

**MASON COUNTY
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION**

JULY 20TH, 2015

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

1. Call to Order

Bill Dewey called the meeting to order at 6:16 pm.

2. Roll Call

Present: Bill Dewey, Kristy Buck, Tim Duffy, Vicki Wilson

Excused: Kevin Shutt, Rob Drexler, Steve Van Denver

Staff: Rebecca Hersha, Grace Miller, Rick Mraz

3. Regular Business

a. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda adopted as written.

b. Approval of Minutes

July 6, 2015- Kristy said on page 2 she asked that “board of directors” and the fact that she and Rob did not sit on the subcommittee be added in the following paragraph:

Kristy asked Barbara if there was any sort of conflict with the fact that she and Rob sit on the Economic Development Council [Board of Directors](#), since the EDC was presenting. Barbara said there is no conflict at this time and asked the other PAC members if they felt the same, which they did due to the fact that neither Rob nor Kristy sat on the revision subcommittee that came up with the suggested changes.

In the following paragraph, Kristy asked that the verbiage be changed to:

Lynn Longan from the EDC spoke to introduce the suggested changes and the council. She said the EDC ~~is~~ has a [subcommittee](#) of 6 people that have been editing and making recommended updates.

Kristy made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Vicki. None oppose, motion passed.

4. Workshop -Shoreline Master Program Update

(a) Review draft additions to Title 15.05, dated June 2, 2015

Rebecca talked about the changes she made to 15.05.040, Letter of Completeness of Application. There was debate on whether (B.) (4.) should be deleted or kept as amended by Rebecca. Vicki said she had originally wanted to delete this section because she wanted applicants to be reassured that they wouldn't be continually asked for additional information before a determination of completeness was given. Vicki went on to say that with the verbiage in (D.) and (B.) (4.) there is confusion as to which one would take precedence. Rebecca voiced concern because she said the language in (B.) (4.) is required for a complete application. After deliberation, Rebecca asked if the following would be sufficient:

*Any supplemental information or special studies identified by the review authority **at the time of application**. However, for vesting purposes if a Determination of Completeness has not already been made, it will be assumed upon an issuance of a SEPA threshold Determination. ~~of Significance.~~*

The Commission agreed on this wording, and accepted the other changes drafted in the document.

(b) Review Draft Landslide Hazard Area Chapter of the Resource Ordinance (MCC 8.52.140 dated 6/17/2015).

Rebecca briefly went through the first six pages asking for any questions. She asked if wording should be changed in 6. (c.) to:

An application may be made to reduce the buffer for the purpose of constructing a single-family ~~residence~~ on a lot existing or vested by December 6, 1996.

Kristy and Vicki agreed that it should be changed. On page 11, Vicki asked if the wording of (4.) (l.) matched the SMP exactly. Rebecca said that it should match the SMP Draft. This then sparked the question of whether or not “or replacement” should be stricken. Rebecca stated that it would be removed to read:

For development proposed within shoreline jurisdiction per MCC 17.50, provide an assertion that the proposed development is set back sufficiently to ensure that new shoreline stabilization ~~or replacement~~ is unlikely to be necessary during the life of the structure...

Within section (5.), Vicki noted that both (c.) and (o.) are identical. It was decided that (c.) would be stricken. Also, Rebecca noted that “or replacement” would also be removed from (o.).

Vicki asked why it was necessary to have verbiage from the SMP repeated in the Resource Ordinance. She used (6.) on page 14 as an example because it was taken directly from the SMP draft. She proposed changing the wording to:

*If shoreline stabilization is proposed, the Shoreline Geotechnical Assessment required per the Shoreline Master Program MCC 17.50, may be combined with a Geological Assessment or a Geotechnical Report required by this chapter, **provided the requirements of each are addressed.** ~~sea level rise is considered and the following are included~~*

It was also decided that (i.) – (iv.) would be removed. No other changes were made at this time.

(c) Review Draft Fish & Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas Chapter (MCC 8.52.170).

Rebecca prefaced this section by saying it is very important due to the fact that it has most of the environmental regulations for streams, lakes, shoreline rivers, and saltwater. She said that the PAC needed to decide whether or not the Common Line Mitigation Manual should be kept or not.

A discussion was had regarding the 3 different options on page 5 of the *staff report for revised FWHCA chapter dated July 13, 2015*. Vicki asked Rebecca which option was more likely to be well received by people. Rebecca stated she wasn't sure and had contacted other counties for information, but had not had any calls back at this time. Vicki asked if there would be any harm in the mitigation manual moving forward as written to see if any public feedback was received. Rebecca said she thought that was a good idea.

Within the staff report beginning on page 3 the PAC needed to decide on any changes to "PAC Decision #1":

Staff prefers that the added allowance for a 200 square foot uncovered deck waterward of the common line be retracted because it would add unnecessary complexity to communicating the common line concept to applicants. (Currently there is no deck allowance– the common line setback applies to all home, deck, garage etc.)

After a lengthy discussion and various options, Rebecca asked if the PAC wanted to leave the verbiage as is and make the structural setback the common line. Kristy said that it currently was not a pressing issue for her and she feels that if it is a large issue, the public will let them know at the hearings.

John Egbert said he would like to see something more lenient and added that he is in favor of allowing building within the setback. Vicki asked Rebecca the reason for having a 15 foot setback in addition to the buffer. Rick answered saying it was to keep people from encroaching upon the buffer. Rebecca added that the closer you are to the buffer, the more impact your use makes. Past issues were discussed by the PAC and members from the public. After some deliberation, Bill said a decision was necessary. Option A was decided upon as follows:

- A. *Allow for 200 square feet of deck waterward of common line, allow pervious, only 1 story, 1 foot above grade and no roof.*

Bill asked if there is a way to reward those who do not build up to the common line. Rebecca said those people are actually rewarded because the Common Line Mitigation Manual states that if they are outside of the buffer, they do not have to do any mitigation.

**Break
8:00-8:09**

- Exhibit 1 – Draft FWHCA Chapter, dated July 13, 2015

Rebecca explained on page 2 (B.) Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area Categories, that Ecology guidelines would support adding language to protect all Priority Habitats and Species (PHS), not just listed species. Rick suggested speaking with the Department of Fish and Wildlife before making changes. Rebecca asked the Commission if they were happy with the current list under (B.)(8), or if language about PHS needed to be added. Kristy, Vicki, and Bill said they were comfortable with it as shown because it matches the WAC.

Bill asked about (D.) Establishment of Buffers on Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas. (1.) (b.). He said the wording makes it seem as though the geologist would need to have extra experience. He suggested changing the verbiage to:

A report prepared by an experienced geologist, hydrologist, or civil engineer with at least 5 years experience with fluvial systems of the Pacific Northwest. ~~which includes~~ The report shall include a review of historic and current aerial photos and maps...

Vicki questioned the consistency in language between (1.) (ii.) and table 8.52.170 B on page 11. (1.)(ii.) currently states:

On streams where Channel Migration Zones have been mapped and adopted by the County, the buffer shall be 150 feet or shall extend to the outer edge of the channel migration zone, whichever is larger.

The table on page 11 has type NP streams with an attached footnote stating the buffer is 150 feet or the channel migration zone, whichever is larger. Rebecca said she would be removing that footnote.

Vicki also discovered that under (D.) (2.), the second paragraph needed to have the word “not” removed to read:

Habitat Management Plans shall be submitted with either a Mason Environmental Permit (or a Shoreline Permit or Exemption when ~~not~~ within shoreline jurisdiction).

In section (D.) (3.) (a.) Vicki asked if National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits should be added to this section. Kristy suggested adding it in the following sentence:

...In cases where approved chemical applications occur as part of a forest practices application or farm plan or National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, proper reporting procedures shall be followed.

Before ending the meeting, Rebecca discussed the Fish and Wildlife draft (Revision to exhibit 1 dated July 20, 2015.) she gave to the PAC at the beginning of the meeting. She said many of the revisions were made by Hood Canal Coordinating Council so people have the option of using in-lieu fee. Terri King asked if this revision had been agreed upon by the Mason County Commissioners due to the fact that they denied it two years prior. Rebecca said she was just making sure that the language within the resource ordinance allows for in-lieu fee to be used if it ever is available.

5. **New Business**

None

6. **Adjournment**

At 8:55 Bill Dewey moved to adjourn