

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

NOVEMBER 1, 2005

1. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Chairperson Kamin.
2. Pledge of Allegiance – The chairperson led the flag salute.
3. Roll Call - Present: Cmmr. Dist. 1 – Lynda Ring Erickson; Cmmr. Dist. 2 – Tim Sheldon; Cmmr. Dist. 3 – Jayni L. Kamin.
4. Correspondence and Organizational Business
 - 4.1 Correspondence
 - 4.1.1 North Mason School District expressed their interest in purchasing 30 acres of land adjacent to school district property (Lots 1,3,4 commonly known as Blair Property)
 - 4.1.2 Habitat for Humanity of Mason County asked to discuss their application for 2060 funds.
 - 4.1.3 Taipei Economic & Cultural Office in Seattle expressed appreciation to the County for the proclamation.
 - 4.1.4 A letter was received from Jules Michel concerning development in the Pickering Road area without permits.
 - 4.1.5 Washington State Liquor Control Board notified that McCarley Chevron, Belfair WA has withdrawn their application for liquor license.
 - 4.1.6 Regional Support Network Advisory Board Resignation – Connie Woodyard
 - 4.2 Announcement of Mason County Employee Food Drive results. Staff: Ben Ramsfield & Kelly Frazier Were present to inform the Board that 1300 lbs. of food were given to the Mason County Food Bank.
 - 4.3 News Release – Doug Micheau, Utilities & Waste Management Director, announced the public meeting for North Bay Case Inlet Sewer Customers on Thursday, November 3, 2005; 6:30 – 8:00 p.m. at the Lakeland Village Community Club in Allyn.
 - 4.4 News Release - Doug Micheau, Utilities & Waste Management Director, announced the public meeting for the proposed Belfair Sanitary Sewer System on Thursday, November 3, 2006; 6:30 p.m. at the Belfair Elementary School.
5. Open Forum for Citizen Input
 - 5.1 Floyd Mullen – Explained that the County negotiated with him for approximately three years and they came up with a contract for the county to acquire the right-of-way in front of their house on Crestview Drive. He felt he has consistently worked with the county staff. He was concerned about his drainfield being destroyed and his driveway being washed out. He expressed frustration for the quality of work being done on the right-of-way. There have been ditches dug across his property and he understood the water was going to be diverted off the property.

Cmmr. Kamin stated she is aware there were letters submitted to the County and Public Works has been working very diligently to address the concerns being raised. She apologized for any difficulty he has had in trying to contact her. She offered assistance in working with Mr. Mullen and Public Works staff.

Charlie Butros, Public Works Director, stated he was made aware of Mr. Mullen's concerns following the majority of the work on the construction on Crestview Drive. They have assigned Mick Sprouffske to work with Mr. Mullen to review the contract requirements and go out and review the work that had been done to ensure Public Works is complying with the requirements. Mr. Sprouffske did go out and visit Mr. Mullen and indicated there are some things the Public Works Department still needs to do. The County is pursuing resolution of those issues and trying to comply with contract requirements. Public Works is aware there is work to be done on site and are following up.

Cmmr. Kamin added she would appreciate an update on this project.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 1, 2005 - PAGE 2**

- 5.2 Mary Jean Hrbacek stated she has done some research on the topic of litter in the county. This came about as a field trip courtesy of Green Diamond and the League of Women Voters. The Green Diamond spends a considerable amount of money each year trying to clear the forestland of trash illegally dumped on property they own. She found out that the model trash and litter bill was passed in the 1970's and was the least effective in the US. Many states have developed a deposit recycling program for bottles and cans which have eliminated the litter. However, she noted that very little of the trash picked up in Washington State is not recyclable. Most of the trash is styrofoam, household junk or tires. She has personally tried to get in on the free garbage dump day and it is very difficult. She felt citizens are discouraged from doing the right thing which is taking garbage to the dump. She questioned how expensive it is to have everybody pay to have all the litter picked up all the time. The honest citizens are already paying for litter in taxes and some also pay a garbage bill each month. She asked that the county consider a pilot program or test period of free trash collection at the county dumps to eliminate those types of things. She does recycle and understands from her research that recycling is more of a "feel good" issue rather than an economic reality. It doesn't pay to recycle because there are not enough avenues for recycling and it costs more to operate recycling programs than the benefit back.
6. Adoption of Agenda – **Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Sheldon moved and seconded to adopt the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
7. Approval of Minutes – **Cmmr. Sheldon/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to approve the special meeting minutes of September 1, October 13, 2005, regular meeting minutes of October 18, 2005, briefing minutes of September 6, September 12, 13, 19, 2005. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
8. Approval of Consent Agenda:
- 8.1 Approval of Veterans Assistance Fund applications for: Shane A. Boyle – housing \$450.00 & food \$150.00; Ned O. Forrest – utilities \$81.06; Wayne W. Kallio, Jr. – utilities \$500.00 & food \$100.00 for a total of \$1,281.06.
- 8.2 Set a public hearing on Tuesday, November 15, 2005, 9:30 a.m. to review updates to Chapter III-6 (Open Space), Chapter VIII (Transportation), Population projections and allocation to the urban areas), a newly created Health & Human Services chapter, and a newly created Chapter X (Shoreline Management). Also proposed for review Chapter 17.50 – Zoning – Shoreline Master Program Use Regulations.
- 8.3 Approval for the Equipment Rental & Revolving Fund Manager to call for bids to furnish Mason County with a new End Dump Pup Trailer for Public Works. Approximate cost \$50,000 plus tax. Date and time of opening to be November 30, 2005 at 9:00 am.
- 8.4 Approval of a contract between Mason County and Herrera Environmental Consultant for an amount not to exceed \$10,000 for Herrera to assist the county in the environmental evaluation for the GMA mandated update of the county Comprehensive Plan and regulations.
- 8.5 Approval of Warrants
- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Claims Clearing Fund | 96404-96711 | \$540,803.90 |
|----------------------|-------------|--------------|

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated she would like to discuss Item 8.2. She asked if the documents which will be considered at a public hearing are available for review and how the public would get copies.

Steve Goins, Planner, stated they have prepared drafts for the Capital Facilities update, Transportation Element update and the newly created Chapter X (Shoreline Management) has also been completed and are available for public documents. They are available on the website at this time. The Health & Human Services chapter is still in draft form.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 1, 2005 - PAGE 3**

Emmett Dobe, Community Development Director, addressed Item 8.4. This involves the contract to complete the environmental review (SEPA) for the Comprehensive Plan. Large projects that might impact the environment are required to go through an environmental review process referred to as SEPA (State Environmental Protection Act). To expedite the December 1st deadline they felt it would be easier to complete all that if they went outside and hired a contractor.

Cmmr. Kamin asked if Item 8.4 end dump is an item already listed on the ER&R Fund.

Dave Loser, Equipment Rental & Revolving Fund Manager, responded this is a new item and is being funded by Public Works.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to approve the consent agenda Items 8.1 - 8.5 as presented. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

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

9.1 Public hearing to consider 2004 applications for Current Use Open Space and Timber for 2005 Assessment for 2006 taxes.

Phil Franklin, Assessor's office, explained that the applications for Current Use Timber and Open Space start in the Assessor's office and then are presented to the legislative authority (Commissioners) for action.

The Open Space Act was enacted in 1970 and allows property owners to have their open space land, farm and agriculture land, and timber lands valued at the current use rather than their highest and best use.

The appraisers are required to value the property at the highest and best use according to the market. In this case, the property owner would be given a lower value on the property.

The 2004 applications for Current Use Open Space for 2005 assessments and 2006 taxes are: (1) Ronald & Judith Allison (Parcel 41925-75-00020 & 41925-75-00030) for a total of 11.01 acres; (2) David Boling (Parcel 31901-32-90010) 20.32 acres; (3) Richard & Janice Jennings (Parcel 22114-76-00270) 4 acres; (4) Neal Jubb (Parcel 32030-13-00040 & 32030-13-90052) for a total of 7.31 acres; (5) Donald Lehman (Parcel 22114-76-00150) 5.03 acres; (6) Ron & Lorie O'Leary (Parcel 42021-34-00000 & 42021-34-00001) 4.84 acres; (7) Brennan Reeve (Parcel 22302-77-00050) 4.6 acres; (8) Ralph & Wanda Scott (Parcel 22114-76-00100, 22114-76-00110; 22114-76-00140; 22114-76-00160; 22114-76-00180; 22114-76-00190; 22114-76-00200; and 22114-76-00260) a total of 40.62 acres (9) James & Victoria Foust (Parcel 22114-76-00120) 4.04 acres.

It was recommended that the Current Use Open Space application for Brennan Reeve be denied because the parcel is less than five acres which is the minimum acreage required.

The 2004 applications for Current Use Timber for 2005 assessment and 2006 taxes are: (1) William & Mary Gortz (Parcel 22126-32-00000) 20.05 acres; (2) Brennan Reeve (Parcel 22302-77-00050) 5 acres; (3) Keith & Peggy Schouviller (Parcel 32134-24-00020) 3.40 acres (4) Richard P. Scott (Parcel 22136-24-00010 & 22136-21-02010) 20 acres (5) Frank Simmons (Parcel 22126-32-00010) 19.05 acres; (6) Matthew N. Welander (Parcel 32123-33-00010) 18.01 acres; (7) Simpson Resource Company, new owner Donald Wooliscroft (Parcel 22005-51-00076) 8.32 acres.

The Board closed the hearing portion.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 1, 2005 - PAGE 4**

Cmmr. Sheldon/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to approve 2004 applications and authorize the Chairperson to sign the agreements for Current Use Timber for William & Mary Gortz, Keith & Peggy Schouviller, Richard Scott, Frank Simmons, Matthew Welander and Donald Wooliscrft. For Current Use Open Space the following applications are approved: Ronald & Judith Allison, David Boling, Neal Jubb, Ron & Lorie O'Leary, Ralph & Wanda Scott, James & Victoria Foust, Richard & Janice Jennings, and Donald Lehman; further move to deny the application from Brennan Reeve for Current Use Timber because the parcel is below five acres, but approve Mr. Reeve's application for Current Use Open Space. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

- 9.2 Public hearing to consider proposed changes to the Mason County Comprehensive Plan and the development standards.

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, explained this is the first of several hearings before the Board that will deal with proposed changes to the Mason County Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations for the Growth Management Act mandate. A proposed schedule was presented for the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Update noting the date of the Planning Advisory Commission hearing dates and the Mason County Commissioners hearing dates as well as the specific items to be addressed.

The subjects for the hearings are the drafts or findings that have been made by the Planning Advisory Commission and have been available for review by the public prior to this date.

Resource Ordinance Sec 17.01.061 C.and D standards to allow certain accessory uses on designated Agricultural Resource Lands:

Allan Borden, Planner, noted that the proposed change is to implement a state law passed in legislature in 2005 that local government should use innovative techniques to conserve agricultural lands while encouraging the agricultural economy.

The County's strategy is to allow accessory uses on agricultural lands that produce, store, or sell locally produced agricultural products while not interfering with the agricultural resource land uses and activities. Mason County proposes to add development standards in the Resource Ordinance that guides such proposed accessory uses by setting standards for setbacks, building sizes, and the kinds of land uses that are permitted as accessory uses on agricultural resource lands.

Mason County Development Regulations, Ordinance No. 82-96, Sec. 1.03.032 standards on Development Densities and Dimension Requirements and Sec. 1.04.404 Rural Industrial, concerning the review of height limits of development on industrial-zoned lands.

These proposed development standards are in response to letters of concern the county received during the preparation of the work program earlier this year.

Review of policies set forth in the Harstine Island Subarea Plan and the inclusion of such policies in the Comprehensive Plan and in the implementing regulations adopted by Mason County.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson questioned why the Plan is necessary if it is just a replication and does not enhance any community character or special feature of Harstine Island.

Mr. Fink commented there are several subarea policies in the Comprehensive Plan that were drawn from Subarea Plans which were developed in the early 1990's before the Comprehensive Plan was updated. In those subarea plans they try to address many of the issues later addressed through more general policies, or the critical area regulations, water quality, ground water protection, rural policies

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 1, 2005 - PAGE 5**

of preservation of the rural character of the area. A question they had was have these policies been implemented through other means in the intervening years. The answer was, yes, through either programs or policies, regulations. The Harstine Island specific policies have been addressed through various means have been implemented. The Planning Commission did not want to remove them or change them at this time.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson commented she understood there may have been a time where the plan exceeded or added additional clarification beyond where the county had policies in the books. However, that is no longer the case, they are now simply consistent with regulations that are enacted throughout the county.

Mr. Fink concurred they are generally consistent with the regulations throughout the county.

Cmmr. Kamin questioned if when they first started developing the Comprehensive Plan they had subareas all throughout the county. Primarily, there are subarea plans within the Urban Growth Areas.

Mr. Bordon responded there were at least three subareas: North Mason, Southeast Mason and Harstine with subarea plans. They were all developed prior to 1993.

Mr. Fink added that the North Mason and Southeast Mason areas were adopted as Subarea Plans and then formally incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. The Harstine Island was never adopted as an independent plan. When the Comprehensive Plan was developed the policies were proposed for incorporation in the plan and adopted that way.

Cmmr. Kamin asked if there was nothing for Hoodspport or Union.

Mr. Fink responded, no. Since that time, the county focused on rural areas for a while, but the subarea plans working on now are for urban areas. Developing urban zoning and urban policies to address that critical need of the county.

Mr. Bordon covered the review of county policies and development standards about manufactured housing in the County. The state legislature passed a law in early 2005 that stated local government shall not treat manufactured housing differently than site-built homes or other forms of housing in their communities. One of the work program tasks was to review whether Mason County has varying standards that address manufactured housing different than site-built homes or other forms of housing. The review process concluded that the County does not discriminate where manufactured homes are located and how they are used.

Cmmr. Kamin questioned about height limits. She asked if it is based on a recommendation from Washington State Community Trade and Economic Development or if it is unique to Mason County.

Mr. Borden noted this is a locally generated issue. It is not a state mandate.

Cmmr. Kamin asked if the intent is to protect rural character.

Cmmr. Sheldon commented that one of the issues is to create an opportunity for industrial areas for companies to have co-generation facilities.

Mr. Borden added that the provision for height limits has been in existence since 1996. In a few cases people have had to get variances for structures of greater height.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 1, 2005 - PAGE 6**

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked what the height requirements are that require fire-fighting equipment.

Mr. Borden noted that the current Development Standard addresses the scope for a large structure. Fire compression concerns are a valid point in the building height.

If there was a proposal for a structure that is 55' high it would be reviewed early on in the pre-submission meeting stage by fire protection services.

Mason County Comprehensive Plan proposed revisions to Chapter IV.2 Population, and new Chapter X Economic Development Element:

Steve Goins, Planner, spoke briefly about County wide planning policies for urban growth area sizing is fairly straightforward. The Growth Management Hearings Board mandated that the county alter the policy to allow up to 50% of excess capacity in urban growth areas to accommodate the allocation population in those areas to 25%. For some time they have been planning under this new policy which limits that added capacity to 25%. This would align the policy in step with what the county has been doing and also the Growth Management Hearings Board has mandated. It is simply the change from 50% to 25% added capacity.

Mr. Goins stated he wanted to expand on the comments made earlier about the public participation side of this component. All of the pieces which they talked about have been through a fair amount of public review through the Planning Advisory Commission (PAC) and public hearings. This particular piece went through a rather extensive review which began in 2004 with the Economic Development Summit. Some of the action statements and initial goals were developed which provided the foundation that was used to further that work. The Department of Community Development hosted four workshops. Because they were located and held in different parts of the county, they were successful in getting a number of people to participate in the process. At the conclusion of the workshops, the staff drafted the initial draft which went through another public review process. They initiated a 30-day review with a workshop with the PAC. Copies of the draft were distributed to a number of key stakeholders for their comments, as well as placing it on the county website. After the 30-day review the PAC had another workshop and subsequent to that hearing where those comments were considered they commented on the various comments received and incorporated their own comments into the draft included in the packet.

The chairperson opened up the hearing for public comments. If anyone has any comments or questions.

Cmmr. Kamin noted there is a lot to be absorbed. She commended the staff for the efforts this year. This has been a very ambitious work plan.

Cmmr. Kamin commented the Economic Development Element is in addition to the Comprehensive Plan. It is not a mandated addition. It is an effort by the county to be proactive and work through the policies and procedures to be able to encourage and support the economic future of the county.

Cmmr Sheldon added that counties generally don't have an economic development element. He felt it is an essential part for the county to grow and diversifying the economy. He too thanked the staff and PAC members.

Cmmr. Kamin added the Comprehensive Plan is a recognition there is more than just jobs here. Jobs are important but also looking at the health and safety aspects of the community.

The public testimony portion was closed.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 1, 2005 - PAGE 7**

Emmett Dobey, Community Development Director, asked that on November 22, 2005 the Board start the business earlier in the afternoon with all of the planning items being continued to that date. The starting time of that meeting would normally be 6:00 p.m.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Sheldon moved and seconded that the Board of County Commissioners continue the public hearing to November 22, 2005; accept written testimony for all items heard today until close of business November 7, 2005, and table further consideration on these matters until the November 22, 2005 public hearing. In addition, the Board instructs the Department of Community Development staff to prepare a final draft plan for public review by November 15, 2005. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

10. Other Business (Department Heads and Elected Officials) - None
11. Board's Reports and Calendar – The Board reported on highlights from the past week and announced calendar items for the upcoming week.
12. Adjournment - The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MASON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Jayni L. Kamin, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Lynda Ring Erickson, Commissioner

Rebecca S. Rogers, Clerk of the Board

Tim Sheldon, Commissioner