

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

October 26, 2015

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

1. Call to Order

Rob Drexler called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: Kristy Buck, Tim Duffy, Kevin Shutty, Vicki Wilson, Rob Drexler

Excused: Steve Van Denver, Bill Dewey

Staff: Rebecca Hersha, Rick Mraz (Ecology)

3. Regular Business

a. Adoption of Agenda

Rebecca stated that she is adding a new document titled SMP/RO Update (dated 10/26/2015). She asked that this document be the new 4. (a) on the agenda. Rebecca then asked if the PAC would like to keep the Draft Cumulative Impacts Analysis on the agenda or if it should be moved. Rob suggested holding it to the end of the meeting. This changed the Draft Cumulative Impacts Analysis to 4 (c.)

b. Approval of Minutes

August 17, 2015- Vicki said that on page 2, in the second paragraph of section 4, last names needed to be added due to the fact that both she and Vicki Kirkpatrick were speaking.

On the same page under Chapter I, Vicki suggested adding “to the shoreline management program section” to clarify what she was covering. This section will now read

In Chapter I, Vicki commented that she would like to see some wording added to the Shoreline Management Program section in regards to...

On page 4, Vicki said that Steve Bloomfield testified in regards to mining and that was not present within the minutes.

On page 5, the section that is labeled *overview* needs to be changed to *Plan goals overview* so people will understand what was being discussed. Within this page Vicki addressed the section titled *Transportation*, the words “and that” should be added to the verbiage under 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.

On page 6 under *Environment*, Vicki said that the change from rural to urban under 10.2 was in the wrong spot and should be near the end of the paragraph:

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.

Commented [MD1]: Previous change from rural to urban was incorrectly placed here in the August 17, 2015 draft.

Kristy made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion passed.

c. Confirm Future Meeting Dates

- November 16, 2015
- November 30, 2015

Rob asked what the next step would be regarding the public hearing process. Rebecca explained that the hearings need to be held at least 60 days after the draft is completed. Rick inquired if the PAC would want to set up a separate meeting after the hearings to go over the comments from the public. Rob said they would have to before moving forward so they could decide on possible changes. Rebecca suggested adding hearing dates to the 2016 calendar. The PAC agreed upon the following dates for public hearing:

- February 22, 2016
- February 29, 2016

4. Workshop-Shoreline Master Program Update

Presenter: Rebecca Hersha, Department of Community Development

a. SMP/RO Update (dated 10/26/2015)

Rebecca explained that her reason behind the SMP/RO document was due to the fact that the language in the ~~existing uses~~ repair/replacement part of subsection 4 of the fish and wildlife chapter of the resource ordinance was similar to the language found in the Shoreline Master Program, but it was not the same in both documents. She clarified that the SMP/RO was a recommendation to delete wording from the resource ordinance and to make changes within the SMP existing uses subsection. Rebecca advised that page 4 of the document showed recent changes to the SMP. Kristy questioned the wording on (e.) saying that it did not read correctly. After a brief discussion, the following was decided upon:

(e.) A grandfathered structure or structural footprint ~~may be that is~~ moved any distance on the subject parcel or that has changed in shape shall increase its conformity with the Program and...

b. Comment Matrix

Rebecca handed out the revised matrix, dated 10/26/2015. She said that the matrix is based off of the January 2013 draft of the SMP, and anything highlighted in peach is new to this version of the matrix.

Vicki said she had created a list of items that she would like to present to the public. She said the list is made up of small odds and ends that she would like to get public feedback on. She asked if perhaps a document could be created to present the public with these items, or if she should just wait for the hearings to see what is discussed. Concern was voiced with presenting the list due to the fact that it could create new issues, and possibly hold up the possibility of public hearings in February. It was decided to proceed with the plan to have the hearings as scheduled and address issues as they come up.

Rebecca asked the PAC to go through the comment matrix page by page to examine the changes.

17.50.040 Definitions

Boat Lift-Covered moorage was discussed. Rob pointed out that the most current draft of the SMP does not allow this. Rebecca suggested leaving it as written in the SMP which was agreed upon.

Marina- At a past meeting Vicki asked if boat houses should be added. Rebecca said she did not feel as though it was necessary.

Rebecca asked the PAC if she should post the comment matrix on the website. It was agreed that it should be posted and Rebecca said she would soon have it placed on the website under the SMP page.

17.50.060 Use Regulations

Boating Facilities- (B. Piers and docks) Rebecca said there was question in section (5) (c) from Department of Community Development staff, specifically asking if replenishing gravel in front of a bulkhead would require an exemption. Rick Mraz said that gravel replenishment isn't considered maintenance and it should be labeled beach nourishment instead.

17.50.065 Shoreline Modifications

Dredging- A long discussion was had between the PAC and Rick regarding the following comment from Public Works:

PW Staff (5/2/2014): General comment. Is there a way to truncate or modify some of the requirements of this section regarding testing, modeling, bioassays, and reporting requirements if the project is not within a 303(d), 305(b) or TMDL? It is not clear why clean dredged sediments are required to follow the same process and protocol as toxic dredged sediments.

It was decided not to change anything at this time, but to instead ask Public Works for more detailed information or an example on how this section should be modified.

TITLE 15

Procedural requirements- Rebecca discussed the comments from Brian McGinnis (North Forty Lodging) which addressed the possibility of changing shoreline substantial development permits (SDP's) from type III to type II, which would eliminate the use of a hearing examiner and instead leave the decision to the director. Rob stated that he agrees with this change. He asked Rebecca what changes would need to be made. She stated that some language in Title 15, language in the permit process, and some ordinances would need to be changed. Vicki asked if there is anything in the RCW or WAC requiring a hearing for SDP's. Rick answered that there are requirements for public notice, but a hearing is not required. Rebecca said she would do some more research.

After completing a full review of the Comment Matrix, Rob asked if anybody from the public had comments.

Jim Mutter voiced concern on the 12" limit on bulkhead height. He said that 12" is not going to be enough if a bulkhead needs repair, and suggested that it should be increased to 24". Rebecca explained that currently you are not able to expand a bulkhead either upwards or outward and have it be exempt from an SDP. Rick and Rebecca explained that it is set at 12" due to a University of Washington study done in the south Puget Sound and on hood canal which shows an average of a 1 foot rise over 35 years. She and Rick told Jim if he can find evidence that says otherwise, or a different study he is more than welcome to present it to the PAC for consideration.

c. Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Rebecca asked if the PAC would like to quickly go over the Cumulative Impacts Analysis (CIA). Rob said he would like to wait since it was late. Rebecca quickly summarized the revised CIA draft (dated October 2015) and stated that it will be discussed in detail at the November meeting.

5. New Business

None

6. Adjournment

At 8:35 p.m. Rob Drexler adjourned the meeting.