

## BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

NOVEMBER 22, 2005

1. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.
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 Per RCW 84.52.020 copies of the 2006 budget/levies were received from: Port of Dewatto, Fire Protection District Nos. 6 & 8, (copies only with Clerk of the Board)
    - 4.1.2 GEI Consultants, Inc. John J. Pizzimenti, PhD and Darryll Olsen, PhD have provided a report on what Best Available Science tells us about riparian buffers along salmon streams in Washington.
    - 4.1.3 Mr. & Mrs. James D. Kidrick asked for a road sign for Mountain View Drive. (Copy to Addressing & Public Works)
    - 4.1.4 Jefferson County Commissioner Phil Johnson submitted information relating to a solution to parking fees in Washington State parks.
    - 4.1.5 Constance C. Ibsen asked that the Board consider consolidating budget and financial services.
    - 4.1.6 Lewis-Mason-Thurston Area Agency on Aging Advisory Board Applicant: Gretchen Dickson
    - 4.1.7 The Allyn Community Association submitted comments and expressed appreciation to the County for beginning the process of completing a comprehensive plan for the community of Allyn.
  - 4.2 News Release – Bill Tabor, Public Works Asst. Dir. announced the county is seeking volunteers to serve on the Transportation Improvement Program-Citizens Advisory Program (TIPCAP). Typically they have 12 members, four from each commissioner district.
  - 4.3 Proclamation – World Aids Day in Mason County. Ben Johnson and the Co-Chair of Mason County Advisory Council noted that there are 93 tested with AIDS in Mason County. They are having a “Vigil” on Friday, December 2 at noon at the Colonial House.
  - 4.4 Post for quotes award for culvert supplies for Public Works. Dave Loser, ER&R Director, noted there were three bids received. They have awarded to Tozier Brothers, Inc. of Shelton, WA for 60’ X 10’ diameter aluminum culvert and 1 connector band for Public Works in the amount of \$18,136.69.
5. Open Forum for Citizen Input - No public comment.
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 October 19 and 20, 2005. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
8. Approval of Consent Agenda:
  - 8.1 Approval for the Facilities & Grounds Director to post for quotes for revisions to the front counter in Building 3. Sealed quotes will be accepted until December 9, 2005.
  - 8.2 Approval of Veterans Assistance Fund application for: Shane Boyle – housing \$450.00; Bob W. Kozel – food \$300.00 & utilities \$73.93; John J. Makoviney – housing \$600.00; Leslie W. Mondy – utilities \$241.89 & food \$348.11; Richard D. Nielson – utilities \$170.35; Rose Oster – utilities \$100.00; Larry M. Tunno – utilities \$110.93 for a total of \$2,395.21.
  - 8.3 Approval of the resolution to amend the Non-Union Salary

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 2**

Range Alignment to reflect the transfer of two positions out of the Engineer Guild and establishes a four-level career track for engineer professionals within the Public Works Department. **Resolution No. 105-05 (Exhibit A)**

- 8.4 Approval of a contract for \$16,500 between Mason County and GeoEngineers to prepare a Shoreline Restoration/Mitigation Plan for the Allyn Urban Growth Area (UGA).
- 8.5 Approval of a contract for \$39,907.16 between Mason County and Jones & Stokes to assist in the establishment of Comprehensive Plan policies and implementing regulations for Master Development Plans in Mason County.
- 8.6 Approval for the Public Works Department to advertise for submittals from interested qualified firms/individuals to provide consulting services for 2006.
- 8.7 Approval to set a public hearing on Tuesday, December 6, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. to consider the 2006 Annual Road Construction Program.
- 8.8 Approval to set a public hearing on Tuesday, December 6, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. to consider the 2006-2011 Six Year Transportation Improvement Program.
- 8.9 Approval of the resolution authorizing County Road Load Restrictions/Emergency Closing Orders for the 2005-2006 winter season. **Resolution No. 106-05 (Exhibit B)**
- 8.10 Approval for the Equipment Rental & Revolving Manager to request proposals to purchase a Payment Processing System for the Mason County Treasurer's office. Proposals will be accepted until December 14, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. The estimated cost is \$27,000 plus tax with funding from the Technology Fund.
- 8.11 Approval for the Equipment Rental & Revolving Manager to utilize the post-for-quotes/telephone bid procedures to purchase a new service body to be installed on vehicle #240 for Public Works. Approximate cost is \$15,000 plus tax and will be funded by the Equipment Rental & Revolving Fund.
- 8.12 Approval to concur with the Board of Health action taken at the November 6, 2005 hearing and adopt an ordinance to authorize the revisions to Title 6, Sanitary Code. **Ordinance No. 107-05 (Exhibit C)**
- 8.13 Approval of Warrants

Claims Clearing Fund Warrant #'s	97329-97571	\$555,953.19
Salary Clearing Fund Warrant #'s	152736-152994	\$217,711.00
- ~~8.14 Approval of an agreement to extend the county's insurance coverage to a fifth wheel yard tractor to be rented from Husky Idealease and providing authorization for the Director of Parks, Utilities and Waste Management to enter into a rental agreement for the yard tractor for the sum of \$2,495 per month plus tax. REMOVED~~
- ~~8.15 Approval to submit the Application for Coverage under the Statewide General Biosolids Permit for Biosolids Management for the North Bay/Case Inlet Water Reclamation Facility. REMOVED~~
- ~~8.16 Approval of Amendment No. 2 to the contract with Financial Solutions Consulting Group, Inc. for financial analysis services in support of the North Bay Case Inlet sewer utility, in an amount not to exceed \$11,385. REMOVED~~
- ~~8.17 Approval of a contract with Gray & Osborne Consulting Engineers to conduct service area planning and development review services for the North Bay Case Inlet sewer system. Service planning not to exceed \$10,251 and development review services according to established hourly rates in the contract. REMOVED~~

**Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Sheldon moved and seconded to approve Agenda Items 8.1 through 8.13 as read. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**

9. Public Hearings and Items Set for a Certain Time

- 9.1 A public hearing to consider a supplemental budget amendment to the 2005 Budget for the Current Expense Fund in the amount of \$213,090 and the Health Services Fund in the amount of \$16,233.

Ione Siegler, Budget & Finance Director, announced that the budget amendment to the 2005 Current Expense Fund budget for the Sheriff's Department to add a \$200,000 homeland security grant. The grant will be used for miscellaneous equipment and supplies. A \$9,645 Department of Ecology grant

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 3**

to the Sheriff's office for litter clean up. There would be a \$3,445 bullet proof vest partnership program grant. The budget amendment for Health Services includes adding \$5,733 from unanticipated beginning fund balance and \$10,500 from Medicaid income from the contracted Hispanic social worker. The money would be used to increase the hours for the Mason County Health Officer in the amount of \$2,071; to purchase communications equipment in the amount of \$3,662 and to increase the hours for contracted social worker \$10,500.

It was noted the funds for the bullet proof vest is federal money.

The public comment was opened and no comments were received.

Cmmr. Kamin questioned about the purchase of communications equipment.

Steve Kutz, Public Health Services Director, noted there were cars they replaced and they had analog phones which they replaced. They replaced four analog phones with two digital phones and car kits to put in the car. One cell phone for the Environmental Health Manager.

**Cmmr. Sheldon/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to approve a supplemental appropriation to the 2005 budget for the Current Expense Fund in the amount of \$213,090 and for the Health Services Fund in the amount of \$16,233. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye. Order (Exhibit D)**

- 9.2 A public hearing to consider proposed changes and updates to the Mason County Comprehensive Plan and development standards as follows: Chapter V (Housing; Chapter IV (Land Use); Revisions to Harstine Island Forest Practice Buffer Policy; Airport Overlay Zone Ordinance; Changes to Urban Growth Area Boundaries; Master Development Planning Policies; Essential Public Facilities.

Cmmr. Kamin noted that there are three hearings continued from November 1, 2005: Economic Development Component; Manufactured Housing; County Wide Planning Policies; Agricultural Resource Lands; Harstine Island Policies; and Development Regulation Height Limits. Items continued from November 8, 2005: Site Specific Rezones; Items continued from November 15, 2005: Open Space; Shoreline Management Program Chapter & Code; Population Projections; Health & Human Services. Also continued is Transportation, but she asked that this be removed at this time for discussion later on.

It was noted that the public oral comment portion has been closed and additional written testimony was received. They reopened the transportation portion to receive staff and Planning Commission comments and any additional public testimony.

Charlie Butros, Public Works Director, passed along some feedback as a result of their evaluation. Some of the comments provided through the Planning Advisory Commission (PAC). They have had several discussions at workshops and hearings of the PAC. They made an attempt to answer some of the questions and clarify the process used for applications of funds on County roads. The comments submitted that they looked at along with DCD could be categorized: 1) Request for priority attention to Urban Growth Areas; the responses provided and information used to analyze the comments are that Public Works currently does not differentiate the way they apply funds on county roads. If it is a county road in an urban growth area or a county road outside an urban growth area it is reviewed and prioritized for attention and fund application. It is based on its condition and priority array analysis. The recommendation is not to make any changes there and continue as they currently are doing. They do not track their expenditures separately. Since they received the comments and had the discussion with PAC they went back and revisited the information on expenditures over the last five years. They found they were expending funds at a higher rate in urban growth area than the rest of the county on a

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 4**

traffic count basis. They feel they are providing the appropriate attention and expenditures there. Another category is a recommendation to modify the process to form a new committee or to provide for joint reviews between the Planning Advisory Commission and the Transportation Improvement Program Citizen Advisory Program (TIPCAP).

The comment is to try to develop some long term future plans. Plans that go beyond the plans that are submitted to the Board for approval (one year and six year plan). The plans are reviewed by the TIPCAP. The point of needing a better long range plan and a more integrated plan is a good comment. They have had extended discussions with the community development counter parts and agree in the next year they will get together good comment. They have had extended discussions with the community development counter parts and agree in the next year they will get together and put together such a plan.

Cmmr. Kamin questioned if that plan would be integrated with the subarea plans in the urban growth areas.

Mr. Butros responded they would consider those areas and they could be integrated into those plans. One category of comment related to responsibility for the roadway systems. Typically, the county is tasked and responsible for county roads. The state is responsible for state and federal highways through the county. One of the recommendations was to consider the full the network of roads in the county and apply county funds in areas that are congested or require correction. The concern is that they expend funding in areas outside their current responsibilities for example state highways or federal routes which would reduce the amount of funding available for the operations and maintenance work on county roadways. The recommendation is that they not do that, but encourage the state to correct situations that require attention or need correction on state highways or federal routes. Generally, on the comments received and evaluated, the recommendation on the list of A – M amendments to approve Amendment L. Amendment C if it is the wish of the Commission, to deal with improvement fees or impact fees for future development, they feel should be some place other than the transportation element even though there could be a transportation element component of that impact fee. The feeling is it belongs in some other section for development. This was all Public Works' recommendation for the Board's consideration from the 13 items submitted.

Cmmr. Kamin commented the county does have opportunities to impact improvements to state highways through the Peninsula Region Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO). This issue came up the beginning of last year, for some improvements the county might be able to do for access onto state roads. It was something the County considered. It was something that did get put into the state's plan through the gas tax and several concerns, at that time, will be addressed. Not sure of the time frame, but some of the access points onto state highways will provide safer travel.

Mr. Butros added they continue to work with the Department of Transportation. They had a meeting just this morning on some of the joint projects. They have a very positive and good working relationship with their counterparts of Department of Transportation. They have been providing the county with a lot of help. They are very protective of how they apply the county funds. They are very concerned about providing county road dollars to state highways and federal highways. That reduces the resource for continued operation and maintenance of county roads.

Mr. Butros noted that Addendum L – proposed change would be to revise the statement in Policy 1 (public participation policy) Paragraph A to strike the first two sentences. "This transportation element was developed with the assistance of the Growth Management Advisory Committee established specifically to help prepare the Comprehensive Plan. Mason County will continue to use a similar committee to advise and periodically update the plan." It is also proposed that the following two

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 5**

Mr. Butros noted that Addendum C – If the County decides to impose development impact fees there will be a transportation element. That is a broader discussion topic. They feel, if that decision is made that issue needs to be someplace else in the comprehensive plan.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked if Public Works has worked with the Planning Department as to where that type of language might be if it is not inserted here.

Mr. Butros responded they have not identified the location, they have had the brief discussion. He asked if there is an area the Board would recommend it be located.

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, noted that finding a place for the recommendation is not difficult.

Cmmr. Kamin noted there is a mechanism already in place with schools for impact fees.

Tim Wing, Planning Advisory Commission, stated that 65% of future growth of Mason County is supposed to go into the urban growth area. That is both residential and economic growth. The plan proposed is basically a rural plan. It makes no mention about urban growth area. The term urban growth area (UGA) does not appear. He felt the past twelve years the county has spent millions of dollars straightening out roads that have very little traffic. The two UGA's in the north end of the county are jammed with vehicles. The system of prioritizing shows they will continue to be jammed with cars, because the county does not consider traffic congestion on state roads. The six year plan, Section VIII, 5.9 – There is not a single project in the next six years inside the UGA of Allyn or Belfair. The next 25 years there is not a single planned dollar to be spent inside the UGA boundaries of Belfair or Allyn. The plan is about rural transportation and not about economic development. It is not about new residential development. When towns are mentioned they are talked about as a place to get to or drive through. There is no discussion about driving around inside one of the UGA's. Economic development is usually talked about in terms of roads following economic development. He felt economic development is fostered by the presence of good roads. The Planning Advisory Commission (PAC) wrestled with this issue because they felt strongly they were very lacking issues and they made a number of proposals.

The first proposal was to focus on both urban and rural travel – Addendum A. There is no discussion about economic development in the plan. There is no discussion about economic development in the staff's recommendation to not consider Addendum A. PAC wanted to make sure if they are going to discuss roads, they should be sure to talk about both rural and urban.

The second proposal is Addendum B which was also recommended by staff not to be included. It says they should be looking at a basic transportation network for the entire community which was emphasized as not just the rural areas.

Addendum E talked about the transportation improvement program. They wanted to take a look at the transportation priorities as the Planning Advisory Commission prior to going to the Commissioners. Their interest was to participate in a group effort to come up with road plans that met everybody's needs and did not just come out of the Transportation Department, but also worked by the PAC. That was rejected.

Addendum F & G – They recommended the county begin the process of establishing interim urban standards for roads that would work inside UGA's. For some reason, the staff felt it is not a good idea to do. They talked about the urban areas being annexed. That could happen in Shelton. They are referring to the City of Belfair and City of Allyn. They are not cities and have no city next to them to annex into. There is not a need to work with another municipality to establish standards. The rural

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 6**

roads being built now are not appropriate for inside UGA's. Both were recommended to NOT be included.

The last two recommendations were an aggressive effort to reprioritize future road expenditures with particular attention to improving road infrastructure inside the UGA's. They felt strongly to plan to ensure the UGA's can take on the expected growth. He concluded the plan totally ignores the urban growth areas. It is primarily a rural plan and has no money to be spent in the next 25 years inside the UGA's. He felt it stifles economic growth and fails to provide for future housing. With all the discussions he has had with people on the TIPCAP and other individuals involved with this for years, he was told it is up to the Commissioners to set the direction. He felt if left the way it is TIPCAP deals with maintenance of existing roads and they don't even exist inside the UGA's. They will continue to build beautiful rural roads. A major part of the future for residential and economic needs to be inside the UGA boundaries. The PAC recommended to start right away to work hard on that issue and enter into the Comprehensive Plan.

Cmmr. Kamin asked about his thoughts on the possibility of incorporating a planning process within the subarea planning process as far as for future roads. Another possibility, they are kind of leaving it up to the development community as they bring roads up to county standards. Perhaps in an UGA the County propose the development community bring those roads up to urban standards before they can be assumed by the County. The county did expend funds for planning for developing the SR 3 roadway plan that included trails and sidewalks. They are working on storm drainage. The state will be funding this. In other urban growth areas, Shelton has their own planning process. In Allyn, that is something that needs to go through their individual planning process.

Tim Wing stated that if developers are going to put roads in for development there needs to be a county standard that is an urban standard within the UGA. The county has none and it is recommended there be standards. Staff has recommended they not work on standards. The second issue is if the county has spent money in Belfair. The County did spend money and was able to get those projects funded by state money. He suggested the County could do that again. If they plan roads and intersections on a bypass on SR 3, in Allyn or Belfair and get them funded by the state, they probably would be able to do that in part because they are partially planned. If they cannot get them funded then they may decide it would be in their best interest to develop. No one on the PAC suggested the county build all the roads for the developers. They county needs to build the side roads, intersections and connectors.

Cmmr Kamin noted with the Belfair Bypass project going through the County has the opportunity to work with the state and communicate the standards the county wants.

Cmmr. Sheldon interjected the County has spent money on roads in the UGA's. The Roy Boad Road and Romance Hill Road, which is a connection to the Belfair Bypass. There is a large amount of housing going in on Romance Hill Road. The Old Belfair Highway; Lakeland Road in Allyn, Homestead Road, Evans Street and North Bay Road with new culverts were all improvements in the two UGA's in the recent past.

Mr. Wing stated when looking at the county plan for the next 25 years there are no projects in the UGA. The congestion on the two roads through Belfair and Allyn exceeds the congestion anytime of the day or night any day of the year in Shelton. He asked the consultant that works with staff about road evaluations if they consider the congestion and safety issues on the state highway in Belfair. He said they do not consider that because it is a state highway. They only consider county roads. The PAC recommended the County consider both roads. If we can't get state to do the work we need job done.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 7**

Cmmr. Sheldon noted the state will be spending more than \$30 million in the next couple of years on the Belfair Bypass and improvements to State Route 3 and \$16 million for sewers in Belfair.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson expressed appreciation for his input and noted she will study these comments carefully. As a rural county, Mason County has a rural taxing package, and some areas that clearly are moving to being urban areas. They want to make growth management to work and want the development to occur there. They don't want to leave potential city development as non-feasible, because the infrastructure is in bad condition that a city can't afford to incorporate.

Terri Jeffries, PAC, stated she was asked to let the Board know that they were dismayed at the categorical dismissal of their recommendation to staff. The recommendations were made in an effort to help guide the transition and set up the stage for the transition. She felt they need a closer look and feel they would find at least the overriding policy that might guide the priority arrays for funding decisions. They recommended and encouraged the County Commissioners to review the PAC minutes and some of the discussions around those. The PAC felt they don't need to consider other types of impacts, such as school impacts, but focus on transportation and it would fit in the transportation element.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked if the PAC wants the Commissioners to look at transportation impact fees and then look at the other kinds of impact fees at a later point.

Ms. Jeffries stated, yes, they were looking at transportation impact fees.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked if the PAC heard from the public safety community, such as the fire and law enforcement. They usually have some thoughts about a need for transportation issues as density occurs.

Ms. Jeffries responded that was not part of their deliberation.

The Board expressed appreciation to the Planning Advisory Commission for the recommendations which the Board will consider.

The Chairperson opened up for public testimony from anyone else in the audience.

David Overton stressed two points. The policy flows down from the Commissioners and in looking at Public Works Department instead of talking in the broad macro numbers it might be interesting to look at some of the policy numbers for next year. Carving out operation and maintenance vs. construction and investment in new dollars. When looking at long range planning those documents only carry weight when the county makes a significant investment in actually achieving the policies. Maybe matching up the construction dollars with the projected growth in urban areas as some targets to give back to staff to try and come up with projects which work on mobility inside the UGA or reducing trips between UGA's on some of the other county roads that need to be maintained. Setting policy goals and letting them work towards that rather than refuting a budget.

The other point of concern is development of urban road standards. As they are developing the UGA's and projects are coming through, such as the Belfair Bypass and other regional investments. The next wave of growth is from the private development community. He felt that without the urban road standards in place they will invest with rural road standards which are overly consumptive of land and do not provide the same sort of transportation links that the county will be looking at in the future.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 8**

The chairperson closed the oral testimony on this item. It was noted the Board will continue to take written testimony until Monday, November 28 on this item. All the changes to the Comprehensive Plan need to be approved by December 1<sup>st</sup>.

Updates to County Comprehensive Plan and Development Standards - Chapter V Housing, Chapter IV Land Use, Revisions to Harstine Island Forest Practice Buffer Policy, Airport Overlay Zone Ordinance, Changes to Urban Growth Area Boundaries, Master Development Planning Policies, Essential Public Facilities

The Chairperson noted the oral testimony will be taken and then written testimony is available until November 28, 2005.

Barbara Adkins, Planner, spoke to the proposed update to the Chapter IV Housing Element. One of the mandated items for the 2005 work program was the housing element. It has been updated to the new time frame of 2005-2025. They have incorporated the housing needs assessment which was completed in 2003 along with additional information from the US Census and Office of Financial Management in the following areas: population, income distribution, housing assistance needs, housing types, housing stock, home ownership, housing quality, housing conditions and housing affordability. These are just updated demographic information from the US Census from the housing needs assessment.

Terri Jeffries, Mason County Association of Realtors, noted they were looking for something different in the housing element update. They understand from staff that this will be looked at next year. They are specifically looking for housing targets for each of the urban growth areas under various economic segments, looking at what the demographic status is now, how the population projection sees it bearing out in the next 20 year period. Being able to identify housing targets for a certain income brackets so when they go back and do the review in the next 7 – 10 years they can look at how well they met their targets.

Chairperson Kamin stated when they talk about housing targets it is about low, middle, high income and trying to make sure they offer affordable housing.

Ms. Jeffries concurred and noted that once the population allocations are adopted for next year and for instance if the allocation for Shelton (UGA) increased by 6,000 more people, they could look at demographic data and trend it out; what type of housing, at what price ranges will be needed to accommodate the increase in population. They could look at the population allocation, who are the people they think are coming into the areas, and how might they make sure there is a home to purchase or rent.

The chairperson closed the oral testimony on the housing section.

Chapter IV Land Use

Barbara Adkins, Planner, explained this is an item on the 2005 mandated work program to update the land use and bring it up to the 2005-2025 timeframe. There were a significant amount of changes. Edits were made to awkward language and typographical errors, references to the year 2014 were changed to 2025. Population totals and timeframes were adjusted to reflect a shift in the planning period. The text has been altered connected with that. Population items updating historical and current trends, county wide growth, growth rates, migration, natural increase and seasonal populations.

Population projections have been calculated in conjunction with the new population data. Land use acreages have been adjusted for each land use based on current calculations taken from the parcel data that they spent several months putting together. Watershed text has been changed to reflect the

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 9**

analysis now is based on urban growth areas and not based on watersheds as was in the last comp plan. Land capacity has been updated with newly analyzed parcel data to reflect build out in the UGA's and rural areas. Build out represents a number of additional population that could relocate in Mason County should each parcel be developed to its fullest residential potential. They realize that not every parcel can be developed. Priority Habitats – page 4 – 4.15 was updated to reflect new priority habitats and species from the Washington Dept. of Wildlife. This information was gathered from Fish & Wildlife.

Cmmr. Kamin asked when this was last amended.

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, the Plan was adopted in 1996. Certain portions have been amended several times in 1998, 2000, 2002 & 2003.

The Chairperson opened the hearing up for public comment on this portion.

Don Hawkins asked if this section includes the requests for rezones.

The Board responded no.

Oral testimony was closed on the Land Use Chapter.

Emmett Dobey, Community Development Director, stated that the final decision on the rezone requests will be announced on November 29, 2005.

Revisions to Harstine Island Forest Practice Buffer Policy

Bob Fink , Planning Manager, noted the proposal for consideration is the deletion of Forest Land Use Policy B2. That is also the recommendation of the Planning Advisory Commission.

It is unclear how the policies could be effectively implemented, and the county does not have the authority to regulate forest practices that are not conversions of land from forest use.

It was open for public testimony and no one spoke to this issue.

The Chairperson closed oral testimony on this section.

Airport Overlay Zone Ordinance

Barbara Adkins, Planner, briefly reviewed the proposal. She noted that the Airport Overlay Zone applies to land divisions, new construction, and changes to existing uses. It does not apply to existing development, aviation development, or use of airport property for aeronautical purposes. There are six defined land use compatibility zones described in the ordinance. Zone 1: Runway Protection Zone; Zone 2 – Inner Safety Zone; Zone 3 – Inner Turning Zone; Zone 4 – Outer safety Zone; Zone 5 – Sideline Safety Zone; and Zone 6 – Traffic Pattern Zone.

It was noted that the Airspace Protection Areas on Map 2 depicts the airspace surfaces defined for Sanderson Field in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations. They are referred to as critical air space surfaces: primary surface, approach surfaces; transitional surfaces; horizontal surface; and conical surface.

She noted that the proposal is that no new residential land divisions are permitted in Zones 1, 2 & 5 or no new residential dwellings are permitted except Infill in Zone 5 as provided in Subsection 8.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 10**

Land Use Compatibility zones 3 & 4 – no new land divisions for the purpose of creating additional multi-family residential parcels except as permitted in Section 17.40.070 (2) Mixed Use Development. Residential land divisions for single family development are limited to one dwelling unit per five acres. Other residential development must comply with Usage Intensity and deed notification. Infill Development is allowed in Subsection 8.

The non-residential development usage intensity for those same land use compatibility zones. Zone 1 – no people other than aircraft occupants, airport personnel or other persons authorized by other airport regulations permitted in that area. Zone 2 – no more than five people per acre average over the site; Zone 3 – No more than 25 people per acre average over the site; Zone 4 – No more than 4 people per acre in buildings and no more than 75 people per acre outside of buildings; Zone 5 – No more than 100 people per acre average over the site.

The ordinance proposes special function land use which is something that DOT recommended be included. Not to put land uses in there where people cannot get out of harms way.

The Airspace Protection Areas relate to height limitations. Deed Notification is included that a notice shall be recorded with the county auditor on new development that the property is located adjacent to an airport and routinely subject to overflight activity by aircraft using the airport.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted that the legislature has made an effort to protect airports from encroachment. He asked if the proposed regulations are any different than any other general aviation airport in the state of Washington.

Mrs. Adkins responded that most of the language being used is basic language being applied. It is not a more intensive description than any other community will experience.

Cmmr. Kamin stated she understood that part of the changes were to allow for larger aircraft landings in the future.

Mrs. Adkins replied she understood they are taking into consideration the future of Sanderson Field uses.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if this in any way changes the restrictions that are now on the fairgrounds property.

Mrs. Adkins stated it would only allow 100 people per acre average over the site.

Cmmr. Kamin commented she was not sure how much of the current location of the fairgrounds fits into the 100 people per acre.

Mrs. Adkins commented she asked the Geographic Information System staff to take an aerial photograph overlay and outline the buildings that are included in the zone. It looked like only two-thirds of the buildings are inside Zone 5. The width of Zone 5 is 1,000 feet on each side of the runway.

Cmmr. Kamin asked what was the reason for the 1,000 feet on either side of the runway.

Kerri Woehler, Washington State Dept. of Transportation Aviation, was present and responded that the 1,000 feet is based on safety analysis studies of where crashes may happen based on certain type of airports. The size and shape of each zone is in the state guidelines.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 11**

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if other airports are precluded from having fly-in events.

Ms. Woehler responded that other ordinances specify that large events are aviation related. Generally large aviation type events are exempt by these type of ordinances.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if the county could get a sample of that type of language that might prevent any irregularities or difficulties with the proposed ordinance and the events we currently have at the location.

Ms. Woehler replied, yes, the definition of may be broad enough to cover those types of things.

Cmmr. Kamin asked how this relates to the Port of Shelton's plan that they have developed regarding airport use and development.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked if the recommendations are somewhat more tailored to the County rather than taken straight out of a book to accommodate the existing fairgrounds.

Ms. Woehler commented on the issue of flexibility; she would characterize it is they are able to provide jurisdictions, such as Mason County, with a number of options for different guidelines standards of practice that are available: Department of Transportation's guidelines that have certain recommendations in them, State of California guidelines with an example of best management practices. Typically they encourage jurisdictions to use all the information to come up with something that works well for them. The Mason County example reflects a good combination. There are choices that are being recommended.

Marv Faughender referred to Temporary Special Events on Page 2; Item (D). It seems to leave some flexibility.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if they would list Oyster Fest as an event (40,000 people on 60 acres). He would like to see the ordinance reflect what occurs at the site.

Cmmr. Kamin noted the fairgrounds is kind of divided in two zones. Part is in Zone 6 which would not have the same regulation.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated she did not want to do anything to hurt Oyster Fest or any other special event that might historically take place at the fairgrounds. If these recommendations are predicated on public safety she would not want to put the public at risk by virtue of historic practice that may never have been safe. They may need to have a thoughtful alternative that does not put the public at risk and does not hurt Oyster Fest.

Cmmr. Kamin asked how this relates to FAA standards.

Ms. Woehler commented the height restrictions are based on FAA standards for airspace. The land use compatibility zones are slightly different. The FAA regulates certain uses directly around runways at airports. For example, Zone 1 Runway Protection Zone is regulated by FAA.

Norm Eveleth, Port District resident, felt it would be a benefit to have a stringent policy that restricts encroachment. Not only the outside but also the inside. Any activity that is not dependent on an airport is an encroachment, such as the fairgrounds. He felt the ordinance should not be written to preserve the fairgrounds. He expressed support of the ordinance and urged to make it tough.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 12**

Marv Faughender, Island Lake Drive, expressed he is all in favor of this. He cautioned the board to look it over very closely. The green protection zone is approximately one mile wide. Airports work well with industry but it doesn't work well with residential. The High School is within one of the zones and are restricted. It is something he feels they need, but make sure they realize the full impact of what it means to the public.

Cmmr. Kamin concurred there is a lot of implications in looking at the development in Zone 6 in particular. They need to work with the City on this.

Ms. Woehler, WSDOT Aviation Division Planner, wanted to voice support of the county's work on the ordinance. The proposal addresses the height concerns which help prevent penetration of those air spaces that allow the airport to function and it addresses land uses to prevent encroachment. She really likes this process that it has been cooperative and collaborative between the city, port and county. She hoped it would continue.

The Chairperson closed oral testimony on this section.

Urban Growth Area Boundaries

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, explained that as part of the 2005 update the County must determine the population projection to be used in the 2025 comprehensive plan. Also, they need to determine an allocation of population to the urban areas. They need to make appropriate adjustments to the urban area boundaries to ensure there is enough land for the allocated population. The recommendation of the Planning Advisory Commission and staff is to not change the boundaries of the urban areas with one minor exception.

They are talking about the present growth boundaries. There are different ways to look at status quo. The growth boundaries and population allocation that is recommended would shift more of the growth to the urban areas, rather than the current distribution of population growth which is primarily in the rural areas.

There was no public comment.

The public comment portion was closed on this section and written comment will be accepted until the following Monday.

Recess

The Board recessed at 4:30 p.m. for ten minutes.

Master Development Planning Policies

Steve Goins, Planner, this is an addition to the land use element that would establish policies for innovative and creative ways of developing large tracts of land. When this was added to the work plan they hired a consultant to help with the process. They developed a public participation plan. He invited the consultant to talk about the process. They created a questionnaire to gather information from the public to create the policies. A case study was prepared by the consultants where they evaluated Mason county's current policies.

The following individuals took place in this process: Rick Anderson, Terri Jefferies, Norm Ereth, Gary Parrett, Jim Hunter, Bill Dewey, Warren Dawes, David Overton & Dennis Handberg. They tried to select a broad spectrum.

The policies would provide a framework as to how the development regulations would be created.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 13**

Ann Erneck, Jones & Stokes, noted they worked with county staff to develop policies and look at the whole process of master planning within Mason County. Some of the key points they identified for the master planning process was to provide a means of allowing large tracts of land to benefit from a more comprehensive planning, long term over a multi-year period. In exchange for a developer getting approval of a master plan they would need to provide some additional benefits to the community.

This is not to be a way to circumvent the Growth Management Act. Any Master Plan that is developed would have to meet the policies that are already in the Comprehensive Plan as well as what is proposed. They want to make sure that any future master plan has to show there is adequate road, water, drainage, sewer, and/or septic capacity now or in the future to meet the demands of the proposed development. There will be flexibility to the existing standards possibly allowing for reduced setbacks, clustering, combining of open space etc. The next step would be to start with regulations next year.

Cmmr. Kamin asked what size limitations are proposed.

Ann Erneck, Jones & Stokes – they will look at that during the regulation stage. The developer will know if it is worth the effort or a certain size of property.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked if the benefit to the developer is they will have certainty over a longer period of time about what will be approved. The benefit to the government is there will be more allowance or requirements for parks and infrastructure pieces that might not normally be part of the development process.

Ms. Erneck concurred, if they looked at a bigger area vs. piecemeal. Sometimes a bigger picture can help recognize the appropriate area to be preserved for open space.

Steve Goins, Planner, added the vesting time is a benefit.

There was no public comment. The oral comment portion was closed and written testimony will be accepted until the following Monday.

Linda, Jones & Stokes, they developed a public participation plan. The idea was to get a sense from as many individuals from a variety of different areas.

Essential Public Facilities Land Use

Allan Borden, Planner, noted that one of the tasks in the Comprehensive Plan Work Program was

The county was trying to initially coordinate with the City of Shelton for essential facility planning related to the provision of capital facilities in the Shelton Urban Growth Area. By mid September of 2005 they realized the City of Shelton were not able to complete their sub area planning process. They refocused the effort on the County defining what land uses. They wanted to look at the definitions and development regulations having to do with essential public facilities. They wanted to better define them. There are two places where essential public facilities are defined. They are defined in the Comprehensive Plan and defined in the Development Regulations. They are facilities and land uses that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, transportation facilities, solid waste facilities, correction facilities and also inpatient facilities such as mental health or substance abuse group homes. Staff talked with the Public Works Department and they have a concern that they are providing improvements in the county that should be viewed as providing a public service. Those facilities

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS  
NOVEMBER 22, 2005 - PAGE 14**

would be the road network, the Public Works operation and maintenance facilities in Shelton and Belfair. They felt those facilities should be identified as an essential public facility.

The Planning Staff is proposing to revise the definition of essential public facilities to include "local" transportation facilities, including operations and maintenance facilities. This definition is proposed to be included in both the Comprehensive Plan definition and the Development Regulation definition.

**Cmmr. Sheldon/Ring Erickson moved and seconded the Board of County Commissioners continue the public hearing to November 29, 2005, accept written testimony for all items heard today until close of business November 28, 2005, and table further consideration on these matters until the November 29, 2005 public hearing. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**

10. Other Business (Department Heads and Elected Officials)

- 10.1 Approval of the bid award to furnish Mason County with a replacement telephone system for the Department of Emergency Management. Bid opening: November 18, 2005 at 9:00 a.m.

Dave Loser, Equipment Rental & Revolving Fund Manager, announced that two proposals were received. It was recommended to go with Eschelon Telecom, Inc. of Seattle, WA in the amount of \$29,209.75. The Nexus company left out an important part of the proposal from downtown to Emergency Management.

**Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Sheldon moved and seconded to award Eschelon Telecom, Inc. of Seattle WA the bid to furnish Mason County for a replacement telephone system for the Department of Emergency Management. Total cost of basic system without options is \$29,209.75 including tax. The Chairperson is authorized to sign contracts associated with these changes. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**

11. Board's Reports and Calendar – The Board reported on meetings they attended the previous week and announced their schedule for the upcoming week.
12. Adjournment – The regular meeting adjourned at 2:40 pm and the public hearing commenced immediately following until 5:11 pm

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