

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

DECEMBER 27, 2006

1. Call to Order – The regular meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by the Chairperson.
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 George Campbell submitted his resignation from his position on the Mason County Water Conservancy Board, effective January 1, 2007.
 - 4.1.2 The Washington State Office of Public Defense is in support of Judge Victoria Meadows request for a second public defender in Mason County District Court.
 - 4.1.3 Belco Forest Products expressed their thanks for the excellent service they received from the Mason County Department of Community Development.
 - 4.1.4 Herb Gerhardt, Dave O' Connell and John E. Johnson are seeking appointment to the Mason County Trails Committee.
 - 4.1.5 Gale McGrath, Steve VanDenover, Daniel Michener, Drew Noble and Joe Spaulding are seeking appointment to TIPCAP.
 - 4.1.6 PUD #3 expressed their thanks for the cooperation shown by the Public Works Department following the wind storm on December 14th. (Copy to Public Works.)
5. Open Forum for Citizen Input – None
6. Adoption of Agenda – **Cmmr. Kamin/Sheldon moved and seconded to adopt the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
7. Approval of Minutes – **Cmmr. Sheldon/Kamin moved and seconded to approve the briefing minutes for weeks of December 4, 11 and 18, 2006. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
8. Approval of Consent Agenda:
 - 8.1 Approval of Veterans Assistance Fund applications for: Lloyd E. Lamb - utilities \$239.24 and food \$360.76; Michael Joel Heimbigner - housing \$600.00; Brian P. Fortner - food \$600.00; Michael B. Ong - housing \$600.00; Samuel S. Ofte - utilities \$229.09; Holmes Ronald Ellis - food \$250.00 and Cheryl Gurley, \$600 for a total of \$3,479.09 as recommended by the Veterans Assistance Fund Screening Committee.
 - 8.2 Approval of the following grant awards for Lodging Tax funds as recommended by the Mason County Lodging Tax Advisory Committee:
 - Joint Chamber Tourism Advisory Council, \$99,700 for marketing;
 - Shelton/Mason County Chamber of Commerce, \$45,025 (includes \$15,500 to Mason County for lease fee of the Hoodsport building) to operate the Shelton and Hoodsport Visitor Information Centers;
 - North Mason Chamber of Commerce, \$17,000 to operate the North Mason Visitor Information Center;
 - Allyn Community Association, \$3,900 for marketing the Allyn Days Event;
 - Mason Conservation District/WSU Mason County Extension, \$1,500 for marketing and printing materials for the Harvest Celebration Farm Tour;
 - Kristmas Town Kiwanis, \$2,500 for marketing the Bluegrass from the Forest event;
 - North Mason Rotary, \$1,500 for the Taste of Hood Canal as a one-day event; \$3,000 if it is a two-day event;
 - Mason County Fair and Rodeo, \$5,000 for the marketing of the 2007 Mason County Fair and Rodeo.Total of all awards is \$177,625.00

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 2**

- Denial of the following applications for Lodging Tax funds as recommended by the Mason County Lodging Tax Advisory Committee: Shelton Drag Strip Association; Annas Bay Music Festival; Mason County Forest Festival and the Outlook Writing and Design.
- 8.3 Approval for the Chairperson to sign the following grant agreements as approved in the Phase Two Homeless Plan:
Turning Point, for Grants Compliance Position, \$37,500
Turning Point, acting as fiscal agent for Mason County Housing Coalition for the Homeless Plan Coordinator position, \$17,000
Mason County Shelter, for Shelter renovation project, \$25,000
- 8.4 Approval for the Chair to sign the Puget Sound Watershed Protection and Restoration grant application in the amount of \$100,000.
- 8.5 Approval for Utilities and Waste Management to request proposals to remove Scrap Metal from the Mason County Solid Waste Transfer Facility and the Belfair Drop Box Station.
- 8.6 Approval to extend the Mason County Garbage Solid Waste Drop Box Hauling Agreement for a period of five years beginning January 1, 2007 until December 31, 2011.
- 8.7 Approval of the amendment to extend the existing agreement between Mason County and Mason County Garbage and Recycling for a period of Three Years.
- 8.8 Approval of the following resolutions for the 2007 property tax levies: Current Expense – two resolutions setting the 2007 Current Expense Property Tax levy at \$7,818,420 which is 1% greater than the previous year; two resolutions setting the 2007 Road Property Tax levy at \$8,434,272 which is 1% greater than the previous year and two resolutions setting the 2007 Skokomish Flood Control Zone District Property Tax Levy at \$59,102. **Resolution Nos. 129-06 through 134-06 (Exhibit A-F)**
- 8.9 Approval of Warrants:
Claims Clearing Fund Warrant #s 116022-116446 \$1,161,322.43
Salary Clearing Fund Warrant #s 162952-163232 \$ 255,006.00
- 8.10 Approval to extend the Interim Zoning Ordinance for the Allyn Urban Growth Area until June 30, 2007 and set a public hearing on January 23, 2007; 6:30 p.m.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Kamin moved and seconded to approve the consent agenda items as read. 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 amending the fee schedule for the Mason County Fairgrounds.

Mike Rutter, Facilities & Grounds, presented the proposed fee schedule with increases for the Convention Center/Fairgrounds Building and Grounds Rental;

They are also trying to add some pre-event sales. They would like to have Friday be designated Youth (ages 6 - 17) and Senior Day at \$1 for admittance fee. Activities would be built up around that attendance. They increased the 3-day Camping Fee from \$20 to \$30. This provides for the cost of doing business.

It was noted in 2007 the office staff will be realigned and there will be a savings.

There was discussion that in 2003 when the fees were last increased it was supposed to be raised a small amount every year thereafter so there wouldn't be any large lump sum increases.

It was noted the proposal does not include an increase in future years. They are trying to maintain the facility until they can address the move and restructure it at that time.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 3**

There was discussion that the stall fee was included in the previous resolution. The fee was used when people needed to house animals for emergency shelter.

Rick Byrd, Gig Harbor Kennel Club, stated they have held an annual dog show at the fairgrounds for several years. They are a non-profit organization and overall they don't have a problem with the proposal. They have a question on the proposal for camping. The way they have operated for several years is they rent the total fairgrounds. They have a parking situation that they use for the camping. They use a computer system and know who they park in different areas. When people send an entry in to attend the dog show they also do their parking at the same time. They use the fees that they collect to pay the Lions Club to help handle the parking. The Elks provide clean up service around the fairgrounds for this event. The 40 et 8 handle the food service. They don't take any percentage from vendors. They have not had a chance to discuss this with their board. He requested that this be postponed to allow them time to speak with the Kennel Club and then come back and talk to County staff about their issues. They need the revenue they get from the parking.

Maralee Carnahan, Festival of Hope, is also a non-profit organization. They don't charge people to come in. They don't raise any revenues from vendors. As they looked at the fee changes they were concerned it would make it impossible for them to continue their program every year.

Cmmr. Sheldon was concerned that the proposed fee increase does not prevent the Festival of Hope from using the facility. The county does have to collect a reasonable fee and they have not raised the fees since 2003.

Cmmr. Kamin voiced concern there is not an ongoing update each year. It is necessary to keep current with the cost of living and maintenance. The community may need a little more time to share concerns.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson noted that the Gig Harbor Kennel Club signs an individual contract so there would be an opportunity to negotiate some specifics for the organization.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Kamin moved and seconded to amend the fee schedule as recommended by the staff. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye. Resolution No. 136-06 (Exhibit H)

- 9.2 Public hearing to consider surplusing Mason County property located at 2378 NE State Route 3, Belfair, WA (parcel #12329 41 60140).

Mike Rutter, Facilities Director, gave an overview of the history of the building, which was a fire station and then converted to a county facility to provide licensing, building and health services.

It was recommended to surplus the two-story structure, because it is no longer viable to provide services for county government because of its size and there is no parking to the building. It was used for evidence, is clean and has no mold. These county services are now located up the street.

The property was surveyed when the facility functioned as a bank and there was an encroachment issue. The north end of the facility is approximately 7' on the adjoining property, so there is a dispute. This will then be put up for sale.

No public testimony received.

Cmmr. Kamin/Sheldon moved and seconded to surplus Mason County property located at 2378 NE State Route 3, Belfair, WA (Parcel #12329 41 60140), authorize the disposal of said property

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 4**

and authorize the chair to sign any necessary documents. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

- 9.3 Public hearing on proposed changes to Mason County Comprehensive Plan Chapter III.7 Water Resources Policies.

Allan Borden, Planner, presented the staff report. The County is working on a multi-year process to update its countywide stormwater program practices, which will include policies. It will integrate these in the Allyn and Belfair Urban Growth Areas as well as the Hoodspout Rural Activity Center. The first step is to look at the current policies. The County received grant funding for stormwater management and hired a consultant Otak who reviewed the current policies trying to see how adequate they are and proposed changes.

The Planning Advisory Commission (PAC) and Planning Staff recommended approval of the revised Comprehensive Plan Chapter III-7 Water Resources Policies including the optional policies prepared by staff:

Environment and Natural Systems – county providing diverse array of public services and do not impact natural systems and regional water quality; Economic Development and Tourism—importance of aquaculture and shellfish industry; Development and Land Use –development of public facilities should incorporate, when feasible, innovative methods of stormwater management.

The optional policies were at the request of the PAC. They have reformatted and edited the existing policies.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted it is a reformatting of policies. There are a lot of “should’s.” These are recommendations looking at the new science and technique for stormwater management so in the future the county can formulate more specific guidelines that reflect these policies in general.

Terri Jeffries, Mason County Association of Realtors Government Affairs Director, stated she also served on the Planning Advisory Commission and was on a leave of absence during the time when PAC heard this proposal. She was concerned that it appears the county is rushing through this again. They feel it is not the septic tanks that are hurting the water; but the stormwater. Much of the Comprehensive Plan does not set out a strategic plan for accomplishing the goals of controlling and managing the growth. They want to make sure the County is committed to making sure there is water available to the places they say they want growth. They want to do whatever is necessary to get growth in the urban areas. A water quality monitoring strategic plan is necessary. She encouraged the Board to take a step back.

Cmmr. Sheldon concurred they have piecemealed a lot of the Comprehensive Plan. It is somewhat the result of state requirements and the fact there are multi-jurisdictions. It is a difficult job to do this in a comprehensive way. There are a lot of “should” and not “shall.”

The Board voiced appreciation to the comments.

Cmmr. Kamin stated that next to passing the budget, the Comprehensive Plan amendments are the most important thing to do as a Board. They have the most direct effect on the general population. She worked to get performance measures for measurable goals and strategic plan. They get a lot of attention to this but never quite carry it a step farther. She would like to see more time spent working with the community and coming up with something up that is an actual plan. Something that is not just a list and that will work to provide for economic vitality.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 5**

Cmmr. Ring Erickson noted that some of the people have been working on grants and reading material for many months and recognize this as a set of statements that will develop the strategy and they will be hearing about the implementation over the next few months.

A lot of resource policies have been adopted and recommended by the Planning Advisory Commission. They have struggled hard to do their job with the resources available.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to Amend the Comprehensive Plan to include Chapter 3.7 water resources policies as presented by the Planning Advisory Commission. Motion carried unanimously. Motion carried. K-nay; RE-aye; S-aye.

RECESS at 10:38 until 10:48 a.m.

- 9.4 Public hearing continued to consider possible amendments to the Mason County Resource Ordinance regarding Critical Areas: Wetlands, Frequently Flooded Areas, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, Geologically Hazardous Areas, and Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas.

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, noted this is a continuation of the hearing from November 28 & December 19. Additional information was sent to the Board since the last hearing. One item was a summary review of the issues regarding Fish & Wildlife wetlands comments from the consultants. There is also a response on an issue under consideration for the Geologically Hazardous Areas. The last item was a draft Findings of Fact for consideration. The Findings would support an action that adopts the Planning Advisory Commission's recommendations with some additional changes that the department is recommending to incorporate into the draft. If the Board decides to modify the Findings they would prepare revised Findings. The recommendation is that the Board adopt the changes and findings as sent forward by the PAC and modified by the Planning Staff. The Department feels the amendments meet the county's requirements under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to the extent that there are issues still open. The county revisits the issues the next year at its discretion. The alternative would be a two-month delay for more public outreach and process. It would delay the county's compliance with the update requirements and the GMA.

Jim Hunter acknowledged that he is the father of Cmmr. Jayni Kamin. He understood this is supposed to be based on best available science. Two things it refers to for science is Health Hazard Management Plan that was adopted by the Board a few years ago and the Channel Migration Zone and potential Avulsion Study. He asked that the Board hold back on this portion and get a feel for the community with more input.

Cmmr. Kamin clarified that the Frequently Flooded Areas and Avulsion Zone is removed from the staff recommendation because the PAC has not made a recommendation on these. There is a concern the County has devoted a considerable amount of time in trying to update that portion to the Comprehensive Plan. She would hate to see the work be lost or suspended indefinitely.

Cmmr. Sheldon expressed concern about putting this off much longer as this was due on December 1, 2006. A challenge could be made to the Hearings Board. He is concerned that the County get an invalidity and it would stop all economic activity outside the urban growth areas. The danger tree provisions provide room to customize the ordinance to help those that are adjacent to areas that need to be buffers.

Mr. Fink stated the "danger tree" occurs in the wetland regulations and the fish and wildlife regulations.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 6**

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked if the staff would continue to work on the landscaping language and the mitigation if a house is placed in line with other homes and it is close to the 20' buffer as opposed to being farther back.

Mr. Fink replied, one of the changes they made last year was in describing the activities that are permitted on site in a regulated area where they have existing development. They are trying to clarify what type of activities people can do when they have lawns or other improvements within the protected areas. It is a constant issue they try to address. They try to make modifications on an annual basis to make it work better for the people and still be consistent with the purposes of the code.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated she would like to be involved in reviewing that particular language as it becomes available to share it with the public.

Cmmr. Kamin stated the county has been working on this for a long time (channel avulsion study and frequently flooded areas). It would be helpful to understand what is at stake. The community has had a building moratorium on it and has also gone to court several times and lost. The County decided we needed to set about developing a new record and look at the scientific evidence; what can be done to alleviate that. To also see if there is a chance of partially lifting the moratorium and be able to preserve the economic vitality of the community, the long term agriculture out there. It is not right to have a long-standing moratorium. If future generations cannot make modifications and enhance their living abilities, they will not survive. She would hate to see the work that has been done on this lost. She questioned if the Executive Summary Channel Migration Avulsion Potential Analysis is the final review from the consultants. She would like to protect the county from further challenges. She would like to finish the Comprehensive Plan. The community has had a hardship. She urged the Board to consider an additional three months of looking at this.

Bob Fink, Planning Manager, explained the consultants prepared the executive summary of the report that is almost at completion. The contract expires at the end of the year and they asked the consultants to bring the report to a completion. They did prepare an executive summary prior to completion of the actual report. The essential elements are being finished. The executive summary lays out the basic findings, which are the identified avulsion potential path and channel migration zones. They also identified a number of options for future consideration by the county. Those were mostly on the first page of the executive summary.

Cmmr. Kamin referred to Attachment B #12 there were also concerns by Washington Department of Transportation with the current Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance and ambiguous language regarding bridges and roads which has not been addressed.

It was discussed that the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance are regulations which are incorporated to protect the Frequently Flooded Areas. They also serve as the County's compliance with requirements for the Federal Emergency Management insurance program for flood damage.

Mr. Fink stated that some people have said that the Planning Advisory Commission has not finished their review of the Flood Hazard Damage Ordinances or changes which are incorporated by reference in the Frequently Flooded Areas section. They have identified some changes, which could be done and should be done at this time that are not dependent on the completion of the channel migration zone study. The recommendation from staff is to adopt the changes. One of the changes that came out of the review was due to Washington Dept. of Transportation pursuing a project to rebuild a bridge on US 101 in the Skokomish Valley. The current county regulations have nothing explicit that addresses bridges and roads directly. The interpretation that staff made in reviewing the record and the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan on which some of these regulations are based, it would fall under a provision which addresses things which effect flood flows. There is a provision to

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 7**

address those and has certain requirements if you are building structures to address flood flows and bridge abutments would fall under the regulation. They felt the language was a little bit vague. One of the proposals is to add a section, which would include the same language and restrictions, but clearly incorporate the bridges and roads to be addressed under that section. There is a section, which is specific to Skokomish Valley but is not based on the channel migration zone study. They are trying to make a distinction between those sections and amendments proposed that are dependent on the study. Those amendments are proposed for other reasons. The change to address the bridges and roads in the Skokomish Valley, although specific to the Skokomish Valley is not a result of the study itself. It was a result of a request during the same time from Dept. of Transportation that they have the intent to proceed with project and what are the regulations needed to comply. There was discussion that this is in the draft ordinance around the last page, Bridges and Roadways. The entire Section 5.5-6 is a new section. It is a modification of Section 5.5-5 which is titled Dikes, Levies, and Other Water Flow Modification Structures.

Cmmr. Sheldon questioned if the language meets Dept. of Transportation standards for the Purdy Creek Bridge.

Mr. Fink responded they are working on being in compliance. When the county proposed this section it included restrictions that were drawn out of the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan and concerns about off-site effects of making these kinds of changes. Where they are doing bridge abutments and other things that might have an effect on flows that they take into consideration off site affects. Dept. of Transportation is aware of this and they are trying to work within the parameters. They have not objected.

Cmmr. Kamin stated the Critical Areas Ordinance was passed with the previous Board under a lot of duress. There were several years where the County was out of compliance and they were not able to do any type of rezones. It was a real economic hardship. When the County finally came into compliance the County was able to address issues. She did not want to see the County go out of compliance, but also would hate to miss the opportunity to rectify and make some changes.

There was discussion that the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance is part of the Frequently Flooded Areas.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he did not want to adopt it at this time.

It was noted this is something the Board can amend at any time during the year. The Board can pass the proposed ordinance in front of them and work on parts of it during the year.

Cmmr. Sheldon would like to review with Department of Transportation the provision in the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance that refers to bridges and roadways because of the plan to construct the 330' causeway over Purdy Creek. He wants to make sure they are not inconsistent with the plan that the state has to build the bridge over Purdy Creek.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson also was interested in reviewing some more specific language with regard to danger trees and how the county would monitor that activity.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to adopt the Mason County Resource Ordinance regarding critical areas, wetlands, frequently flooded areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, geologically hazardous areas and fish and wildlife critical habitat areas, with the exception of references to danger trees in Section F #5 in the Fish & Wildlife Ordinance and also on Section D #1 F 7; also the exception of the Mason County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. K-nay; RE-aye; S-aye. Motion passed.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 8**

- 9.5 Public hearings on proposed changes to the Mason County Comprehensive Plan and development standards as follows:
- a) Mason County Comprehensive Plan proposed revisions to Chapter III.7 Water Resources Policies and the Chapter VI Capital Facilities Element;
 - b) Mason County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan;
 - c) Mason County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map request to change designation of lands from Long-Term Commercial Forest to Inholdings Lands (Shaw Family LLC, 97.80 ac. parcel)

Allan Borden, Planner, explained this covers several elements of the Comprehensive Plan which were reviewed previously at separate public hearings. On December 12, the Board reviewed items in (a) above and recommended consideration on December 27. Item (b) was considered on December 19 and public comment was received with a decision to be on December 27. Staff recommended to address those three topics first before moving on to the items in (c).

Cmmr. Sheldon/Kamin moved and seconded to divide the question and vote separately on Items: a) Mason County Comprehensive Plan Water Resources Policies; b) Mason County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan; and c) Mason County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map(Shaw Family LLC). Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

Mr. Borden stated Mason County Community Development is bringing existing policies that are proposed for revision and consistent with environmental and County issues that have come up within the last ten years since they were initially adopted. This is the first step in pursuing a Comprehensive Stormwater Program in the next few years. The first step is to edit the policies and keeping them in combinations that have been previously presented. The Planning Advisory Commission instructed the Department of Community Development to prepare three additional policies that could be considered.

The Capital Facilities Element is updated on an annual basis. It matches up anticipated improvements and ongoing programs in the various departments in the county, including Public Works, Parks, Facilities & Grounds, Community Development, Utilities & Waste Management. They use the element for annual budgeting. It is presented in a six-year program from 2007-2012. There were no changes since the public hearing on December 12, 2006.

John Keates, Parks Manager, stated he did not have anything to add to the previous staff report other than to say this park plan was put together with the help of the Parks & Trails Advisory Committee and updates the last plan which was done in 1996.

Mr. Borden explained item c) relating to the Shaw Family; the property is located on Matlock Brady Road. The request is to take lands currently designated from Long-Term Commercial Forest and redesignate to Inholding Lands. After reviewing the record, the Planning Staff is recommending denial of the request. There are multiple reasons for that. There are several criteria that are not met by the request. The property is located in a fairly remote location to receive county services and emergency response by Sheriff or medical services. The requested property is in the middle of a large block of resource land. There is plenty of land available outside of the urban growth areas to serve the needs of the 20-year period of the comprehensive plan. There is no information provided by the applicant to say that this is a unique situation that these properties are distinguished from similarly located properties. The potential for rezones in the future could cause a lot more difficulties in managing these long term resource lands if a conversion from resource land to inholding land were to take place.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated the Department's position has not changed and the Planning Advisory Commission's position that all the criteria were met and should be granted has not changed.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 9**

Steve Whitehouse, Attorney representing Shaw Family LLC, responded to a few comments made. He disagreed that this is an isolated piece of property. There are 57 properties, which are inholding within a mile of this property. They looked at a map of the Matlock Brady Road corridor and it is very clear that significant properties along that approx. 12-mile corridor are not long term commercial forest. Properties back from this are long term commercial forest. He understood the staff report recommended that it be converted to inholding as long as 35 acres was excluded. The 35-acre exclusion was based on a seasonal stream being classified as a Class IV stream. They came back and showed the Planning Staff that it has been determined to not be a Class IV stream. It is just seasonal and goes underground.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Kamin moved and seconded that the annual updated Capital Facilities Element and the amendment including the Water Resources Policy Chapter III.7 be adopted as presented by the Board today. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

Cmmr. Kamin/Sheldon moved and seconded to approve the Mason County Parks & Recreation Comprehensive Plan as presented. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted that there were a lot of mistakes made when the Comprehensive Plan was put together and the land use designations were made. They have had several rezone applications because of those mistakes granted and they have others that were changed because of mapping errors. After reviewing what was presented by the Shaw Family for the 97 acres because it is bordered primarily by inholding lands and not bordered by long term commercial forest. If it was done all over again and time was not a consideration and GMA was not leaning over the County, this property would likely have been designated as inholding lands as the other 57 properties .

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated she was not sure that staff made particular compelling arguments on any of the levels. It was brought to her attention when this first came before the Board, there had been a decision they would not be adding any more inholding lands. There is enough problem getting the density development in the urban growth area. She understood there is enough land outside the urban growth area to accommodate 92,000 people. It is troubling and she does not want to put the County in a position of eroding the work and the statute for upholding the Growth Management Act.

Cmmr. Kamin asked if the Shaw family was hoping to have the land placed into Inholding Lands vs. R10.

Mr. Whitehouse responded they need made both proposals to give as much flexibility to the staff and commission as possible. They viewed their proposal as a compromise. They wanted some flexibility to do something more with it than they could do now. They would be satisfied with either option.

Cmmr. Kamin added she felt the County does need to look at Inholding Lands. By placing it into Inholding Lands it would be reviewed along with all the other lands. She asked for clarification that inholding lands has a time limit to further develop the land.

Mr. Borden responded when there is a change in designation from long term commercial forest to another designation the applicant, if approved, has to propose a development within three years.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Kamin moved and seconded to approve Mason County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map request to change designation of lands from Long Term Commercial Forest to Inholding Lands (Shaw Family LLC, 97.80 ac. Parcel) be granted. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
DECEMBER 27, 2006 - PAGE 10**

10.1 Building and Planning Department proposed fee increase update.

Barb Robinson, Deputy Director, noted the staff will be meeting with Olympia Master Builders to have further discussions on the proposed fee schedule before January 9, 2007 when the Board will have a continued public hearing.

10.2 Adoption of the 2007 Budget for Mason County.

Ione Siegler, Budget Director, reviewed changes since the presentation of the preliminary budget. New funds established: Victims Witness Activities Fund; Trial Court Improvement Fund; and Sheriff's Boating Fund.

The Board stated it is a priority to offer a good package of services and at the same time not put the County in a position of creating a bureaucracy they cannot support in the future.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Kamin moved and seconded to adopt the 2007 Mason County budget as presented. Motion carried unanimously. K-aye; RE-aye; S-aye. Resolution No. 135-06 (Exhibit G)

11. Board's Reports and Calendar – The Board reported on meetings attended the past week and announced calendar updates for the upcoming year.

12. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 11:48 a.m.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MASON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Lynda Ring Erickson, Chair

ATTEST:

Tim Sheldon, Commissioner

Rebecca S. Rogers, Clerk of the Board

Jayni L. Kamin, Commissioner