

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

FEBRUARY 5, 2002

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairperson Wesley Johnson. Commissioners Bob Holter and Herb Baze were in attendance.

Approval of Minutes

Cmmr. Holter/Baze moved and seconded to approve the briefing minutes of 12/18/01, 12/27/01, 1/7/02, 1/15/02, 1/18/02, 1/22/02, 1/25/02 and the regular meeting minutes of 1/22/02 and the special meeting minutes of 1/22/02. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

C O R R E S P O N D E N C E

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

Peggy Olsen submitted a letter urging the board to enact the regulations in support of the Growth Management Act.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Received a copy of the State of Washington Office of Financial Management's population projections for through 2025 for Growth Management.

GOVERNMENT SPONSORED DAY CARE CENTERS

Squaxin Island Tribe expressed appreciation for the county's efforts on behalf of the Tribe and local community in passing an interim ordinance authorizing government sponsored day care centers outside the growth management boundaries.

MORATORIUM REQUESTED

The Allyn Sub-Area Planning Committee has requested the county institute a 90 day moratorium for construction permitting for all properties on the east side of Highway 3 and North Bay Road within the Urban Growth area of Allyn. Copy forwarded to Community Development/Planning.

B U S I N E S S

PARK ATTENDANT CONTRACTS

Mike Byrne, Tourism & Recreation Director, presented the following contracts for park attendant contracts for 2002:

Rick & Gayle Mican, Sandhill Park
Karen Visser, Union Park
Hilton and LouEllen Malone, MCRA Park
Vera Lorenz, Truman Glick Park
Lawrence Myers, Foothills Park

Cmmr. Baze/Holter moved and seconded to approve the park attendant contracts for January through December 2002 as presented with the exception of the contract with Lawrence Myers which will be March, 2002 through September, 2002. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

PORTABLE TOILET CONTRACT

Mr. Byrne requested authorization to post for quotes for a two-year contract for portable toilets for the Parks Department and the Utilities/Waste Management Department.

Cmmr. Holter/Baze moved and seconded to authorize the Director of Tourism & Recreation to post for quotes for a two-year contract to provide portable toilets for the Parks Department and the Utilities/Waste Management Department. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

FOOD CONCESSIONAIRE CONTRACT

Mr. Byrne then requested permission to post for quotes for a two-year contract to provide food concessionaires for MCRA Park and Sandhill Park.

Cmmr. Baze/Holter moved and seconded to authorize the Director of Tourism & Recreation to post for quotes for a two-year contract to provide food concessionaires at MCRA Park and Sandhill Park. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
FEBRUARY 5, 2002 – PAGE 2**

SPILLMAN TECHNOLOGIES

Sheriff Whybark presented an agreement between Government Capital Corporation and Mason County for a photo imaging system in the jail. This will interface with existing computer system so the imaged pictures are available to necessary staff. The Sheriff requested the Chair be authorized to sign. The total amount is \$56,670 payable over a five year period. Qwest will set up the payment system through the prisoner jail phone system.

Cmmr. Holter/Baze moved and seconded to authorize the Sheriff to enter into an agreement with Dynamic Imaging that will be facilitated by Qwest in the amount of \$56,670. This system has to do with the mug shot system in the jail. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye. Resolution No. 09-02 (Exhibit A)

SET HEARING – EASEMENT REMOVAL - STARLAKE

Kristen Riebli, Planning, requested the Board set a hearing on March 5, 2002 at 9:15 a.m. to consider the easement removal as requested by Gayle & Barbara Brooks, Starlake Division 4.

Cmmr. Baze/Holter moved and seconded to set the hearing on March 5, 2002 at 9:15 a.m. to consider the removal of utility and drainage easements between tax parcel numbers 51908-53-00013 and 51908-53-00014, lots 13 and 14 located in the plat of Star Lake Division 4. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

STATE & LOCAL ASSISTANCE CONTRACT

The Emergency Management Director is recommending the Board approve a State and Local Assistance Contract through September 30, 2002 to provide emergency management programs.

Cmmr. Holter/Baze moved and seconded to approve the annual contract with the State Department of Emergency Management and FEMA in the amount of \$20,495, the effective dates are October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

VETERANS ASSISTANCE APPLICATIONS

- 1) Jerry K Buxton – VFW 1694 – Housing \$400.00
- 2) Mrs. George W. Depoe – VFW 1694 – Utilities \$133.63
- 3) Dale R. Barker – VFW 1694 – Housing \$400.00
- 4) Robert D. Rietze – VFW 1694 – Food \$150.00
- 5) Robert Damrose – VFW 1694 – Housing \$400.00
- 6) Robert A. Rolton – VFW 1694 – Utilities \$97.50; Housing \$251.25 = \$348.75
- 7) Scott B. McGrath – VFW 1694 – Housing \$400.00
- 8) Mrs. William N. Thompson – VFW 1694 – Burial \$300.00
- 9) Mrs. Willard J. Johnson – VFW 1694 – Housing \$400.00
- 10) Jeffrey A. Olinger – VFW 1694 – Housing \$400.00
- 11) Mrs. Donald J. McPherson – VFW 1694 – Utilities, \$400.00
- 12) Mrs. Epifanio Longoria – VFW 1694 – Food \$200.00
- 13) Dan B. Stack, Jr. – VFW 1694 – Housing \$251.67; Food \$76.30 = \$317.97

The Veterans Assistance Screening Committee is recommending approval on the above listed applications totaling \$4,250.35.

Cmmr. Baze/Holter moved and seconded to approve the Veterans' Assistance applications as presented by staff for a total of \$4,250.35. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

HEARING – Consider the extension of a moratorium on applications for land use permits as they relate to sexually oriented businesses, as adopted in Mason County Resolution No. 148-01.

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, presented staff report. The moratorium will allow time for the county to complete the planning for Urban Growth Areas which allow a determination of appropriate sites for these types of businesses. The moratorium expires July 13, 2002. He stated that Darren Nienaber, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, asked the Board to continue the hearing to February 19, 2002 to allow time for legal review.

Cmmr. Baze confirmed there have been no applications, to date, for sexually oriented businesses.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
FEBRUARY 5, 2002 – PAGE 3**

Prevention Ordinance were both amended on January 19, 2001 at the Board (Ordinance No. 05-01). These ordinance sections are part of the Comprehensive Plan development regulations and provide the guidance for regulating development and uses in the frequently flooded areas of Mason County.

These ordinance sections were subsequently reviewed by the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board and issued Findings and Order on June 27, 2001 stating that Mason County was not in compliance with the GMA and that certain actions must be taken to revise these ordinance sections to remove the substantial interference to the GMA goals 2 (reduce sprawl), 8 (natural resources industries), 9 (open space), and 10 (environment).

The June 27, 2001 Findings and Order stated the following eight issues must be resolved by Mason County for GMA compliance:

1. Formally adopt a final map of frequently flooded areas.
2. Provide a Skokomish River FFA map overlay delineating rural and resource area densities.
3. Include in the ordinance definition section (2.0) complete definitions of the categories in the legend of final map of frequently flooded area.
4. Reexamine the avulsion interpretation zone areas noted by the Tribe to determine whether they should indeed be included in no-new-footprint zones.
5. Examine the base flood categories to determine whether they should be no-new-footprint areas and clearly demonstrate the reasons for the decision.
6. Bring Shoreline Master Program and FWHCA ordinances into compliance and enumerate the functions and values protected by a compliant FFA ordinance.
7. Establish a diking monitoring and regulation program that precludes individual homeowners from frustrating inspections, and provides for the inspection and monitoring of existing dikes.
8. Provide a list of existing dikes.

Mr. Borden stated they are proposing that several definitions be added to the Mason County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance for the following terms: conditional-build zone, emergency, ordinary high water mark, overbank setback requirement and reasonable use exception.

Ron Henrickson, DCD Director, noted that on January 16th the Planning Department held a workshop in the Skokomish Valley and approximately 70 people attended. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 30th and a number of people spoke.

After deliberation, the Planning Commission recommended the following be added to Section 1.3, Methods of Reducing Flood Losses: Removal of accumulated bedload in the low gradient section of the Skokomish River at intervals sufficient to allow the natural river hydraulics to deepen the river channel and to strongly encourage the Washington Department of Transportation to take a serious look at elevating State Highway 101 to alleviate a serious problem with the flooding and the serious bottleneck on the Skokomish River.

Mr. Henrickson recommended the Board not adopt these amendments as submitted. He clarified that his recommendation is not because the Planning Department has objection to the philosophy of the issues that the Planning Commission is trying to raise. He does believe that the ordinance, as it is, is for frequently flooded areas and is not encompassing a program to solve the long-term issues of the river.

He asked that if the Board finds to not add the recommendations, then to direct Mr. Henrickson, by motion, to initiate discussion with the Skokomish Tribe and the valley property owners regarding specific actions which are consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan. In that Plan are a number of items, including those both mentioned, relative to the highway and the gravel removal as well as a number of others that should be considered when addressing a long-term program. Those discussions could identify joint actions which could be undertaken to address the issues of rising water table and more frequent flooding which result in a health threat, threat to life, damage to property and pose an impediment to profitable agriculture use. He wanted to make it clear they share the concerns of the residents, however they believe it should be addressed in a different manner.

Cmmr. Baze asked if the ordinance would restrict any future gravel removal or trying to alleviate the flooding problem in the valley.

Mr. Henrickson responded that in his opinion, the ordinance as proposed by staff, does not restrict any actions that the county or the tribe could, with the authority and proper permits, take in the valley that would result in a long-

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
FEBRUARY 5, 2002 – PAGE 4**

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, addressed the third issue raised by the Planning Commission which is to incorporate language to protect the long-term ag lands ability to operate as a farm. He gave copies of the letter dated February 1, 2002 that DCD sent to Dan Sokol, DOE, regarding this recommendation but he has not received a response back. Mr. Fink stated that in reviewing the ordinance, staff doesn't believe that some of the impediments have been raised or are necessarily restricted by the ordinance in places that are appropriate. One of the key issues that was mentioned in previous hearings, was the ability to cluster farm structures for the efficiency of operation and economy. He noted that in the existing ordinance, Section 5.4-4 (3) deals with the maximum allowable obstruction for all development in the detailed study area which is the overall regulation that sets the standards of how buildings have to be spaced so they don't obstruct the flow of the floodwaters during a flood event.

For larger properties, he referred to Section (3) (C) which addresses the setback requirements for development on parcels larger than five acres, which generally an agricultural parcel would be larger than five acres. This provision allows for a case-by-case evaluation to determine the setbacks of those structures and provide a safe conveyance of floodwaters. He stated staff believes the current regulations do provide for the flexibility, although he hasn't confirmed that interpretation with DOE, nor have not had a response from DOE regarding the Planning Commissioner's other recommendations.

Mr. Fink stated staff does not suggest a change to the ordinance to respond to this issue (clustering farm structures). They do have some minor changes which he doesn't consider substantive. Section 5.4-5 Dikes, Levees and other Water Flow Modification Structures. The tribe recommendation was to add a phrase to make it clear that when the county addresses repair, removal, modification of dikes, levees or other impediments, that those modifications are subject to other existing regulations. The intention of the proposed new paragraph, is to not change the authority of the Public Works Director, but only to grant them specific authority in the case of an emergency to be able to enter property and assess the condition and then use whatever other authorities they have to take the appropriate actions that are deemed necessary. The tribe's recommendation is to add, after the word impediments "as subject to other regulations". Mr. Fink believes that is implicit in the nature of the regulation but it would add clarity. Darren Nienaber suggested a sentence be added to the same section to say that "the Public Works Director shall report his findings to the Board every two years." This is so the Board can keep apprised of the status of what is happening in the valley.

Cmmr. Johnson asked for the rationale for that inclusion.

Mr. Fink believes the intent of the statement is to further the control. A concern of the Hearings Board was to have an on-going monitoring of what the actions are. They were particularly addressing the diking.

Mr. Henrickson thanked the residents of the valley and the tribe for their work on this issue.

Warren Dawes, Oyster Beach Road – representing petitioners MCCDC, referred to the last sentence in the first paragraph of Section 4.4-3, Reasonable Use Exception, "... not intended to allow residential development in designated floodways." He asked if the County would want to extend that, clarify it, for the special flood-risk zone. For instance, if there is property in the no-new-footprint zone, wouldn't the County want to restrict the building of residential structures in that zone.

Mr. Henrickson would like to discuss that with staff. He understands that the purpose of that is to avoid a takings issue. However, a special provision could be made relative to the requirements for building. There could be conditions within the reasonable use that would allow that but they would have to alleviate the safety concerns.

Mr. Fink added that the restriction on residences in floodways is by state law. The state law says you cannot permit residences in floodways, but there are no restrictions for the density floodplain approach, such as was developed in the Skokomish Valley.

Bill Hunter, Jr., Skokomish Valley resident and member of Flood Board, he stated they have had a lot of input in developing a flood plan for the valley and are trying to keep other regulations from superseding what they put together. He referred to page 25, Section 5.4-5 (1) which talks about not increasing stream flow in the main channel. He would like to see that refer to the flood plan. He believes if the ordinance says you can't raise the water in the main channel, that is contrary to the density program because anything a person would do could raise the water. He then referred to Page 10, Development Permit. He wants an interpretation of the statement that if no other county permit is required, a development permit shall be required.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
FEBRUARY 5, 2002 – PAGE 5**

Mr. Fink answered that he doesn't believe it would impede the plan. It is a regulation that may still remain in effect when the plan goes into effect, depending on the nature of the plan. If it should impede the implementation of that plan, that will be identified and that would be the time to modify it.

Cmmr. Baze asked if that would happen automatically or would that have to go back through the process.

Mr. Fink responded that it would require amending the regulation. It could be modified as part of the process of implementing the plan.

Cmmr. Johnson stated that he believes J.R. is stating there is a discrepancy between what is in the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan and this statement.

Mr. Fink stated he is not sure where that discrepancy would be. He understands there were earlier discussions about when they adjusted the diking system, there would continue to be an impoundment of the water behind dikes that would be a broader area and there may be a conflict between this existing language and the eventual implementation of the diking that was envisioned in the comprehensive plan. The intent of this ordinance is that in the mean time, people should not be building up their dikes, they should not be modified or raised in ways that could potentially have an impact on other property. He understands it was the intention of the plan, to maintain status quo or even let the existing dikes degrade until such time that the new dike system is implemented. Ultimately, some modifications may be needed but this is not the appropriate time to do that.

Cmmr. Johnson expressed concern that when we have a more detailed flood plan, that there will be two conflicting statements – one in the ordinance and one in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Fink stated this is a regulation to address what happens in the interim. Although it is not phrased as an interim regulation, you could think of it that way. The goals and policies that are developed in the plan, direct how the regulations will be written and revised and not the other way around.

Cmmr. Holter commented that if the Board has the ability to make the decision today, they have the ability to change it down the road, if it necessary.

Cmmr. Baze asked if J.R. was having an erosion problem and put a large, woody debris log in that pathway, would J.R.'s concern be an obstruction to that. He asked how would the County prove that the river changed.

Mr. Fink responded that this regulation is specific to diking and leveeing. It doesn't address modifications in the stream by jetties or designed logjams, either removing or replacing them. He reads it as addressing the changing of the dikes either moving them closer to the river or building them higher so they restrain the water in the main channel more.

Cmmr. Johnson asked if the language could be changed so it says that. He reads it that if an erosion path was created along the bank of the river and you have a channel of water flowing where it didn't flow before, you could not put anything there that would cause that water to stay in the channel where it originally was.

Mr. Fink replied that he doesn't believe this addresses bank armoring. If you had no dike there before and you have erosion issues and the bank needs to be armored, this doesn't address that. Armoring a bank is not diking. Diking is raising the level, building up from the bank of the river.

Mr. Hunter, Jr. expressed concern with the term "water flow modification structures". He believes that is a catchall and would like to see a definition.

Mr. Fink responded that is the title of section. Section 5.4-5 addresses a range of things.

Mr. Nienaber added that it is a general rule that titles are not the law, they are explanatory.

Bill Hunter Sr, stated he has to agree with staff that this addresses protecting land from erosion. He pointed out his farm has one little dike and the water goes around it. It is a low spot that prevents serious erosion from occurring. He noted he has been in the valley all his life and he has watched the river deteriorate. He recalled that when he was a county commissioner, he was told that if they can get a comprehensive flood plan, then projects would be able to

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
FEBRUARY 5, 2002 – PAGE 6**

concern with the words “unless they are used by salmon”. He noted that salmon are all over the valley floor and roads at flood time.

John Smith, Skokomish Valley, has several objections to the proposed ordinance. He believes the Skokomish Valley farmers have been very excellent stewards of the land and he doesn't want them forced off their land and he believes that is the direction things are going. He stated residents with small holdings are also having problems. He would like to see a minimum threshold. He expressed concern with having to hire experts before being allowed to do anything on his property. He recalled that Governor Lowry had a meeting in the valley and the residents asked for some relief in making a difference in the streamflow but all that has happened are more regulations that primarily impact the residents. He agreed that the problem came about through mismanagement of the upland watershed and inadequate ordinances. He stated the public interest is important but so are private property rights. He believes this ordinance is geared towards satisfying the Commissioners and the Hearings Board. He asked why the County doesn't buy the property if they want to protect the residents. He asked what business does government have to tell him he can't build on his property and he doesn't believe this is helping the salmon at all.

Shelley Johnson, Skokomish Valley, referred to the no new footprint maps, she stated the line for the no new footprint goes up the common boundary between her property and Wes's, then across the county road and then angles back down and asked why that is the only place it juts away from the stream and takes in almost their entire 20 acres. She referred to the black squiggly line on the map that comes down from the county road towards her house, she asked what that is. She stated that if that designates a stream, there is no stream there and she wants that clarified so she doesn't have a problem with setbacks. She referred to Page 25 and expressed concern with the term levee and dike. She stated that when she applied for a permit for a flood wall, county personnel continually told her she couldn't do that because it was dike. She stated after hiring an attorney they did get a permit and now have a floodwall which has saved them immensely during the floods. She has concern with the approach that the regulations can be changed later because in her experiences, government takes the maximum. She then referred to Page 10, 4.1-1 and expressed frustration with the permit process. She wants the best document in place because staff changes over so frequently. She too has a concern with the term “unless they are used by salmon” in the definition of stream. She also has concerns with the provision to inspect dikes and wants to be certain that the county obtains permission from the property owners prior to the inspection. She believes that government has enough restrictions and that the government wants the valley to go back to nature. She supports dredging the river.

Mr. Hunter Sr. expressed frustration with the salmon issue. He referred to an article in the *Seattle P.I.* that talked about the river taking 20,000 cubic feet per second of water to flood in the mid-eighties, today it takes 8,500 cubic feet which demonstrates the flooding problem with the river. He stated if farming is to continue by the river, you need to either dike it or dig it. He noted that the oysters in the Canal also suffer due to the sediment that comes down the river. He believes those that helped to create the problem with the river need to take the responsibility to fix it.

Bart Robbins, Hama Hama, believes it is time to cure the cause of the flooding problems, then maybe the regulations won't be necessary.

John Smith asked if the situation, in 20 years, will be better or worse. He believes the ordinance won't address the problems. If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem. He doesn't believe that enacting further restrictions on the people who have the most interest in curing the problem, is going to solve it.

Bob Sund, Hood Canal, feels the people of the valley should be the key people to determine what should be done with their valley. He referred to the definition of streams on page 7, believes the phrase “unless they are used by salmon” negates the definition. He suggested changing the language to “unless they are used naturally or normally by salmon” (in non-flood conditions) or to leave out the salmon phrase entirely.

Cmmr. Baze stated it does seem that what Mr. Sund said is true because if a salmon swims on a field, that statement makes the field a salmon course. He asked if there is a practical way to address it.

Mr. Fink stated he interprets the provision to mean that if the salmon use the stream for spawning or to get to or return from spawning areas, not that they are abandoned by the floodwaters to die. He believes the definition was adopted from a WAC but he hasn't verified that. He believes it is reasonable to leave salmon in the definition. This entire ordinance is subject to review by DOE and the tribe.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
FEBRUARY 5, 2002 – PAGE 7**

Cmmr. Baze pointed out that there are instances all the way through the ordinance where words can be added. From his standpoint, there are two completely different things in dealing with flood risk zones and trying to fix the problem. He doesn't see them as connected. He hopes there is a way to alleviate the problems and he doesn't see the ordinance as roadblock. One of the problems has been to get all the agencies on board at the same time.

Cmmr. Holter agreed with Cmmr. Baze. He believes this ordinance is not the vehicle to address the flooding issues.

Mr. Hunter Jr., disagreed and hopes the ordinance isn't used as a vehicle to hurt the flooding problem.

Jeff Heinis, salmon biologist for Skokomish Tribe, stated a definition of a salmon stream is any water that they spawn in, migrate through or rear in and it can be dry half the year.

Cmmr. Baze asked if the field would be called a stream.

Mr. Heinis responded that you can see a channel through most of them and they are streams.

Cmmr. Johnson asked about the water flowing across the road with salmon swimming in it.

Mr. Heinis believes they are historic overflow channels that the salmon use. Technically all those floodways could be typed as Type 3 streams.

Mr. Smith brought up the issue of defining the stream definition.

Cmmr. Holter referred to Mr. Heinis's definition of salmon stream and it could make it worse if you try to add to the language.

Mr. Smith commented it sounds like it is up to interpretation and now is the opportunity for the Board to define it.

Cmmr. Holter believes it would be difficult to get concurrence from the tribe.

Chair Johnson closed the hearing. He suggested the information that was presented today be reviewed and delay a decision until next week.

Cmmr. Holter stated he would prefer to move forward and make a decision today.

Cmmr. Baze agreed with Cmmr. Holter.

Cmmr. Holter understands what Cmmr. Johnson is saying but there are a number of other serious issues that are connected to this and he doesn't believe his decision will change from today to next week.

Cmmr. Johnson noted there have been language changes suggested and he would like to allow time for the Planning staff to review those suggestions.

Cmmr. Holter/Baze moved and seconded to approve the proposed amendments to 17.01.090 Frequently Flooded Areas section of the Mason County Resource ordinance, and the proposed amendments to Mason County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, January 8, 2002 draft, together with Special Flood Risk Zone Maps 1 to 6, with the amendment to Section 5.4-5 (3) to add after the word "impediments" the phrase as "as subject to other regulations", and adding at the end of the Section "The Public Works Director shall report his findings" to the Board every two years. Also to direct the Planning Department to prepare findings of fact for the Board's approval. Motion carried. B -aye; J-nay; H-aye. Ordinance 10-02 (Exhibit B)

Cmmr. Baze/Holter moved and seconded to direct the Director of Community Development to initiate discussions with the Skokomish Tribe and valley property owners regarding specific actions consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan, which could be jointly undertaken to address the rising water table and more frequent flooding which result in a threat to life, damage to property and pose an impediment to profitable agricultural use. Motion carried unanimously. B -aye; J-aye; H-aye.

Cmmr. Johnson stated the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance is not a cure-all for all the problems that exist in the

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
FEBRUARY 5, 2002 – PAGE 8**

January 1, 2002 to June 30,2002. The consideration is increased by \$6,614.00 for a maximum total of \$44,473. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

Ms. Riley then presented amendment #6 to the Early Intervention program DSHS agreement #21648.

Cmmr. Holter/Baze moved and seconded to approve and authorize the Chair to sign the Early Intervention contract amendment #6 to DSHS Agreement #21648. This agreement extends the period from October 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002. The consideration is increased by \$11,370.00 which includes a 2.1% increase for a maximum total of \$42,917.00. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

Ms. Riley requested the Board authorize the Chair sign the Passport contract amendment #4 to DSHS agreement #21646.

Cmmr. Baze/Holter moved and seconded to approve and authorize the Chair sign the Passport contract amendment #4 to DSHS Agreement #21646. This agreement extends the period from October 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002. The consideration is increased by \$13,193 for a maximum total of \$44,473. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

COORDINATED PREVENTION GRANT AGREEMENT

Ms. Riley requested the Board approve the Coordinated Prevention Grant with DOE.

Cmmr. Holter/Baze moved and seconded to approve and authorize the Board to sign the Coordinated Prevention Grant No. G0200223 SWE. This agreement is from January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2003. The consideration is for \$152,004 with a local match of \$50,334 for a total \$202,338. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

CARD ROOM MORATORIUM

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, requested the Board set a hearing date to extend the moratorium on the issuance of building permits or other development approvals for card rooms within the unincorporated area of Mason County.

Cmmr. Holter/Baze moved and seconded to set a hearing on 2/19/02 at 10:00 a.m. to consider extending the moratorium on card rooms. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; H-aye.

APPROVAL OF WARRANTS

FUND NAME	WARRANT NUMBER	AMOUNT
Claims Clearing	34317-34493	\$463,961.73
	34494-34865	\$267,832.52
	34866-34886	\$7,772.72
	34887-34889	\$371.02
	34890	\$45.03
	34891-34892	\$3,305.00
	34893-35044	\$108,936.68
	35045-35180	\$321,170.67
	35181-35226	\$54,336.32
	35227-35228	\$123.21

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.