

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

JULY 24, 2007

1. Call to Order – The regular meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.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 – Ross Gallagher.
4. Correspondence and Organizational Business
 - 4.1 Correspondence
 - 4.1.1 The Washington State Department of Corrections has selected Commissioner Ross Gallagher to serve on their Statewide Work Release Equitable Assessment Committee.
 - 4.1.2 The Washington State Department of Ecology announced the Oakland Bay Shellfish Protection District and the Annas Bay Shellfish Protection District have been identified for a grant offer of up to \$75,000 each through the new Local Government Stormwater Grants Program.
 - 4.1.3 The Economic Development Council of Mason County sent their Second Quarter Report.
 - 4.1.4 The Washington State Department of Health announced an increase in fees for certified copies of birth and death certificates and other vital records, to take effect July 22, 2007. (Copy to Health Department.)
 - 4.1.5 John Stanley thanked David Baker from Utilities and Waste Management for his help in locating a source for a new logging road gate and would like to know if there are any resources to assist landowners who have problems with illegal dumping. (Copy to Utilities and Waste Management and Environmental Health.)
 - 4.1.6 Johnnie Cary expressed his concerns regarding applying for a logging permit. (copy to Public Works.)
 - 4.1.7 Leigh Bacharach is seeking appointment to the Lodging Tax Advisory Committee.
 - 4.1.8 Mason County Fire District #13 Board of Commissioners fully support a sales tax increase for 911 dispatch services.
 - 4.2 Betty Wing, Central Operations Director, announced that the deadline for submitting applications to serve on the Mason County Planning Advisory Board has been extended until August 17th (Cmmr. Dist. #1 & #3).
5. Open Forum for Citizen Input - No comments.
6. Adoption of Agenda – **Cmmr. Gallagher/Sheldon moved and seconded to adopt the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
7. Approval of Minutes – **Cmmr. Sheldon/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve the briefing minutes for weeks of July 9 and July 23, 2007. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
8. Approval of Consent Agenda:
 - 8.1 Approval to appoint Rick Brush as Mason County Property Manager. **Resolution No. 83-07 (Exhibit A)**
 - 8.2 No objections to the conditional approval by the Washington State Liquor Control Board for the Liquor License Application in Lieu of Current Privilege from Lil' Moe's in Belfair. The conditions are that all Mason County Change of Ownership and Change of Use requirements are met.
 - 8.3 Approval to concur with the re-appointment of Jo-Ann Andrews to the Timberland Regional Library Board of Trustees representing Grays Harbor County.
 - 8.4 Approval of the contract for the Phillips Lake Park Gateperson position.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 2**

- 8.5 Approval of Veterans Assistance Fund applications for: Almund Gullotto - food \$450.00 and Robert Ramar - utilities \$161.24 for a total of \$611.24 as recommended by the Veterans' Screening Committee.
- 8.6 Approval of the resolution creating a special program in Mason County to subsidize monthly utility payments for individuals in needs. **Resolution No. 84-07 (Exhibit A)**
- 8.7 Approval of the resolution setting a public hearing on August 14th at 9:30 a.m. to consider supplemental appropriations to the 2007 Current Expense Fund Budget in the total amount of \$156,422 and Budget Transfers from the Ending Fund Balance in the 2007 Current Expense Fund Budget in the total amount of \$22,338. **Resolution No. 85-07 (Exhibit B)**
- 8.8 Approval of a new clerical position in the Department of Community Development for the imaging and record retention project. This new position will be funded within the existing Community Development Budget.
- 8.9 Approval of the resolution establishing the Mason County Sheriff Chaplain Fund #141-000-000. The Mason County Sheriff established a Chaplain Program to provide emotional support for law enforcement personnel and the citizens of Mason County who find themselves victims of crimes. This accounting fund will allow the receipt of donations and other revenues and to pay costs of this program. **Resolution No. 86-07 (Exhibit C)**
- 8.10 Approval to set a public hearing on Tuesday August 14, 2007 to review the following revisions to the Mason County Development Regulations, Ordinance No. 82-96:
1. Sections 1.04.214, 1.04.224, 1.04.234, and 1.04.244: adding theater fly gallery to exemption to 35-foot building height.
 2. Section 1.04.332: adding automotive and non-automotive repair and service to permitted uses for Rural Commercial 2 zone.
 3. Section 1.04.602 and Section 1.04.612: adding text of certain land uses that describe Outdoor Recreation permitted uses.
 4. Section 1.05.018: delete special use permit provision to re-establish old land non-conforming land use or structure.
 5. Section 1.05.046: adding text stating required information for application for Special Use Permit, and deleting duplicated text under certain zones.
 6. Section 1.06 Definitions
- 8.11 Approval of the resolution authorizing the road closure on Deckerville Road (County Road Number 00800) at M.P. 3.479 to facilitate a culvert replacement project. The closure will start at 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday, August 21st and reopen at 5:00 p.m. on Friday, August 24th. **Resolution No. 87-07 (Exhibit D)**
- 8.12 Approval of a resolution, once the exact closure date has been set, authorizing the road closure on Carmen Road North (County Road Number 08810) at milepost 0.55 to milepost 0.69 to facilitate work associated with the replacement of a culvert. **Resolution No. 88-07 (Exhibit E)**
- 8.13 Approval to authorize the Deputy Director/County Engineer to advertise, set bid-opening date/time, award contract, and authorize the Chair to sign all pertinent documents for the construction of the new Public Works Facility. Contract will be announced during a regular meeting of the Board.
- 8.14 Approval for the Equipment Rental & Revolving Fund Manager to call for bids to furnish Mason County with nine new Fujitsu ST5111 Tablet PC's with accessories for the Assessor. Date and time of opening to be August 8, 2007 at 9:00 am.
- 8.15 Approval of Warrants
- | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Claims Clearing Fund | Warrant #s 125987-126329 | \$1,079,766.85 |
| Salary Clearing Fund | Warrant #s 169046-169341 | \$ 279,069.00 |

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 3**

The Board noted that Item 8.13 is a milestone event for the County to build a new Public Works Facility. The existing building is well beyond its useful life and needs to be replaced.

It was requested that Item 8.8 be removed for further discussion.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve Items 8.1 – 8.15, with the exception of Item 8.8. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

Barbara Robinson spoke to Item 8.8 Approval of a new clerical position in the Department of Community Development for the imaging and record retention project. This new position will be funded within the existing Community Development Budget.

She stated this to refill a position, which was a temporary five-month position, for the imaging and indexing of documents for the record retention program. The person in the position was promoted to code enforcement officer. They have invested several thousand dollars in the programming as well as the scanning machine for the project. This would allow staff to continue to scan and index all of the files in the Permit Center which represents approximately several 100,000 pieces of paper, creating an electronic record so people can retrieve the information through the website.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated it is prudent to scan the records and this will enable the records to be retrieved much easier.

Mrs. Robinson added that it is a multi-year project.

Cmmr. Gallagher/Sheldon moved and seconded to approve Item 8.8. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

9. 6:30 p.m. Public Hearings and Items Set for a Certain Time

9.1 Public hearing to consider the petition to establish a Mason County Public Hospital District No. 2.

Chairperson Ring Erickson explained the process for the public hearing beginning with a staff presentation followed by questions from both the Commissioners and the citizens. After the questioning period it will be open for public comment so anyone that would like to be heard at that time can be heard.

Monty Cobb, Deputy Prosecutor, summarized that several weeks ago the Board entertained a motion on behalf of Public Hospital District (PHD) No. 1 to remove a number of areas from the PHD No. 1. Subsequently, there has been a petition from the citizens advisory committee for the establishment of what would be termed Hospital District No. 2. The boundaries of that petition included all of the land which were removed from Hospital District No. 1. The Board would need to consider that petition. The Mason County Auditor has found the petition to be adequate and valid and has forwarded it on to the Commissioners. The statute requires the Board follow precinct lines and the petition follow precinct lines. The proposed Hospital District No. 2 would include voting precincts Belfair 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 also precincts Tahuya and Dewatto. The Board is to determine if any of the precincts are unjustly or illegally included. He did not see any illegal action. The Board would determine if it would be unjust or improper to include any of those. The Board would also need to resolve for election of commissioners of that district if there would be three, five or seven commissioners. This board would also determine whether or not those positions are a mix of at-large or district positions, all district positions, or all at-large positions. Once that decision is made, the Board would forward the petition on to the voters for their determination.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson questioned what would constitute illegal, unjust or improper.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 4**

Mr. Cobb responded the illegal aspect generally would be if the boundaries crossed county lines. It would therefore involve a different process. Whether it split a precinct, which none of these do; or if it would overlap another hospital district. None of those exist as best as he could tell.

The statute allows for the selection of the number of district commissioners to be decided by the Board and also to determine if it would be at-large, district, or a combination of the two.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated it is the Board's ability to place that on the ballot for the voters to decide.

Mr. Cobb noted it is the Board's decision, as to the number of commissioners. The terms of office are staggered and that is set out by statute, by number of votes received. The term is six years.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson interjected, that at some point in the future, if the Board would consider and want more commissioners that is a decision the Board would make and resubmit to the voters.

Mr. Cobb added there is another provision in the statute, RCW 70.44 which allows for change in the number of commissioners.

Herb Gearhart, Chair of the Citizens Committee for the Establishment of Public Hospital District #2, stated they discussed at length as to the number of commissioners, three or five. Their feeling was three commissioners would serve them best and they should be at-large positions. The reasoning is if they look at the fire district, non-paid positions are hard to fill. People are constantly resigning.

He urged the Board to ratify the resolution to allow them to form Public Hospital District #2 to allow them to bring in an urgent care center in the area to serve the people in the area.

Bev Wendell urged the Board to go ahead with the approval of this.

Kaye Massie voiced support of the urgent care center.

Brooke Quigley noted she participated in the campaign gathering signatures for the hospital district and asked the Board to give the voters the opportunity to have this item on the ballot.

Ray Stutz stated he agrees with the three commissioners as it would be less cumbersome. He believed they would be better served with three person commission rather than five..

Frank Kenney, North Mason Chamber of Commerce Executive Director, expressed support of the Public Hospital District #2.

Randy Neatherlin urged the Board to bring this forward on the ballot. He would like five members rather than three members.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he is in favor of a five commissioner district. He believed it would give better representation across the district. In the beginning there will be a lot of work and with the open meeting laws it is necessary that commissioners keep thinking about how their discussions are going. This might facilitate things in the beginning.

Cmmr. Gallagher stated this process started before he came into office. It is wonderful to have representation for the North Mason area. He concurs with Commissioner Sheldon's remarks about the five commissioners. There was some recent history about two people being together. Since this is all new it would be better to have five commissioners present.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 5**

Cmmr. Ring Erickson commented this has been a thoughtful and positive conversation and process. This is something the community can rally around. She personally favored the five commissioner configuration. They cannot talk to each other about public policy issue. If they can get together and brainstorm it allows a more thoughtful and in depth process. With the start up there will be a lot of work to do. One of the things she has heard from the Belfair area is they don't get enough representation. It invites more people to participate.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Gallagher moved and seconded that they find the inclusion of voting precincts Belfair 1 – 6; Tahuya and Dewatto into Public Hospital District # 2 are not illegally or unjustly included. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye

Cmmr. Sheldon/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve the resolution to submit the question of whether or not to form the Mason County Public Hospital District No. 2 to the voters within the territory of the proposed District. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye. Resolution No. 89-07 (Exhibit F)

Cmmr. Sheldon/Gallagher moved and seconded to provide for an election for five at-large Public Hospital District #2 commissioners at the next general election. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

- 9.2 Public hearing to consider revisions to Sections 17.03.030 & 17.03.031 of the Mason County Code (and Sections 1.03.030 & 1.03.031 of the Mason County Development Regulations) controlling On-Site Disposal Requirements for the Belfair and Allyn Urban Growth Areas (UGA).

Emmett Dobe, Utilities & Waste Management Director, stated in the fall of 2006 the Western Washington Hearings Board made a finding that the County's approach to managing onsite systems in the Belfair and Allyn Urban Growth Area (UGA) was not adequate to control growth in that area. Especially the use of septic tanks and drainfields make it difficult to meet urban densities within that area. He suggested that there are real reasons why this issue needs to be addressed. Next week they will be interviewing consultants for the design of the Belfair sewer system and they hope to have that system completed and working some time in 2010. They are certain that growth will occur and likely could occur at the fringes of the growth boundary outside the area where the proposed sewers will be located. They are discussing a way to control and manage growth within Belfair and Allyn as they move forward with the development of sewers.

In Belfair, the main trunk line, in the first phase of the development is a line that runs along SR3 and out the old Belfair Highway. The construction of a water reclamation facility which will create Class A reclaimed water and a disposal field that is outside the growth area. Future expansions occur to the north, east, and south. Those future expansions are proposed in the plan to occur either through developer financing or a combination of developer and county contributions to the development of those lines. The question is how do they control growth as it occurs within the areas which are outside those areas. He believed the County has four approaches to take: 1) Stop growth until the sewers do become available; 2) Any new extensions beyond the core area that occurs between now and when all the lines are installed is at the cost of the developer; 3) Continue the use of on-site septic systems and runs the risk of not meeting compliance with Growth Management. More importantly, it eliminates customers from the customer base. In Belfair and Allyn they have a very small customer base they have to spread sewer costs over. As they eliminate people and take them off sewer and put them on a septic system that could cause the rate to be much higher for those people that stay on the system. 4) Middle road approach that allows development to occur but it requires the development to occur at urban densities and allows community drainfields or other alternative systems to be used so

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 6**

development is allowed to be continued. Is it at a density that can support future sewers. When sewers do become available those systems have to connect to that regional municipal sewer.

The proposal is divided into three parts: 1) Regulate new development; 2) Regulate existing lots of record; 3) Control the consolidation of lots. There is a small limited provision proposed in the ordinance that does have a variance procedure which can be followed. Specifically, in new developments there is an allowance that no new lots with on-site systems would be allowed. New subdivisions can be created but they must use some type of alternative system. That alternative system has to have some type of ownership or control by some government entity. They must pay a monthly utility rate. There has to be at least an urban density of 40 units per acre in those new subdivisions.

The existing lots of record. An existing lot with a septic tank on it can come within 500 feet of a new line then they have to connect. If you have an application that is in and has been approved, then you have until January 2009 to use the permit to install the system. It sunsets at that point and you have to start the process all over. However, if you install a system between now and 2009 you are required to connect to the system, unless it comes within 500 feet. After 2009, no new permits will be issued with the exception of special circumstances which include site constraints, poor drainage, steep slopes, but the cost of the development must exceed 200% of the cost of extending the line to the area. A variance can be granted.

No lot can be consolidated to create new lots that you can put a septic tank and drainfield on. In summary, they think it is important because it allows them to meet the GMA requirements. It assures that they have a large enough customer base to support a future sewer system. It allows development in the community continue to develop while developing the sewers. It provides some fairness. It doesn't allow a developer on the edge of the community to put in a less expensive on-site system when one inside the area will have to develop a sewer system. The City of Shelton has a similar program that does not allow any new development. They allow a variance type procedure. Thurston County has a requirement very similar to this that does allow the development to occur within the cities. The cities have to manage those on-site community systems.

He asked the Board to review this proposal, continue the hearing for a week and then take action at that time.

Ken VanBuskirk questioned if an existing lot is outside the urban growth boundary but is within 500 feet of the line if they are required to connect.

Barbara Robinson noted that originally they had a smaller version of this document which basically stated that all properties shall connect within 500'. That was given to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board. They remanded it back saying the regulations are not specific enough. The proposal today includes the revisions to the original regulations that were taken to the Planning Advisory Commission this year.

It was noted the proposal is much more stringent than the original discussion that went to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board.

There was discussion that Olympia and Lacey requires 250 feet and Tumwater is less than that. It varies between 1 – 500 feet.

Cmmr. Gallagher asked if an individual can have sewer service if they are located outside of the UGA on the southern end.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 7**

Mr. Dobe responded, no. Part of the discussion they had earlier about establishing growth boundaries and where sewers went was that they need to be within the urban growth areas. They proposed a much larger system that has served the North Shore. They have proposed to do that through a mechanism called a local area more intense rural development (LAMIRD).

Mr. Dobe stated the Board is allowed each year to look at the issue of growth boundaries to enlarge or make smaller. That is based on population allocations that come from the state. As development occurs on sewers or otherwise, the county has an opportunity to look at the size of the growth boundary to see if it is large enough.

The deadline for adoption of this document by the Growth Management Hearings Board is August 6, 2007. The County is taking forward a package of changes which includes the facility plan and stormwater plan.

Citizens can provide written testimony up to the next meeting.

The average cost of what a person in Mason County should be paying for sewers is \$70 per month. This proposed sewer rate is \$86 per month which is above the average cost. As they allow septic tanks to occur on larger lots which diminish the ability to meet growth management requirements on density, they diminish the customer base.

One of the findings that they made early on is that septic tanks and drainfields are one of the major contributors to nitrogen and fecal contamination to Hood Canal. One of the reasons they were able to demonstrate the need for the sewer is showing the data that indicated they were a problem and this is going to eliminate a large number of septic tanks and drainfields that contribute to pollution in Hood Canal.

The County cannot access portions of the money that has been allocated to Mason County unless the County is in compliance with Growth Management.

The whole idea of the urban growth area is to have a sewer. They were not aware of any urban growth areas in the State of Washington that does not have a sewer.

Jack Johnson stated he has some comments on the proposed revisions to the Mason County Codes and development regulations in particular Section 17.03.030 where it brings up four units per acre. That conflicts with the three zoning in the Belfair UGA. He believed there should be a range of urban densities and essentially this is a defacto moratorium on R3 Zoning. There is a possibility that it would affect the R5 zoning because there is no flexibility for site constraints. These revisions do not allow for critical areas, steep slopes, stormwater, minimum road standards. It is possible that the property is not suited for four units per acre by the time they include all of that. If it is a five acre parcel and two three-acres are subtracted by critical areas for steep slopes. In this decision it needs to either change the R3 zoning or it needs to allow for zoning of three units per acre. He recommended a range of densities. Not everyone wants to live on a 7500 sq. ft. lot. They are in the business of developing property and the market is not going to be for 7500 sq. ft. lot and smaller. People will want to see different lot configurations and this needs to be addressed.

He voiced concern about sewers. He questioned why individual septic systems need to be eliminated if the property is contracted to connect to the sewer when the sewer comes within a certain distance. There is a lot of properties that are a long ways from the infrastructure that is going to occur. There are a lot of existing lots in the Riverhill area. People that live out the area may not even know they have to get a permit and septic system installed in the next two years or they cannot build on their property. He supported that septic systems have to connect when they get within a certain distance. He did not

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 8**

believe 500 feet is reasonable. There should be some allowances for people that do own property and pay taxes and live in areas that are a long ways from where the sewer is located. He supports the sewer in Belfair, but felt there is very little investment in the collection when they look at the Urban Growth Area as a whole. He felt this would put a building moratorium on everything outside of the UGA because no one would be able to build. They would not be able to connect to the sewer. It would put all of the finance of extending the sewer on the backs of the property owners. It is important to work out some sort of compromise on individual septic systems for existing lots.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson suggested he talk with Mrs. Robinson as she did not read the moratorium part into it. She felt there is some flexibility there for people that are not on the original sewer.

Mr. Johnson also stated he felt the R3 Zoning is important.

Jeff Carey noted he spoke with Mr. Dobey regarding this proposal. He felt that the County needs better planning. If there is a critical path with a drop dead point it should be the priority. Belfair and Allyn community should have more than a couple of weeks. When a sewer system is built, there are portions of Allyn that have no sewer. A system is put in and grants and loans pay for portions of it. It seems like it is not balanced out. Everyone should pay a fair portion of the expense. The current plan is to install grinder pumps.

He requested that the County date the forms that are placed on the website.

He did not think that 7500 sq. ft is a magic number for someone in the Plat of Allyn, that wants to consolidate their lot. He felt there should be another mechanism.

Ken Van Buskirk commented that when the urban growth boundaries were originally established in Belfair a number of the critical areas were not identified correctly up the Union River Valley. In looking at the map, they still are not shown. He asked that they keep the option open of adjusting the urban growth boundary.

The Board noted they will continue to accept written testimony until July 31 2007; 9:30 a.m. It was suggested that comments be submitted earlier rather than later so the Board has a chance to read the information.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Gallagher moved and seconded to continue this public hearing until July 31, 2007; 9:30 a.m. and additional written public comments be accepted. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

- 9.3 Public hearing to consider the adoption of the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plans for the Allyn and Belfair Urban Growth Areas and the amended Capital Facilities Element Mason County Comprehensive Plan.

Barbara Adkins, Planner, gave a summary of the process. She noted that the Growth Management Hearings Board stated the Comprehensive Plan is in non-compliance because the Capital Facilities Element did not show a financing plan for the Belfair sewer. It did not address stormwater management needs for Allyn and Belfair.

The Capital Facilities Plan has been amended to incorporate by reference all three of the plans. The edits appear on pages 3, 13, 58 and 67. The Capital Facilities Element has been available for public review since June 29, 2007 and the Stormwater Plans have been available for review since June 12, 2007.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 9**

They had a public meeting in Allyn at the Port of Allyn to invite the public to go over the plans. The consultant discussed with the public and took public comment. There was a public hearing held on July 9, 2007 before the Planning Advisory Commission. The recommendation was no recommendation as they did not feel they had the time to review it properly or the technical skills to properly review.

It was recommended the Board hear public comment and then hold over until July 31, 2007 for the final decision. The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board deadline is August 6, 2007.

Charlie Butros, Public Works Director, started with a brief background statement regarding the stormwater plans. He noted that efforts are needed to protect the water bodies in Mason County such as Hood Canal, Puget Sound and several freshwater bodies. Stormwater has contributed to the county's water quality problems and sensitive water bodies adjacent to areas of growth. Mason County growth regulations promote development in urban areas and rural activity centers. The county's current stormwater requirements need to be updated. Currently, they have adopted Department of Ecology 1992 stormwater manual and they are looking to update that to the current manual which is the 2005 manual. Funding was provided from various sources to assist the county in developing the review and developing the plans and programs needed to improve the stormwater programs. The majority of that funding came from the Department of Ecology, a portion of the funding came from Community Trade and Economic Development, and a portion was provided by the county. The Allyn and Belfair plans were developed and issued for review. They held an initial workshop on June 20 in Allyn. Substantial comments were received and revised and reissued the plans in July. They received comments from the Puget Sound Partnership and they were supportive.

Joe Simmler, Otak, Inc. stated he has worked with the county for the past year in developing a county-wide stormwater management program. The emphasis is on water quality enhancement but also to guide development and make sure the development is occurring properly. The focus is on urban and urbanizing areas. Also, they worked on individual plans for Allyn and Belfair. They identified things like maintenance, public education, development review, water quality monitoring and coupling these with the capital projects. Future capacity and drainage issues were also addressed in the plans. One of the major objectives was to look at existing and future regulatory requirements. These activities both programmatic and capital were prioritized and integrated so the compliance opportunities were optimized at the same time. The resulting plans for Belfair and stormwater were similar in content, scope, and formatting recommendations. In general, drainage areas were mapped and basins were characterized. Problems were identified and capital projects proposed. The programmatic elements were identified and integrated. Both of them constituted the development of the comprehensive stormwater plans for each of the urban areas. Costs were identified and generally with the capital element of approximately \$100,000 per year and the programmatic elements at \$300,000 per year. Annual costs were roughly \$400,000 per year for both stormwater planning activities. A financial plan was proposed and different funding mechanisms were discussed and presented. The amounts of annual revenue which could be anticipated from some of these was taken into account and used to support the development and implementation of these plans. There was a substantial amount of review and comment. They made some good improvements and additions to the first draft. The first draft emphasized the capital improvements projects. The second draft emphasized the programmatic and funding to a much greater degree. That became a much more comprehensive plan. They received letters from the community and stakeholders at the same time. In Section 10, all the 48 comments came in at the June 20 meeting were responded to. They wanted to stress is this is just the beginning of the planning process for the stormwater management. There is a lot of water quality concerns and habitat issues in Hood Canal and Puget Sound. These plans are intended to begin to address those concerns. The idea was to develop an annual implementation plan to further interpret and refine these and then incorporate these into annual budget initiatives.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 10**

Cmmr. Ross Gallagher asked if there is a fish bearing creek in Allyn.

There was discussion that Sherwood Creek is in Allyn and is a fish bearing creek. Also, it was discussed there is a small unnamed tributary on the north side, much smaller than Sherwood Creek.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked Mr. Simmler's his educational background and skills.

Mr. Simmler responded his academic training is as a chemist. He has a masters degree in Engineering and a doctorate in water resources from the University of Washington. He has been doing stormwater plans for almost 30 years.

John Konovsky, Squaxin Island Tribe, commented on the Allyn Stormwater Plan. He summarized that the Squaxin Island Tribe has a treaty interest in Case Inlet. They regularly harvest shellfish off the beaches in North Bay adjacent to the Allyn UGA. They also have fish going up Sherwood Creek, Coulter Creek. They also direct a lot of tribal resources to protecting those resources of the creeks ad marine water around North Bay. The area is very unique. Mason County has a lot of natural resources left. When there is too much impervious surface habitat suffers. What they have are some very low levels of development. The impervious surface in the Sherwood Creek watershed is only 7%. The impervious surface in the Coulter Creek watershed is 4%. The County has a resource base that is not hacked to death already.

There is no provision for pre-treatment of stormwater to make sure when it gets down to the bay it is clean. Most of the focus seems to be how to get water from point A to point B and into the salt water without enough concern about improving its quality along the way. It relies on centralized systems. It does not rely on the emerging science says about dispersion and infiltration of stormwater close to its sources through multiple controls. That is the state of the art now to try to spread it out and infiltrate it on site as much as possible and not to build large detention ponds that take the entire stormwater supply from an area and process it.

If you look at the stormwater science coming out of the University of Washington suggests that structural fixes for stormwater runoff only really mitigate the most egregious consequences of the stormwater runoff. They don't really address the serious, but less visible impacts. The only way to do that is to limit impervious surface and maximize native vegetation. They hope that those two provisions get worked into the plan.

He asked that the Board take more time to review the stormwater plan.

Rick Anderson, President of Anderson & Sons, Inc. developers of Lakeland Village. When people think about the Allyn UGA sometimes only the downtown core is considered. It also is the platted and unplatted portions of Lakeland Village. He estimated that over 2/3 of the UGA is Lakeland Village. When Otak started addressing the stormwater plan for Lakeland Village they met with the Otak engineers and Steve Goins, Mason County Planner. They decided they would provide the stormwater planning for Lakeland Village. They did all of the stormwater planning of the existing Lakeland Village. They also went farther and developed a stormwater plan for the future undeveloped areas of Lakeland Village. He stated that probably the Allyn UGA has one of the best stormwater plans existing in Mason County because of the existing stormwater facilities of Lakeland Village. He asked that the Board review and adopt the plan.

The Board discussed that they have been briefed there is an existing stormwater plan for the Lakeland Village part of Allyn.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 11**

Jack Johnson commented he felt there was insufficient time for public participation and comment on the stormwater management plan.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson interjected the Board can adopt a plan and continue to revise it over time.

Pat McCullough stated that he is a consultant representing Lakeland Village. In the planning effort he has done for the last nine months he advised that stormwater utility will be the most expensive utility in the county. They need to do as much planning as they can and as much detail as they can to get this included in the Comprehensive Plan. They just submitted the preliminary plat of Lakeland Village Division 14 and will be submitting Division 15.

Years ago, when he first started working with Lakeland Village and Anderson & Sons in 1991 they set out to preserve the water quality in Anderson Lake. This is a manmade lake and a part of the storm drainage system. They have been sampling and monitoring the lake for the last 15 years, approximately. The results have exceeded their expectations in terms of preserving water quality. Lakeland Village has one of the finest stormwater treatment and control systems in the state of Washington. What the Board has in front of them for consideration is the existing and proposed future stormwater system for Lakeland Village. He stated it is important for them to adopt it because the upcoming platting processes they will be going through will be referencing this document as part of the environmental impact statement and planning and approval process. A lot of money and a lot of time spent in preparation of this documentation. They believe they exceed any existing and future standards that the 2005 manual may present.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked what is their recommendation.

Mr. McCullough replied that they are recommending the Board adopt this as part of the Allyn plan as a chapter.

Jeff Carey, Allyn Community Association, stated their committee commented on the June 20 and July 9 meetings, and that significant improvements have been made to the plan. They are supportive of a stormwater plan and understand that Lakeland Village has two-thirds figured out and the part they are trying to resolve is the eastern third from the ridge line to the waterfront. He stated the critical path is important. There are still some cost issues and concerns about drainage basin identification and its boundaries what they see vs. what has been proposed. The cost of \$630 per foot on Main Street is something they need to address. The method of financing is there. He felt this is one of the more comprehensive documents and is appreciative of the County getting to this point. He understood this is a living document and changes can be made. There are a lot of engineers and brain power put to this which he appreciates. The east side of the hill to the water has an interesting characteristic. It will absorb rain for a while and then it will get saturated. Once it is saturated it runs and there is an impervious surface for some time. He felt they need to look at a bigger picture. As development happens there will be a lot of roof water and he understood this water does not have to be treated. This would be cheaper in the long run and reduces the amount of water that would need to be treated.

Ken VanBuskirk read a one-page letter addressed to the Commissioners dated July 24, 2007 asking for considerations by the Board before approval.

Bill Dewey, Taylor Shellfish Co., noted that one of the reasons he volunteered to serve on the Planning Advisory Commission, was in hopes of participating in policy development in the County that would protect water quality and longevity of the shellfish industry in Mason County. Stormwater has been one of his pet issues. He submitted four-pages of written comments addressed to the Board offering points for consideration before adoption of the Belfair/Allyn stormwater plan.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
JULY 24, 2007 - PAGE 12**

Cmmr. Sheldon commented this is a tough subject. The influence of stormwater to the salt water and fresh water water quality is an impact which is very difficult for a small county to deal with. The county is off to a start and he sees a policy document rather than a technical document. He encouraged the Board to continue this for another week and work even harder to deal with the issue.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson added this Board is concerned about getting as much public comment as possible. This is a living document and there will be opportunities to change it as it goes forward. She voiced concern there is a basic plan that is valid which meets the threshold to keep the County in compliance to get the sewer money. At the same time recognize many people in the community have thoughtful comments which will contribute to ultimately a plan that works better and takes into account the work which may have been done in certain areas.

She is committed to continuing the process that gets to the cutting edge in terms of how a community can develop and be prosperous and at the same time take into account not just water quantity, but water quality.

Cmmr. Sheldon/Gallagher moved and seconded to continue the hearing to July 31, 2007 to consider the adoption of the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plans for Allyn and Belfair UGA and the amended Capital Facilities element of the Mason County Comp Plan. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

10. Other Business (Department Heads and Elected Officials) - None
11. Board's Reports & Calendar – The Board reported on their calendar items for the past week and announced their schedules for the upcoming week.
12. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MASON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Lynda Ring Erickson, Chair

Tim Sheldon, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Rebecca S. Rogers, Clerk of the Board

Ross Gallagher, Commissioner