

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

DECEMBER 7, 2004

1. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance – The chairperson led the flag salute.
3. Roll Call – Present: Cmmr. Dist. 1 – Herb Baze; Cmmr. Dist. 2 – Wesley E. Johnson; Cmmr. Dist. 3 – Jayni L. Kamin.
4. Approval of Minutes – **Cmmr. Kamin/Baze moved and seconded to approve the briefing minutes of November 22 and 29, 2004 and regular meeting minutes of November 9, 16 and 23, 2004. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; K-aye.**
5. Board's Calendar for week of December 7 – December 14, 2004.
6. Correspondence and Organizational Business
 - 6.1 Correspondence
 - 6.1.1 Comments on the public hearing to be held regarding the Belfair Sub-area Plan – Bruce Landram; Bryan G.; Robert & DeAnna Gossett; Jim & Rusty Kidrick; Gerald Thompson, Sande Boat Works; Steve Clayton; Stan & Phyllis Walster; and Bette Lund.
 - 6.1.2 Comcast sent notice that effective January 1, 2005 they will be adjusting the prices for their analog and digital cable service levels.
 - 6.1.3 Susan Korvell wrote of a road issue she is trying to resolve on the Benthien Road property. Copy forwarded to Public Works
 - 6.1.4 VFW Post 1694 has requested that Mason County co-sponsor the purchase of a 12-passenger van with Grays Harbor and Pacific counties for a cost of \$4,000 each (3-county contribution) or \$6,000 (two counties contribute) for transporting veterans to the veterans hospital.
 - 6.1.5 Mason County Transportation Authority (MCTA) thanked the County for twelve years of continuing support for providing financial services support and excellent customer service. MCTA will begin in-house service of payroll and warrant processing, effective for the accounting year 2005.
7. Open Forum for Citizen Input - Ed Edmiston, Agate (Crestview Drive) – Asked that the county place fog lines immediately after new construction as it is very difficult to drive with no striping. They have had accidents during the new construction.
8. Adoption of Agenda – **Cmmr. Kamin/Baze move and seconded to approve with agenda, with the exception to move Item 11.1 before Item 10.1. Motion carried unanimously. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; K-aye.**
9. Approval of Consent Agenda:
 - 9.1 Approval to appoint Betty Wing as the Property Manager for Mason County. **Resolution No. 118-04 (Exhibit A)**
 - 9.2 Approval of Veterans Assistance Fund applications for: Rodney Gorm – housing \$200.00; Ned O. Forrest – utilities \$88.41; Earl L. Vaughan – food \$200.00 for a total of \$488.41.
 - 9.3 Approval of Warrants

| | | |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------|
| Claims Clearing Fund | 80980-81458 | \$1,652,354.45 |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------|
 - 9.4 Approval to change the meeting time of the Tuesday, December 28, 2004 Mason County Commissioner meeting from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m.
 - 9.5 Approval to appoint the following individuals to the Transportation Improvement Program Citizens Advisory Program (TIP-CAP) 2005: Ken Wilson, Ted Smethers, Daniel Michener, Drew Noble, Clifford Hall, Mel Williamson, Herb Brehmeyer, Joseph Spaulding, Gale McGrath, Jack Nicklaus and Norm Eveleth and appoint Norm Eveleth as Chair and Ted Smethers as Co-Chair.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 2**

- 9.6 Approval of an ordinance allowing Mason County to impose an excise tax on timber harvested from private and public lands. This excise tax will be phased-in over ten years, credited against the state tax, and administered and collected by the WA State Department of Revenue. **Ordinance No. 119-04 (Exhibit B)**
- 9.7 Approval of an agreement between the WA State Dept of Revenue and Mason County to authorize the Dept of Revenue to administer and collect excise tax on persons engaging in business as harvesters of timber for Mason County.
- 9.8 Approval of the resolution setting a public hearing on Tuesday, December 21, 2004 at 9:30 a.m. to consider a 2004 budget transfer in the Current Expense fund in the estimated amount of \$158,251. **Resolution No. 120-04 (Exhibit C)**
- 9.9 Approval of the renewal of the JABG Contract between Mason county Juvenile Court/District Court Probation Services and the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration in the amount of \$10,653.
- 9.10 No objection to the following liquor license application:
New Application – Tradename: T and C Gas & Food Mart, Loc Addr: 1065 E Mason Benson Road, Grapeview; Applicants: Anthony O & Charlotte D Kennedy; Privileges Applied For: Grocery Store – Beer/Wine
- 9.11 Approval to set a public hearing on December 21, 2004 at 9:30 a.m. to consider speed limit changes of county maintained road No. 14010, Old Olympic Highway.
- 9.12 Approval to authorize Public Works to advertise for Letters of Interest for: Construction Project Inspector Services; Contract/Fee Appraisers, Negotiators and Title Research Services; Geotechnical Lab Services.
- 9.13 Approval to sign the Quit Claim Deed releasing interest in a portion of right-of-way (easement) on Rasor Road West, County Road No. 62400, in trade for an equal portion of right of way from the adjacent property.
- 9.14 Approval for the Public Works Director to acquire lot 77, Plat of River Haven, Assessor's tax parcel 61930-51-00077 for emergency access. This would allow for a route to be used only when Haven Drive is flooded and impassable.
- 9.15 Approval to sign a letter of support to the Mason Conservation District for the proposed Nalley Farms dike removal project.
- 9.16 Approval to adopt a resolution setting a hearing on Tuesday, December 28, 2004; 9:30 a.m. to consider public comment on the petition for vacation of the surplus right-of-way created by County Road Project 1610/1719 in Section 1, Township 22 North, Range 3 West, between highway engineer stations 14+54.01 and 19+50. **Resolution No. 121-04 (Exhibit D)**
- 9.17 Approval to adopt a resolution setting a hearing on Tuesday, December 28, 2004; 9:30 a.m. to consider public comment on the petition for vacation of a portion of Whitener Road adjacent to Bruce & Gay Towheys property and the parcel of property labeled as culturally significant on County Road Project 1789, Sheet 9 of 9. **Resolution No. 122-04 (Exhibit E)**

Bob Allen asked that the Board continue a decision on Consent Agenda Item 9.5 until January 2005. This is the first time the Board will have appointed the members of the TIPCAP prior to the new year.

Charlie Butros, Public Works Director, explained that in the past TIPCAP has met middle of the year between May and September. A schedule change for the meetings was proposed which would allow the TIPCAP members to meet throughout the year beginning in January every other month. As a result, it was recommended appointment be made early to allow the meetings to start earlier than was traditionally the case.

Cmmr. Baze added the TIPCAP membership is not set in stone. It can be added to at any time.

Mr. Allen stated he would remove his objection.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 3**

Bob Harris also spoke to Consent Agenda Item 9.5. He objected to the appointment of Ken Wilson & Jack Nicklaus to the TIPCAP as it appears the Board is appointing them as representatives of the North Mason community. Mr. Harris did not feel they represent the North Mason community. He asked that the Board continue to accept more applications.

The Board noted that they appointed all who applied.

Richard Byrd referred to Consent Agenda Items 9.6 & 9.7 and asked if the excise tax is a new tax and if it should have public hearings.

It was noted that it is not a new tax. It is phasing in what the state has been collecting.

Ron Henrickson, County Administrator, explained that Consent Agenda Items 9.6 and 9.7 are tied together. Item 9.6 is the ordinance that enables the county to collect the tax which was approved by the legislature. It is getting the tax portion of it that the state is already collecting. Item 9.7 is the agreement with DNR that allows them to administer and collect tax and then send it to the County. The state collects 5% tax. Over a period of ten years they will start at 1.3% and increase to 4% from the counties. It is the same amount of tax, but rather than going to the state it will be going to be shared with the counties.

Cmmr. Kamin/Baze moved and seconded to approve consent agenda items 9.1 through 9.17 as presented. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; K-aye.

10. 9:30 a.m. Public Hearings and Items Set for a Certain Time

- 10.1 Public hearing to consider a Budget Transfer to the 2004 budget for the Current Expense Fund in the amount of \$90,962.

Ione Siegler, Budget & Finance Director, presented the staff report recommending approval of the budget transfer in the amount of \$90,962.

Cmmr. Kamin/Baze moved and seconded to approve a 2004 budget transfer in the Current Expense Fund in the amount of \$90,962. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; K-aye.

- 10.2 A public hearing at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, December 7, 2004, to consider amendments to the Mason County Comprehensive Plan regarding the Belfair Urban Growth Area and to consider amendments to the county development regulations to implement those plan amendments.

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, gave a staff report explaining the draft Belfair Urban Growth Area Plan would provide guidelines for the next 20 years for Belfair. The process of developing the plan began in November 2002 with the work of a consultant, Makers, and the Belfair Sub-Area Planning Committee. public facilities. The proposed new zoning code includes design guidelines for each district. The proposal includes three residential zoning districts at three, five, and ten dwelling units per acre. They also include festival retail district; mixed-use district; and long term agricultural district.

The Planning Advisory Commission recommended some changes from the Belfair-Sub Area committee recommendations:

- 1) Reduce the area of the R-10 district to reduce intensity of development consistent with reasonable expectations for population growth in the urban area.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 4**

2) Recommend an additional area for zoning as Long Term Agriculture because it is currently designated by the county as Agricultural Resource Land.

Transportation improvement recommendations include: State Route 3 improvements, building a network of roads, pedestrian and bicycle improvements and a new alternate route to SR 3.

The Planning Advisory Commission also recommended a few changes.

The transportation polices, accept with no recommendation for sequencing of the SR3 improvements and the alternate route construction (T-6) and also recommended that the Board of County Commissioners give substantial deference to the written and oral testimony of Pat McCullough. The SR-3 improvements and the new route both are considered high priority with no specified timing preference.

It was recommended that the Board of County Commissioners not approve the Heffron Transportation, Inc. Transportation Technical Report (Oct. 27, 2003) as an appendix to the plan, unless the report is fully reviewed and corrected by the Public Works Department.

The Planning staff supports the recommendations of the Planning Advisory Commission; however, there are a few issues raised in the public comment and environmental review that cannot be answered yet.

It was noted the county will review and update the Comprehensive Plan in 2005. If the proposal is adopted now, there will be an opportunity to gain experience with the regulations and make them better in the future.

Cmmr. Baze asked if the proposal, if adopted this year, will be opened up in 2005 to update along with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Fink responded, yes, it would not be the only thing on the agenda. The Growth Management Act requires the County update its Comprehensive Plan in 2005 which includes the Development Regulations.

Cmmr. Baze questioned what would happen if this proposal is adopted in 2005.

Mr. Fink stated that the timing of adopting the proposal next year could be an issue. The Growth Management Act limits amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to once a year. Although there are exceptions, this amendment would probably not meet those exceptions. It would create a problem because, according to law, the County has to adopt its update no later than December 1, 2005.

There is some question whether the County could adopt two amendments in one year.

Cmmr. Kamin asked if they will be looking at population distribution/projections and urban growth boundaries as part of the update for the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Fink stated their work program calls for updating the projections of population. The County Comprehensive Plan has a 20-year time horizon.

They anticipate to look at a 20 – 25 time horizon. The state makes projections for population and the county uses those projections in making an allocation to determine how much the different urban areas will grow.

They do not make the adjustment on an annual basis but in their mandated updates on 10 year cycle.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 5**

Cmmr. Kamin asked if the Belfair SubArea Plan is at 20 years.

Mr. Fink responded that the capacity of the urban growth area with the boundaries drawn and proposed zoning for Belfair has a range of approximately 4,000 – 7,000 people. One of the reasons the Planning Advisory Commission made the change was to reduce the amount of the most intense residential zoning. This was to reduce the number of people projected to be capacity of the UGA to handle the people. They picked an interim number. There is a table in the SEPA document in the final EIS that has those comparisons with the proposal that the Planning Advisory Commission made and original proposal of the Belfair Sub-Area Committee. Planning is a constant ongoing process. They are more accurate as they get more information.

Cmmr. Johnson asked if there was a population growth percentage projected for the three urban growth areas in the county.

Mr. Fink responded he could not state what the percentage of population is currently allocated in the plan through 2014 for the Belfair area. The number is approximately 4,000 people. The plan proposed by the Planning Advisory Commission is higher than that. One of the options looked, and one of the questions raised in the EIS, was whether it was necessary to look at the population allocation and adopt a more distant time horizon for the UGA as part of this process. It is unclear if that is necessary. There is a requirement in the Growth Management Act that the urban growth area boundaries be looked at every ten years. There is an allowance and expectation that rezoning of property within the UGA would be done on an ongoing basis at least in a minor way. There has been no pattern of cities or counties re-evaluating the urban areas whenever they made a zoning change within that urban area. Potentially, any zoning change will affect the capacity in one way or another of the urban area to handle the allocated population. He understood that they do not make the adjustments on an annual basis as they do any rezones. They do it with the mandated updates in the ten year cycle.

Cmmr. Kamin asked how long the Belfair subarea plan process has been ongoing.

Mr. Fink responded the Belfair Subarea Committee had been working on the plan for approximately a year before the consultants came on which was November 2002. They worked a year with the Subarea Committee to produce the draft. It has been at least three years that this process has been ongoing.

The community always learns from what it adopts, changes in economic conditions. There are things which have to be done to address changing circumstances and new information on an ongoing basis.

Comment letters were received as of 5:30 p.m. on Monday, December 6, 2004 from the following: – Robert Drexler, Board of Realtors; Constance Ibsen; Ken & Peggy VanBuskirk (2), and Steve Clayton.

Cmmr. Baze referred to the public facilities. The original plan which came from the planning body that worked through this was sequencing with the SR3 recommended to begin before the alternate route process. He understood that the Planning Advisory Commission (PAC) recommended that both projects be considered as high priority with no timing preference.

Mr. Fink replied that is correct. The PAC recommendation does not establish any sequencing order. It does establish both projects as high priority. Both projects deserve to be expedited. Both projects are needed.

The Chairperson opened it up for public testimony. Comments were limited to five minutes per person.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 6**

Ken Wilson, Wilson Communications and North Mason Chamber of Commerce, President – He stated that the NMCOC would like to compliment the commissioners on the public forum and recognize the volunteer work by the Belfair Subarea Planning Committee and Planning Advisory Commission. He referred to Chapter 17.34 of Sub Area Plan – Signs in Belfair UGA. Section 17.34.400 Nonconforming Commercial Signs – The PAC recommended a five-year grace period for nonconforming signage. The NMCOC believed that while they have historical years behind them, the businesses are still trying to become profitable. Budgets do not allow for large marketing expenses. Signage is the only avenue for many. Several of the newer signs need depreciation time factor built in. The NMCOC recommends doubling the five-year grace period to a minimum of 10 years for large commercial signage.

Section 17.34.380 – Permitted Commercial Tenant Sign Standards. The NMCOC recommends a 90-day grace period for blade signs, A-frame signs. During the period, he recommended the county would initiate a mailing of all businesses informing of the new standards. This would be followed up by a physical visit to each business with signage and advise them of the compliance/noncompliance prior to implementation and enforcement of the ordinance.

He spoke as a business person and recommended to move forward as the Belfair Subarea Plan as submitted. They may not ever agree on a perfect plan. The Plan should be a living document allowing for the new commissioners and general public to add amendments where needed and as the community continues to grow.

Cmmr. Baze asked how the NMCOC came to the recommendations within the signage chapter.

Mr. Wilson stated they talked to businesses. They looked at other ordinances throughout the state and found difficulties when there is a small minimum of five years or less. The NMCOC had two task force meetings. They would like to grandfather it forever. They are trying to find a middle ground and use a 10-year period.

John Owen, Makers (Consultants for Belfair SubArea Plan), explained that he is available to answer questions. He wanted to note that there has been a lot of work on the plan. The Belfair Subarea planning committee had 12 meetings during the year. There were a number of different subcommittee meetings. There was an enormous amount of public participation for the community this size in the three public workshops. They had positive input and great ideas which are incorporated in the plan.

Bob Harris, resident in North Mason since 1969 and business owner. Also a member of the Belfair Special SR 3 Road Project Committee. He felt there appears to be minimal support of the Belfair Subarea Plan. He referred to a second set of petitions which prioritizes the Belfair Bypass as the most important project and not remodeling Highway 3, not spending county tax dollars on a state highway. He explained that this petition with the other petitions turned in to the Planning Advisory Commission total 1400-1600 people. He submitted a petition to the chairperson with approximately 170 signatures asking for a continuance of the hearing to Belfair or close and convenient to the people of the Belfair UGA. He submitted copies of letters which were also turned in to the Planning Advisory Committee. These were letters written by North Mason community members about the Belfair Sub-Area Plan. He felt that the plan needs to go back to the committee. He noted that the Pertee Engineering won't deliver a report on the Belfair Sub-Area Plan until January. There was a meeting which was just cancelled. He felt that the County has not received the input and heard from the public. He felt that the sign ordinance is a contentious ordinance. The sign ordinance eliminates 95% of the commercial signage in Belfair which he feels is overkill.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 7**

Ed Edmiston, Agate Road, stated that he felt this is a rip off to the rural community. He was very upset about spending money on the Belfair UGA. He asked that the Board consult people in Mason County and not just North Mason regarding these issues.

Bob Allen stated that he is wearing several hats, as Port Commissioner of Grapeview, business owner and interests in several communities (Hoodsport, Belfair and Grapeview). He noted that he also does small land development. He stated that the draft document was difficult to follow with the cross references. Also, the intent was the materials were to be available at the point the announcement was made. November 24 was the first time the document was made available. He felt that a little under two weeks is a short time to go through final documents. He felt it could easily be argued that two amendments could be done in one year for the plan.

The Belfair draft sign ordinance is the most restrictive within the State of Washington. He was told from NMCOC that they intended to help write a sign ordinance. He asked that the Board consider a separate committee for the sign ordinance.

Nancy Moran read the letter into record from Mason County Association of Realtors, to continue the proposal until 2005.

Dr. Brian Petersen, Belfair Subarea Planning Committee Chair, they were operating for a year and five months before they hired the consultant, Makers, who worked with them for another year and three months. It was approximately a three-year process. He was surprised that people did not think there was enough public process. He understood that Pertee Engineering was not hired to comment on the Belfair Sub-Area Plan. He did not think the petitions which were brought forward had anything to do with the Belfair plan and development regulations being discussed at the hearing. It is specifically about the component of Belfair Bypass vs. SR3. He did not interpret the signatures on the petition as people who were against, zoning, planning, or sign ordinances.

He noted that the public process started with regular newspaper notices. In the regular calendar people were notified of every meeting. Typically, they wrote articles following the meetings to brief the community on what they were doing. They also put out a survey through the NMCOC newsletter (800). They put out stands in the community for people to complete and return the survey. They had a Belfair planning website. They put together notes and links of audio of the actual meeting. They had links from the Chamber website and also at the end had information on the county's website. The consultant, Makers, had information on their website. Dr. Petersen offered regular speaking opportunities throughout the community to update on the plan. He spoke to the Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis, Farm Bureau and monthly updates to the Chamber of Commerce. They also brought in specialists in the subcommittees. They brought in the City Planner for Sumner to learn about their experiences. An infrastructure night was put together where they brought in PUD, Qwest, Charter, Belfair Water and Cascade Natural Gas. They brought in LCA out of Portland, Oregon to put together a community workshop.

They put flyers in windows in businesses, countertops at businesses, two large posters on easels at the entrance of QFC & Safeway. They had it on the readerboard in front of a church. They spent \$1700 each time they did two of the three public meetings for direct mail to everybody's home (10,000 homes/post office boxes) inviting them to participate in the process. People with businesses and residences received two invitations to participate. People participated in visual preference surveys, large and small group study sessions. There was a lot of discussion regarding parks, signage, building types standards.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 10:28 a.m. – 10:35 a.m.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 8**

David Overton felt that Mason County is rushing a judgement on this decision. He felt that there are flaws. There is new highly technical information from the new GIS system which came to light. He understood that in 2005 there will be a comp plan update. He stated that is an admission the plan is not finished and not ready to be enacted to county law. He felt they need to get a third party input. If the plan is passed it will be challenged and taken out of the community's hands and put in front of a quasi judicial board that will enact a judgment in 2005 and 2006. The Board may then have to go back and amend the Comp Plan. He felt that the Board should delay the update of the plan until it can be taken into a programmatic view of what the future updates will be. He felt that the County is not consistent. He recommended the Board remand this plan back and look at what infrastructure is needed for the community and then go forward with zoning changes that reflect the community cost. They are putting in a commercial core zone that has not been costed out the road improvements needed to satisfy the up zones recommending. He also felt the County has not able to assess the environmental impact in the most sensitive area in Belfair (Theler Wetlands).

Courtney Flora, Land Use Attorney on behalf of the Overtons, stated she was following up on points by David Overton. The County has designated Belfair as an UGA. They are designed to attract density. They need to have adequate urban services to support the density attracting. They feel the county has not provided adequate urban services. They heard there are a lot of public facility improvement recommendations in the plan. There is no funding and those improvements have not been incorporated into the official GMA planning document. They felt that the first step is to designate the UGA. The second step is to ensure there is adequate capital facilities and infrastructure to support the added growth. The third step, which the County is currently taking, is to get down to project level basis and talk about specific uses and types of development to be permitted within the UGA. They are suggesting that the County is switching steps two and three. The first area of consideration is infrastructure and capital facilities before they can do detailed work in the Belfair Plan. They feel it is premature to adopt the plan without the infrastructure to support it. The TIP which was just adopted by the County does not include the Belfair Bypass. The County has indicated the Belfair Bypass project is a priority but it does not appear to be reflected in the recent plans. Also, the transportation element was updated in 1996. They submitted comments on the Belfair Plan and the Final Supplement Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS). In response, the county indicated zoning planning must proceed capital facilities planning. They feel this is backwards. The capital facilities planning should come first before zoning planning. They believe that violates the concurrency provision of Growth Management Act which requires adequate infrastructure to support growth. They felt they did not have adequate time to review and comment on the environmental analysis in the Final SEIS which came out on November 23. They feel it should analyze specific impacts on water, sewer, transportation, and critical aquifer recharge areas. They suggest there is more work to do in terms of studying specific impacts of the new zoning designations on the environment. They ask that the county do so before adoption of the Belfair UGA Plan. They are asking the County keep the plan in place, review it, and look at it in the context of updates the transportation element and the capital facilities element that the county is planning on undertaking in 2005.

Craig Mann stated that he moved from Montana to Mason County in 1985. He strongly feels the County needs an alternate route at Belfair. He felt that the transportation issue involves the entire region (Tahuya, Union, Mason Lake, Ally, Grapeview, Mission Creek, North Shore, South Shore). The business owners in Belfair have made a great effort in participating with the development of the Belfair Plan. At the meetings he has attended there was clearly a majority in support of the Belfair Bypass. He felt that the Belfair Bypass should be prioritized for the transportation in the North Mason area.

Steve Clayton, Planning Advisory Commission and Belfair SubArea Plan member. He felt the Board did a great job in appointing individual representatives for the plan. It appeared to be a cross representation of the community. On the Planning Advisory Commission they also reviewed the transportation element

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 9**

and decided not to make a recommendation. He wanted to clarify they did not feel they had enough information to make a decision on such an important component.

He stated he had some discrepancy with the transportation element report submitted by Heffron. The Planning Advisory Commission unanimously recommended rejecting that report because there were significant problems with factual numbers. It was not a rejection of what the Belfair SubArea Plan Committee approved and how they align what to do with the different transportation components. It is merely a separate report. He agreed with a lot of the petitions submitted to the Board and noted they do not address the Belfair Sub Area Plan, only the component of the alternate route or enhancing SR 3 first. He made a couple of recommendations on density through the SR 3 corridor. He felt it was an oversight by the group to allow unlimited residential density in the mixed use zone.

Randy Neatherlin pointed out there was a lot of work involved in creating the plan. He understands there were great intentions involved. The people are asking that this plan be put off until 2005. He also asked that the Board show compassion to the group and allow the Belfair UGA Plan to be tabled.

Ken Loomis noted that his family has had property for 41 years in Belfair. He felt there has been plenty of public input. He asked the Board to approve the plan.

Jay Hupp spoke on behalf of himself. He stated that about 15 years ago the Planning Commission made the decision to recommend the Commissioners opt into the Growth Management Act. He felt that was a bad decision. In observing the planning process in Mason County and across the state of Washington and in particular on the rural areas. He felt the GMA was forced upon the citizens in the rural areas. A lot of things were forced on people they were not ready for. He felt they are moving at too fast a pace and the adoption of the Belfair UGA Plan should be slowed down.

Ken VanBuskirk submitted a letter dated December 7, 2004 Re: Belfair Sub-Area Plan - Population Allocation. The SubArea Plan group was charged with planning for an additional 4,000 people in the UGA by the year 2020. The consultant confirmed the draft zoning equated to 12,000 – 15,000 people. He felt it is highly irresponsible to plan for that number of people. The critical aquifer recharge area in the proposed zoning, the amount of R10 zoning which focuses intense development around the downtown node over the top of the critical aquifer recharge area is contained in both the Planning Commission reduced density alternative and in the SubArea Plan alternative. He felt that both are inappropriate. The long term agricultural zoning contained in the plan. He owns a parcel and has a three year old rezone request to remove them from the UGA. He enclosed a petition with 90 signatures supporting his rezone request. The transportation component and timing of those in the SubArea Plan are a large area of concern. He submitted a petition from the NMCOC dated 1997 asking the County to build a bypass signed by 40 members. He noted that SR 3 is more congested since that time. He requested the Board defer a decision until the Comp Plan and state population allocations are reviewed in 2005; the USGS has completed their study of the groundwater or aquifers in connection with the Hood Canal dissolved oxygen program; the UGA boundaries and zoning densities be reconsidered in light of the critical aquifer recharge area; the County complete a buildable lands inventory with all critical areas mapped; and the timing and construction of the alternate route be the priority of this plan.

Bruce Landram noted that his family started out in Belfair in 1946. He felt the vote before the Board is not on the process, but rather on the Belfair UGA Plan. He would like to see the process and the plan separate. The most controversial issue is the timing of the Belfair Bypass. He questioned how many cars will go through Belfair when Hood Canal Bridge closes.

Cmmr. Baze noted that the Washington State Dept. of Transportation has not given that information to the County because they do not know the number at this time. He asked the Board to delay voting on the Plan.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 10**

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, stated a lot of the issues which came up were about timing and delaying action. He clarified there are regulations in place. The area is already designated as UGA. Already, almost any commercial or industrial development can happen within the UGA. The demands for urban services are present. There is nothing to keep new development from coming short of the County adopting a moratorium or removing the designation of the UGA. The only significant change in intensity is the increase in the intensity of residential development.

Robert Drexler noted what they need is compromise. He felt the plan doesn't compromise. He felt the Board should put this off until the first of the year.

Larry Gorden expressed he is in favor of the current sign regulation. He did not see the need to rush into a decision. He too concurred with postponing a decision until the new board takes office.

Chairperson Johnson expressed appreciation for the comments given. There were important issues presented and discussed and the department of the group has been good.

Cmmr. Baze/Kamin moved and seconded to close the public hearing and render a decision on Tuesday, December 21, 2004; take written testimony until noon on the 20th. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye; K-aye.

11. Other Business (Department Heads and Elected Officials)

11.1 Approval of the resolution appointing a person to fill the Port of Tahuya Commissioner position, Dist. No. 1

Ron Henrickson, County Administrator, explained the position of Port of Tahuya Commissioner, District No. 1 became vacant earlier and state allows the agreement of the existing two Port Commissioners to appoint. They could not agree and by law it goes to the County Commissioners. The Board advertised and received three applicants: Dave Christiansen, Dan McPhee and Brad Carey of which were interviewed.

The appointment is for the remainder of the unexpired term which will end on December 31, 2005.

Cmmr. Baze/Kamin moved and seconded to appoint Dan McPhee. Motion carried unanimously. B-aye; J-aye. K-aye. Resolution No. 123-04 (Exhibit F)

12. Administration - None

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 7, 2004 - PAGE 11**

13. Adjournment - 11:24 am

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MASON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Wesley E. Johnson, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Jayni L. Kamin, Commissioner

Rebecca S. Rogers, Clerk of the Board

Herb Baze, Commissioner