

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

August 17, 2015

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

1. **Call to Order**

Bill Dewey called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM.

2. **Roll Call**

Present: Steve Van Denover, Tim Duffy, Rob Drexler, Kristy Buck, Vicki Wilson, Kevin Shutty, Bill Dewey

Staff: Barbara Adkins

3. **Regular Business**

a. **Adoption of Agenda**

Agenda adopted as written.

b. **Approval of Minutes**

March 2, 2015- On page 5, Vicki said that the WAC definition of “Priority Species” was missing from the second paragraph. Rob made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Kevin, motion carried.

June 8, 2015- On page 3, Vicki said the title of the document should be added. She asked that the following be added:

After break, Rebecca handed out a revised [section H, Shoreline Stabilization Regulations](#) ~~shoreline document~~ dated June 2, 2015 to the PAC with various revisions.

She also asked that a reference point be added in the following paragraph:

In reference to part (V.) (i), Gary Hanson asked what “cumulative over ten years” meant in regards to the one foot cap...

Under section 5. Review revisions to Landslide Hazard Area Chapter of Resource Ordinance (MCC 8.52.140), Vicki asked that a note be added regarding the fact that this topic was tabled at the June 8th meeting. She suggested:

Tabled to July 20, 2015 meeting with a decision to limit changes to SMP related text.

Kristy made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Vicki, motion carried.

c. **Future meeting dates**

- August 31, 2015
- September 14, 2015
- September 28, 2015
- October 12, 2015
- October 26, 2015

4. **2016 Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan Update-Workshop**

Begin Review of Chapters I & II for mandated updates, public comment, and Planning Commission edits.

Presenter: Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development

Barbara began with Chapter I. She said she would like to work on the chapters in order to prevent confusion. On Chapters I & II, Barbara said she went through and cleaned up incorrect verbiage, dates, and processes. Much of the language was from 1992 and was not corrected during the last update in 2005. She went through chapter I and II, briefly covering what was changed.

Bill asked if section III-8, Housing, was so dramatically rewritten that track changes weren't appropriate. Barbara answered that from what she understood, the chapter was rewritten. Bill said he would discuss that once Vicki Kirkpatrick presented the chapter.

Rob asked for progress on the Belfair/Allyn UGA citizens committee. Barbara said she saw it advertised but has not seen any applications that meets the necessary criteria.

Chapter I

In Chapter I, Vicki commented that she would like to see some wording added to the Shoreline Management Program section in regards to not infringing on constitutionally protected private property rights. She then asked for a history of the comp plan from the beginning. Barbara said the comprehensive plan is fairly young and copies exist from 1992, 1996, and 2005. Kristy and Steve said that it would be valuable to know why things were changed in the updates, and would give insight into the current update.

Comprehensive Plan Amendments - Bill questioned why item 4 (a-d) was stricken. Barbara said that section is state law, so it is unnecessary to add it. Kristy agreed that it would be best to refer to any state laws since they could potentially change before the next update.

Population - Bill asked Barbara if the census data on page 6 could possibly be put into a chart format. Vicki had a chart of population growth and decline through the years, which she gave to Barbara who mentioned that a chart may be more appropriate in Chapter III or IV where population is discussed more in depth.

Geography - Kristy asked about the last paragraph on page 6. She wanted to know why there were question marks in the edit. Barbara said they were there because she was unsure if the number of each operation should be kept. Steve said the paragraph should stay more generic. The following changes were suggested:

Combined national, state, and private forests currently account for about 56.8 percent of the County's land. ~~Mineral deposits underlie Mason County's top soils. At present these deposits support 21 [??] surface mining operations.~~ Agricultural and aquaculture areas

contribute both to the County's natural beauty and its economy. Mason County also includes substantial open space. Open space within the County hosts wildlife habitat, undeveloped natural areas, and many developed park and recreation sites. These open space areas include ~~101~~ sites managed by federal, state, county, municipal, and private interests.

Andrew Kinney spoke up and asked how the PAC was going to accept public comment. He said he was concerned with everyone sitting through all three chapters before speaking because they would forget to voice their main concerns. Bill agreed and opened the floor for comments on Chapter I.

Andrew Kinney, who works for Thurston County and resides in Mason County, spoke first and voiced concern with the future. He said that as a County we are unprepared for disasters such as storms, earthquakes, floods, etc. Andrew said these disasters are an economic force and need to be addressed. He then addressed the suggested edits saying that any numbers we have should be kept for future information. The more details that are published, the better.

Constance Ibsen asked about "Public Process" (page 5). She asked if the County had applied for an extension, and said that there is no public participation plan on the website. She said the following items need to be posted with answers on the website:

- Proposed meeting dates with proposed agenda items
- Determine the overall strategy for the comp plan and review
- Are comments and questions only welcome at the workshop meetings?
- Are comments due before the meeting or can they be submitted during/after meetings?
- Can comments be submitted on topics already covered?
- Do comments made at a PAC workshop need to be resubmitted before or at a hearing to be considered?
- Do comments need to be made in person or can they be submitted in writing?
- Should comments/edits be in a specific format to be considered?

Constance handed a copy of her questions to the PAC.

Bill inquired if the public participation plan had been adopted when it was presented. Barbara clarified that the PAC recommended to move forward, but that the County Commissioners have not adopted it yet. Bill asked if Barbara could go through Constance's questions and address anything that is not in the Public Participation Plan. He suggested she present it at the next comp plan workshop. Constance then asked Barbara about the completion timeline, saying she is concerned with the amount of time available versus what needs to be done. Vicki commented she was afraid of the comp plan becoming the new SMP and taking years to complete. Bill asked the other members how they would like to proceed with the time given. After a short discussion, Bill said the timeline will need to be revisited at the next meeting.

Terri Thompson spoke and said she is confused as to how the comp plan is being handled. She said there is a lack of clarity and asked the following questions:

- Will the resource ordinances be updated?
- When will that happen?
- Will changes be done to the Critical Aquifer recharge (CARA) section of the comp plan?
- Since the CARA ordinances have not been implemented, how will issues be resolved without opening up for public review and discussion?
- If there are questions on random areas of the comp plan, can they be submitted at any time?

At this time, Terri handed the PAC a statement she typed up including the above questions. Terri then asked about the “Economy” section on page 7. She said that a vision needs to be outlined in this section and recreation/tourism should be added.

Patricia Vandehey said that in Chapter 2 under “Public Participation”, she was worried about the sections that had been crossed out and asked how the County was technically complying with the Growth Management Advisory Committee rules (GMAC). She then asked the PAC members if any of them were just citizens or if they were all involved with a special interest, board or business. Each of the members answered with their occupation. Patricia said that there needs to be more of a balance with the general public.

Steve Bloomfield stated that the number associated with gravel mines is important because it sets up history and assists with seeing changes.

Jay Hupp addressed Barbara Adkins by saying he was encouraged by the idea of cleaning up 20 years worth of oversight. He went on to say that the time allotted for completion is a concern that needs to be discussed with the County Commissioners. He commented that before Chapter 1, there is a glossary that has quite a few recommended changes from the Economic Development Council. He then addressed the “Economic Development” verbiage in Chapter 1 and gave a background of the EDC.

Ken VanBuskirk began by complementing the staff on their meeting notices. He then stated that he stands behind Vicki’s question regarding a history of the comprehensive plan, saying that it is necessary information. On page 1, under “How is the comprehensive plan organized?” Ken suggested adding the year all of the elements were last updated. In the section labeled “Belfair Urban Growth Area Sub Area Plan” (page 3), he said that though the goal for Belfair is to evolve from a “pass through” center, it has been such for 50 years and will continue to be a pass through center. In closing, he suggested the vision statement for this section be completely revised.

No other comments were given for Chapter I. Before moving to Chapter II, Bill asked Vicki about her earlier comments regarding the history of the comp plan. He asked how detailed she was thinking. Vicki said she wasn’t sure how detailed it could be, but her main concern was loss of information because once you remove sections out of the comp plan, it will be difficult for someone to know how the plan was originally developed. Rob questioned if anybody would really need to know the full history because the document stands alone. Kevin agreed with Rob and added that too much history can be paralyzing. He added that the document needs to be reflective of the time in which it’s written. Steve agreed with that statement.

Chapter II

The Rural Areas - Kristy suggested changing “Christmas tree farming” to “minor forest

products”. Kristy then noticed Barbara had a question on page 2 regarding “The Urban Areas”. The PAC liked the idea of each area having its own description, but Kristy felt that the description of Shelton was a bit weak and needed more detail. Barbara said she would like to have that detail come from the City of Shelton. Vicki asked if the introduction for “The Urban Areas” should be deleted or kept. She said that if it is kept, the type of businesses should be changed because retail and service industries are currently the only types listed.

Overview (Page 2 under “Plan Goals”)-Vicki questioned Barbara about the second paragraph which had a comment saying, *[This could be updated if the City is interested in another joint effort. If not we either leave it or take it out.]* She noted that in Chapter 2, there are some changed county-wide policies and said that the policies done with the City of Shelton need to either be left alone, another joint process needs to be done, or the County has to declare that they are not joint any longer. Barbara responded saying that not all of the policies related to both jurisdictions. Some of the policies do mention both the county and the city, but many were very generic.

Reduce Sprawl - On page 6, the PAC discussed 2.1. There was a question regarding “personal freedom” which was in the previous version of the comp plan. Steve said it should be stricken because it is inappropriate for the plan. Kristy agreed, saying it was too broad. 2.1 will now read:

The Rural areas throughout Mason County contribute in large measure to the quality of life enjoyed by residents. These areas are characterized by low housing densities, wilderness and recreational living opportunities, and open space. Other rural qualities include peace and quiet, low traffic volumes, natural views, and privacy. ~~and personal freedom...~~

Also on page 6, Barbara asked about 2.3 which reads:

Establish level of service standards in Growth Areas that ensure adequate services to prevent out-migration due to congestion.

She asked for clarification on what this section really meant. Bill said it is for locations that have high levels of traffic which cause people to seek services elsewhere to prevent sitting in traffic for hours every day. He then pointed out that the same verbiage is also under “Transportation” (3.3) on page 8. Steve recommended striking it from page 6 because it was better suited within the transportation section. Kristy agreed.

Kristy referred to page 7, under 2.4 where Barbara posted a question regarding Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD). This sparked talk between the public and the PAC regarding which areas were designated as LAMIRDs. Bill asked Barbara to obtain some more information regarding how the County designates LAMIRDs.

Transportation - Bill asked if this section had any reference to the Transportation Improvement Program Citizen Advisory Panel (TIP-CAP). Currently there is no mention of TIP-CAP, so Kristy suggested adding it to 3.7 to read:

Ensure that cooperative planning efforts continue with the Peninsula Regional Transportation Policy Organization and the Transportation Improvement Program Citizen Advisory Panel (TIP-CAP) and that policies of the County and the organizations are consistent and coordinated with the Comprehensive Plan as the guiding document for Mason County.

Housing - Bill questioned if this section of Chapter II dealt with the same information as Chapter III-8. Barbara said this portion deals with policies. Vicki suggested coming back to this portion of Chapter II after the actual Housing chapter had been discussed. The same was decided for “Economic Development” (page 9).

Permits - Vicki suggested adding verbiage such as, “Policies and regulations should support elimination of redundancy and duplication in permitting.” She said she would like this added to assure permits are processed in a timely and fair manner and also to make sure they are processed in the most efficient way from the customers prospective. Vicki added that if a customer is turning in multiple applications, they should not have to give the same information multiple times. Andrew Kinney spoke from the audience saying that not all applications go to the same people, so sometimes the same information is needed. Bill said that the verbiage may need to be changed but did not want to spend valuable time creating a statement. Barbara said she understood what Vicki was saying, but also mentioned that if two applications were turned in and only one had the necessary information, an employee would have to take their time filling out that second application instead of working on its approval.

Natural Resource Industries – Vicki pointed out that 8.1 was missing “mining” in the list of industries. A question of whether or not to add “aquaculture” was considered. Steve said he felt as though both should be added. 8.1 will now read:

Maintain and enhance natural resource based industries including productive timber, agriculture, mining, aquaculture, and fisheries. Encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible uses.

Open Space – Kristy brought up the fact that “open space” means different things to different people. Because there is a criteria for designation listed, she proposed adding a list of criteria that open space does *not* include, to solve any confusion.

Environment – Bill voice concern about the verbiage in 10.2. Barbara asked if changing “rural” to “urban” would fix the issue. Everyone agreed that would be sufficient. 10.2 will now read:

Encourage the use of individual or group on-site sewage disposal systems where permitted in rural areas to protect public health and water quality; reinforce the importance of public sewer systems in ~~rural~~ urban areas through appropriate regulatory and funding mechanisms.

Due to time, the PAC decided to hold their comments on the rest of Chapter II, so that public comment could be heard.

Marilyn Vogler reiterated that the comprehensive plan needs to be reflective of the time in which it is written. She went on to talk about the vision statement and said that the community has gone through large changes over the last ten years. Marilyn then discussed the aspects of rural character and focused on mining. She pointed out that mining has caused fracking, contamination of groundwater, and other large issues throughout various areas of the United States that she does not want happening in Mason County.

Larry King handed a letter to the Commission members and then read it out loud. The letter touched on the vision statement, and asked why industry is being allowed in residential areas.

Debra Soper referred to “Economic Development” on page 10. She read item 5.2, and encouraged the PAC to include protection for adjacent residents and property owners within the comp plan.

Barbara Parsloe discussed Public Participation, saying that much of the removed language has served in the past and may serve in the future to encourage community involvement. She suggested not only having a citizen board in the Belfair/Allyn Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), but having one for the Shelton UGA as well. She went on to say that she does not believe that it is appropriate to have one small committee such as the PAC making changes without proper input from the community.

Ken VanBuskirk read a statement aloud regarding population projection from 2005. He suggested looking deeper into the population projection.

Jay Hupp asked when the Economic Development Council (EDC) suggestions will be merged into the comp plan. Rob said that was asked for at the previous meeting and asked Barbara if she was planning on that merge soon. Barbara said that her intent was to clean up the original document first and to then merge suggestions in. She said that after this meeting, she was going to be combining the documents from this meeting and the EDC.

Terri Thompson asked why, in section 12.2, “public participation” was stricken. Barbara said that to her it didn’t make sense in this particular section, but if the PAC would like, it can remain in print. She added that the participation was more extensive in 1994 when the County had a Growth Management Advisory Committee. Terri questioned why the participation aspect has been cut so much since 1994. Barbara explained that 1994 marked the conception of the Comprehensive Plan, so the entire plan had to be created from scratch. She said that now they have a document to work off of and add to. Terri questioned how citizens could submit suggestions and if they would be considered. Barbara said that any suggestions are welcome and that she would be more than happy to incorporate those suggestions. An unidentified female from the audience asked when the deadline for ideas is. Barbara said there is no deadline because no grant is in place. Barbara added that in previous revisions, there were multiple people working together. Currently, she is the only staff member from the County rewriting the entire plan.

Due to time, Chapter III-8 is tabled until the September 28, 2015 meeting.

5. New Business

None

6. Adjournment

At 9:01 p.m. Bill Dewey adjourned the meeting.