeting to order at 6:06 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Members present: Jim Sims, Vicki Wilson, Kristy Buck, Bill Dewey, and Ken VanBuskirk. Rob Drexler absent.

Staff present: Barbara Adkins, Rebecca Hersha, Grace Miller, and Allan Borden.

Department of Ecology and Commerce: Rick Mraz and Tim Gates.

Mason County Commissioners: Terri Jeffreys, Tim Sheldon, and Randy Neatherlin.

3. REGULAR BUSINESS

a) Adoption of Agenda – Agenda approved. (No formal motion made.)

b) Approval of Minutes – Vicki Wilson made a motion to accept the minutes from October 21, 2013, Bill Dewey seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. SMP UPDATE JOINT SESSION WITH BOCC

Jim Sims began by acknowledging staff and expressed the PAC's gratitude. Specifically, Rebecca Hersha – Planner and PAC's lead from Mason County Department of Community Development. Tim Gates - on loan to the County from the Department of Commerce. Rick Mraz – the representative from Department of Ecology. And Allan Borden and Grace Miller, County Planners. Also Mindi Brock, who they are disappointed to have leaving her position with the County.

Jim Sims gave history on how the Planning Advisory Commission has arrived to where they are today. The first SMP was adopted in 1975, and then updated in 1988. The current update was paid for by a grant from the Department of Ecology up to the original due date of June 2013. Over the first couple of years, there were meetings held by the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), which Vicki Wilson was a member, and there was a Joint Technical Advisory Committee (JTAC). The draft SMP was delivered by the contractors to the PAC in January 2013, and since then the PAC has been meeting about twice a month for about 3 hours each time. Without the help of Barbara Adkin's leadership, the PAC would not be where they are today. The PAC

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 18, 2013

expects to continue the process and have a review and complete proposal to go to public hearings. The PAC hopes to present to the Commissioners in May or June 2014 a product of their efforts.

However, as changes are made to the draft SMP, there are going to be changes required in the County's Resource Ordinance to ensure that the citizen is not dealing with two sets of regulations. The PAC has found that Shoreline Environmental Designations has been the hardest issue to resolve. The DOE has published guidelines of designations to assist in this regard.

Comments:

Ken VanBuskirk shared that in 2011, the staff person brought the SMP before the PAC and explained that there were 5 different phases. The PAC asked at that time to be kept in the loop at the end of each one of the phases, and one of the phases was the environmental designation. It didn't come back to the PAC for almost two years. He referenced that a number of properties with environmental designations came before them and the landowner asked them to consider change in those designations, which they did. But one of the members of the Department of Ecology said changing the designation would be promoting development and that DOE would take a formal role when it came before the Board of County Commissioners. He felt a bit pressured by DOE to change their decision on that and didn't feel it was appropriate.

Jim Sims wonders why the PAC should restrict future development that is already zoned one way and a strict adherence to the DOE guidelines restricts that development opportunity. He comes down on the side of zoning and what is currently important to property owners in Mason County to ensure potential development is more than an RCW.

Bill Dewey commented that the PAC needs to reach out to people where they know the environmental designation is changing adjacent to their property. Kristy Buck added that they really need to reach out specifically to waterfront. Commissioner Terri Jeffreys inquired if it is known whether these similar issues have been raised in other counties and have been vetted.

Vicki Wilson offered that the intent and purpose of the current environmental designations are pretty much parallel with the intent and purpose of the proposed ones. She believes where the issue lies is in this update, the criteria for looking at property and which designation best fits those criteria.

Tim Gates acknowledged that the PAC is discussing an inherent issue in shoreline management. He suggests that the best way for this to move forward is in a partnership, collaborative way. He expresses that there is still time to keep at this topic and work with the landowners.

Rick Mraz discussed his background in providing technical assistance to the staff. He added that the existing SMP has been accompanied by the Resource Ordinance (RO), and a lot of the shoreline buffers and setback requirements are currently implemented by the RO. The changes are to harmonize through implementation. He agrees with Tim Gates' and feels that the DOE's effort has been collaborative and will continue to be in order to move forward.

There was informative discussion by the PAC as to how the Resource Ordinance will be a part of the Shoreline Master Program. Rebecca explained that currently, the county applies both the SMP and the RO in development review and oftentimes both SMP and RO permits are required.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 18, 2013

Now, it will be similar in that the SMP and the RO will apply in shoreline jurisdiction, but only shoreline permits would be required, which will reduce burden on applicants and review Staff. Additionally, they are making an effort to clean up discrepancies within the Resource Ordinance, within the SMP, and between the two regulations.

The Mason County Board of Commissioners offered their support to the PAC and their confidence in receiving a quality product, and thanked them for their hours of work put into the SMP.

Jim Sims asked for any public comment, and there was not any.

Break 7:16 to 7:33 pm

5. PUBLIC MEETING FOR SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM REVIEW

A. Outdoor Advertising (PAC Revisions)

Rebecca introduced her document titled "Outdoor Advertising, Sign and Billboards" and dated 11/7/2013, which included the changes to the chapter that the PAC had recommended at the 10/21/13 PAC workshop.

Vicki Wilson noticed that the language at Draft SMP Regulations, Item #4, should read as was decided and outlined in the October 21, 2013 minutes at page 3. In addition, at the Proposed Classification Table, under Natural there is an X, and the PAC had decided to put a P there, also as noted in the October minutes at page 3.

B. Transportation

Vicki Wilson discussed Definitions, Transportation Facilities (page 1) to add the following language:

Transportation Facilities. *Facilities consisting of the means and equipment necessary for the movement of passengers or goods, including roads and railways, and all related bridges and culverts, fills, embankments, causeways, parking areas, truck terminals and rail switchyards, siding and spurs.*

(Note: This definition was amended again at the next workshop on December 16th, 2013.)

Ken VanBuskirk commented that since DOE guidelines suggest pedestrian, he thought it might be important to include pedestrian in the definition. PAC agreed and asked Staff to incorporate that wording into the definition.

Vicki Wilson also referenced Regulations Item #15 through #22 (page 5 and 6), which are all about parking. She wondered if maybe that should be one section with #15-#22 as subsections underneath it. The PAC agreed to this.

Ken VanBuskirk referenced Regulations Item #5 (page 5), and the PAC discussed alternate language with Public Works staff, Loretta Swanson, Storm Water Engineer and Melissa McFadden, Engineer. It was decided to have it read as follows:

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 18, 2013

Requirements for culvert installation in streams used by anadromous fish are defined by shall be consistent with the Department of Fisheries and culvert installation may require a hydraulic permit.

(Note: At the next workshop, PAC and Staff agreed that this entire regulation should be stricken.)

Bill Dewey referenced Policies (page 2), and suggested having a separate policy that states where appropriate, and where there is opportunity, informational kiosks or educational displays be incorporated (if doing transportation along the shoreline). After the PAC discussed the same, Jim Sims asked Rebecca to revise Policies Item #14 to include this language.

Vicki Wilson spoke to Policies Item #16 (page 3), and its Regulations Item #11 (page 5). The policy seems to be restricted to public, but the regulation is not. The PAC decided that Regulations Item #11 should be stricken. (Note: This regulation was reinstated at the next PAC workshop).

Kristy Buck discussed Policies Item #15 (page 3), in reference to “mutual consent”. After lengthy discussion about this item’s wording, and ideas to remove it altogether, the PAC agreed to revisit this after some query work is done. Rebecca will look into the Parks Plan’s wording.

Kristy Buck also discussed Regulations Item #2 (page 4). It was agreed that it is not necessary to use the word “new” in front of bridge construction. Rebecca referenced Item #2(b). Melissa McFadden of Public Works pointed out that the draft SMP suggests in this Chapter has the potential for significant cost impacts to projects and sometimes can make things difficult to construct.

It was decided that Rebecca would revise this section to incorporate the WAC’s language, and she would get a copy of comments to the PAC.

Kristy Buck brought up Regulations Item #3 (page 5). Discussion was had about the difference between a foot bridge and a vehicular bridge. It was decided that this language is appropriate.

Rebecca talked about Regulations Item #12 (page 5). Melissa McFadden of Public Works offered her suggestion that the word “shall” be changed to should. After discussion, the PAC decided to delete this item altogether.

Grace Miller commented that it is important to think about the general public that might want to build a road through a ravine between two private residential areas. Having some basic guidelines for the public would be helpful to educate them as to why their building could be a bad idea. The PAC appreciated this comment, and decided the language about parking is necessary, but Regulations Items #13 through #22 (pages 5 and 6) need to be reworked and broken up some. Rebecca will make the changes the PAC asked for and review the last part of Regulations and make a recommendation after looking at Public Works’ comments. She will provide a summary at the next meeting.

C. Utilities

Rebecca spoke to page 89 of the Draft SMP, and the Utilities Staff Report, page 2. She discussed the Resource Ordinance statement and the 4 new Policies. There was some discussion as to Regulations Item #7 (page 4), and the reference to “Totten Inlet” only. It was decided the language should be changed as follows:

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 18, 2013

Discharges from new sewage treatment plants shall not be allowed into surface waters ~~Totten Inlet~~ regardless of the environmental designation, unless no feasible alternative is available.

D. Review and Address Written Public Comments

Jim Sims referenced to the PAC his letter dated October 29, 2013, responding to Mr. Gregory S. Zentner's letter dated October 10, 2013. The PAC was fine with Jim Sims' response and staying with the policy recommendation. *This comment letter was regarding the PAC's meeting on Capital Facilities, not regarding the SMP update.*

6. NEW BUSINESS

Rebecca will revise the SMP update timeline. The next meeting is on December 16, 2013, and the January 2014 meeting will be set at that time.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:02 pm.