

**Mason County
Planning Advisory Commission**

May 23, 2016

(This document is not meant 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: Rob Drexler, Vicki Wilson, Deb Soeper, Kevin Shutt

Excused: Bill Dewey

Unexcused: Steve Van Denver

3. Regular Business

a. Adoption of Agenda-No changes. Adopted as written

b. Approval of Minutes- No minutes

c. Public Comment- None

4. Hearing -2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Presentation of the Transportation Element Draft prepared by SCJ Alliance

Presenters: Loretta Swanson, Public Works and Thera Black, SCJ Alliance

Rob re-opened the hearing at 6:10 p.m.

Loretta spoke first, reiterating the fact that this hearing is a continuation from May 16, 2016. She noted that though the hearing was continued so public comment could be gathered, only one other comment was received. The comment was from Erica Marbett of the Squaxin Tribe in favor of the culvert replacements noted in the plans. Loretta suggested going through the comment/response document that was prepared by Thera Black of SCJ Alliance.

Thera stated that she would like to go through the comment/response document in order to ensure that all questions and comments were addressed to the liking of the PAC. All present members agreed.

On page 2, while discussing the use of the 2012 traffic counts done for Belfair, Vicki voiced concern over the age of the study. She said that some people may dismiss the study because of its age and relativity to current traffic issues. Thera agreed that some people may dismiss it, but also pointed out that the traffic count is only a portion of the story.

Thera then addressed the following comment on page 2:

Will WSDOT relinquish SR 3 when the bypass is constructed or will it retain both roads as state highways? Mason County needs this information in order to plan for its future.

At the May 16th hearing, she said she would do some research and try to have an answer for this hearing. Thera mentioned that she did make some calls to the D.O.T and was told that the state wasn't sure what their plans were at this time. She went on to say that if this is true, it would be a good opportunity for Mason County to make some decisions such as who would be in charge of maintenance or speed limits. These decisions should be on record with the state.

Thera continued through pages 3 - 5 with no suggestions or changes from the PAC. On page 6, while discussing the comment stating:

It is not apparent within the projects identified in the plan what Mason County's priorities are

Vicki asked if perhaps a picture or diagram could be done to help the public better understand how the pieces of this plan fit together. Thera agreed.

Vicki then moved on to the next comment on page 6:

Will the bypass really be a bypass or will it be something else, more of a byway? Too many connections will diminish its usefulness as a bypass and it will become congested like SR 3.

She asked if Mason County would have to fund connections. Thera stated that it is the county's responsibility to pay for connections. Vicki asked about adding language about the construction of the connections. Thera then said she would place it into the section about the bypass in the transportation update. Ken Van Buskirk then asked if the connectors would be at the beginning and end or if they would be mid-point. Rob and Thera confirmed that they would be mid-point.

Rob asked if any of the PAC members had any other questions or comments. Kevin praised the work done by Thera and Loretta on this element. Rob then opened the floor for questions.

Ken Van Buskirk asked Thera when the next transportation update would be. She responded that the minimum required time frame is 10 years, but the plan can be amended at any time.

Constance Ibsen questioned where SR 102 is located. Rob clarified that it is the Dayton Airport road.

With no further questions, Rob opened the floor to public testimony.

Constance spoke again, this time suggesting the following change on page 15 of the draft transportation plan:

2.1.2- Make funding for preservation and maintenance of the existing transportation system ~~a~~the top priority, especially when resources are tight, because deferred preservation is expensive preservation.

Constance also suggested adding another line, possibly before 2.1.2, saying "all new proposed roads and/or private roads to be considered for transfer into the county road inventory demonstrate connectivity to the system". She said that a policy should be introduced making sure that roads will have to connect to the transportation system. Rob asked if she could give an

example to clarify her statement. Constance said that the subdivision across from the Victor cutoff has roads only for that subdivision and should not be county roads. She asked if a policy such as this existed already. Loretta Swanson advised that currently when somebody asks the county to take a private road into the system, they have to meet certain design standards such as shoulders, hard surfacing, ditches, etc. She said this policy is available on the county website.

Vicki went back to the suggested language change of 2.1.2 and asked Loretta if she would support this change. Loretta advised that she does support it, but also wanted the language to reflect some flexibility in case a larger issue arises.

Teri King questioned what “catastrophic” meant within this document. Thera responded that floods, earthquakes, wildfires or anything along these lines would be considered catastrophic. Teri advised that there should be a plan for vehicles in section 3.3. She went on to say that many of our roadways along water are used for product transportation and large vehicles such as tanker trucks could end up in the water as a car had done the week before. Teri then proposed a change to 5.1.2:

Minimize transportation-related impacts on salmon, shellfish, and other wildlife or habitats through the replacement or retrofit of inadequate facilities, ~~and~~ reducing ~~or~~ and treating stormwater runoff- and decreasing toxics used in road maintenance.

She said changing this verbiage would fit with the Puget Sound Partnership goal for toxins.

Ken Van Buskirk discussed bike routes and how pleased he was to see it within the plan. He talked about his own journey from Belfair to San Francisco via bike and said that a major route for biking goes from Belfair to State Route 106 then south through the county. Ken noted that he would like to see the level of service establishments in the transportation plan as soon as possible, along with the concurrency ordinance and the Belfair Urban Growth area as soon as possible. He discussed the traffic issues along the Old Belfair Highway and said that it is now bumper to bumper on a daily basis. On page 3 of the comment packet, the comment stating:

Traffic congestion is causing people to leave Allyn because they can't get in or out of their driveway, and people can't get to area businesses.

Ken said this comment was taken out of context. The comment came from a member of the public at a Belfair/Allyn planning meeting. That person had discussed the difficulty of working at the shipyard and getting through the traffic in Belfair and Allyn. Continuing to page 4, he talked about the Strategic Action Plan, suggesting the involvement of North Mason School District because the bus drivers, who are on the roads daily, would have a better idea of any issues on the roadway.

At 7:24 p.m., Rob closed the public portion of the hearing. He said the goal is to send the transportation draft to the County Commissioners with suggested changes and asked if the PAC had any other discussion.

Vicki asked Thera if a glossary of acronyms could be added. Thera agreed that was a great idea and said she would add it. On page 14, 2.1.3, she suggested the following addition:

Recognize that keeping life-cycle costs as low as possible supports sustainable economic growth and vitality by avoiding unnecessarily expensive infrastructure reconstruction, ~~and~~ replacement and disrupting travel.

On page 17, Deb asked about the definition of “community resources” in 4.1.6. Thera said she was referring to the public right of way. She noted that this was added due to the fact that once a right of way is gone, they’re extremely difficult to get back.

Rob then ran through all of the comments with the PAC to make sure nothing was missed and that all decisions were agreed upon.

Constance Ibsen voiced concern over some of the goals directed towards Allyn as being too specific. She asked where the goals had come from. Loretta said several of the ideas were from the Allyn subarea review. She suggested possibly re-evaluating the needs of Allyn. Constance then asked if Trails End road would always be in maintenance mode or if a new road would need to be done. Loretta advised that a 3-step plan is in place to keep it open.

With no other comments on the floor. Kevin Shutty made a motion to adopt the Mason County Comprehensive plan update for transportation with the recommendations provided by staff and public comment, and to move it forward to the board of County Commissioners. Motion seconded by Vicki Wilson. All in favor, motion passed.

5. New Business

None.

6. Adjournment

Rob adjourned the meeting at 7:52 p.m.