

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

NOVEMBER 18, 2008

1. Call to Order – The Chairperson called the regular meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance – The flag salute was led by Officer Cindy Brewer.
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 Auditor's office sent the results of their investigation into a citizen's complaint.
 - 4.1.2 The Washington State Department of Health has reclassified a portion of the Oakland Bay commercial shellfish growing area from Restricted to Conditionally Approved.
 - 4.1.3 The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife made an Imminent Danger Declaration at NE 1/4 of Section 06, Township 21 North, Range 03 West in Mason County.
 - 4.1.4 The Washington State Liquor Control Board sent notice of establishments in Mason County with liquor licenses due to expire on February 28, 2009.
 - 4.1.5 The Washington State Department of Natural Resources sent projections of income from state forest lands.
 - 4.1.6 The Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction sent a listing of the 2009 calendar year excess general fund maintenance and operation levy authority for school districts in Mason County.
 - 4.1.7 The United States Federal Energy Regulatory Commission granted an extension of time to the City of Tacoma for the Cushman Hydroelectric Project.
 - 4.1.8 Carolyn Malanowski is seeking appointment to the Mason County Housing Authority Board.
 - 4.1.9 Comcast will introduce Additional Outlet Service pricing beginning December 3, 2008.
 - 4.2 Staff Recognition – Sheriff's Office. Presenter: Dean Byrd – The following employees within the Sheriff's Department received unsolicited compliments from the public for services provided and Green Stars were presented to them: Deputy TR Rankin; Deputy Duain Dugan; and Mary Jean Hrbacek, Chief Financial Officer.
 - 4.3 News Release - Lewis-Mason-Thurston Area Agency on Aging Advisory Council -- Betty Wing, Central Operations Director, announced the Board is accepting applications until December 19, 2009 for the position that is open representing Mason County.
5. Open Forum for Citizen Input - None
6. Adoption of Agenda – **Cmmr. Gallagher/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to adopt the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
7. Approval of Minutes – **Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve the briefing minutes for the week of October 20, 2008 with a correction on the 9:45 a.m. item to establish “no shooting zones with the UGA.” rather than “not shooting zones within the UGA.”; special briefing minutes for October 31, 2008; regular meeting minutes for October 28 and November 4, 2008. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.**
8. Approval of Consent Agenda:
 - 8.1 Approval to appoint Carolyn Malanowski to the Mason County Housing Authority Board of Commissioners for a five-year term ending November 2013.
 - 8.2 Approval to appoint Ida Sevier to the Lewis-Mason-Thurston Area Agency on Aging Advisory Council for a two-year term, January 2009 to January 2011.
 - 8.3 Approval of the agreement between Mason County Parks and the Mason Conservation District for Mason County to accept an Oakland Bay Riparian Assessment Grant in the amount of \$2,000.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 2**

- 8.4 Approval to schedule a public hearing on Tuesday, December 9, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. to consider adoption of revised Mason County Comprehensive Plan Chapter VI (Capital Facilities) and Chapter VIII (Transportation) in accordance with RCW 36.70A.70(3).
- 8.5 Approval for the Interim Director of the Department of Community Development to enter into a consultant agreement with Shea, Carr & Jewell of Olympia, Washington to prepare a future roads map for the Belfair Urban Growth Area (UGA).
- 8.6 Approval of an agreement between Mason County and the Mason County Shelter to provide \$20,000 advance funds to the Shelter for their rental assistance program under the Homeless Grant Assistance Program (HGAP).
- 8.7 Approval of an agreement between Mason County and St. David's Episcopal Church in the amount of \$2,600 for operating expenses of the Emergency Cold Weather Shelter.
- 8.8 Approval of the Veterans Assistance Fund applications for: Sherman Barker - housing \$525.61; John Makoviney - housing \$600.00; Clayton Bennett - housing \$209.00 and food \$391.00; Curtis Holmes - utilities \$546.10; Leonard Wilford - food \$350.00; Wayne Kallio Jr. - utilities \$500.00 and food \$100.00; Raymond Berry housing \$600.00; Shawn Deegan housing \$430.00, utilities \$23.00 and food \$147.00; Arthur Smith - food \$152.57; and William McCarty (Shirley) burial \$600.00 for a total of \$5,174.28 as recommended by the Veterans Assistance Fund Screening Committee.
- 8.9 Approval of Warrants
- | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Claims Clearing Fund | Warrant #s 149605-150383 | \$1,275,365.06 |
| Salary Clearing Fund | Warrant #s 1959-2024 | \$ 314,513.28 |
| Direct Deposit Fund | Deposit #s 7857-8286 | \$ 600,705.25 |

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve Items 8.1 through 8.9 as read. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

9. 9:30 a.m. Public Hearings and Items Set for a Certain Time
- 9.1 Public hearing to review written objections to the proposed roll of rates and charges for Mason County Lake Management District No. 2 for Mason Lake (LMD #2).

Emmett Dobey, Utilities & Waste Management Director, presented the staff report. He explained a vote overwhelmingly approved the formation of the district by 357 in favor and 57 not in favor. An opportunity was given for people to object to the rates and charges that they would be charged for the clean up operations within the lake. He noted the Commissioners have two actions for consideration: 1) approve the roll of rates and charges and 2) adopt a resolution prescribing what would happen if people do not pay their assessment. It was noted the staff did remove four parcels from the lake management district, as they did not have access to Mason Lake. The Board acts somewhat like a Board of Equalization. If for some reason the Board modifies or wants to modify the role of rates and charges today, remove parcels or add parcels, they would need to start the process over again notifying people of the new assessment. If the Board chooses to remove other parcels than the four that did not have access to the lake the process would need to start again. He reminded the Board the lake management district was formed in 2002 and operated until 2007. The property owners at Mason Lake restarted the process to reform the LMD in September 2008. There are two resolutions recommended for approval with a list of objections and the financial impacts associated with each objection.

Ron Moon, property owner on Mason Lake, stated they have been having problems with non-residents launching their boats off of the public boat launch. They park their vehicles and move boats out and have parties till early in the morning.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted the hearing is about the assessment and the roles for Lake Management District #2.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 3**

A question was raised if the Board would be going through the objections in this portion of the meeting.

Mr. Dobey responded, the objections would be summarized and the board has a copy of the objections.

Mr. Dobey read the following objections into the record:

Mr. Komen had a lengthy objection based on a number of items; one being there was already an assessment placed on the aquatic fee for the boat license. He felt this is double taxation because of that. The assessed valuation had gone up and this added more taxes. They suggested a couple alternatives to the board. Hold a moratorium on the imposition of the regulations for ten years. Another suggestion was to give a discount to retirement people of age greater than 65.

Jim & Luella Lindley questioned why the assessment was being charged and wondered why better kept homes were paying the fee.

Another person questioned if the assessment was based on linear footage or frontage or assessment value of the property then they would have no objection.

Mr. Dobey stated it is based on property value and not on linear footage.

Entus suggested that Mason Lake is a public lake and wondered why the people on the lake should have to pay.

Larry Evans stated they do not add to the weed problem and they should not be assessed.

Richard Flaherty had a long letter suggesting it is an increased burden on the homeowners.

Kathy Murray suggested it was too high an assessment.

Laurence W. Fowler felt the state should be paying for this instead of the homeowners.

Robert Hay concurred that the state should be taking care of this matter.

Tony & Michelle Jennings noted the property taxes continue to go up and they are unable to afford this.

Lola Johnson listed the state belongs to the state and they should be paying this fee.

Jim Madden objected and proposed a different type of formula to be used with 25% to be paid by the homeowners, 25% paid by Simpson and the balance paid by the Sunnyslope homeowners.

Gregory E. Smith felt the assessment was too high.

Anne Wooten stated they are not objecting but the bill is too high.

There were four parcels removed from the Lake Management District. There were 24 parcel owners objecting.

There were 414 votes cast with a vote of 357 votes in favor of the LMD #2 roll of rates and charges and 57 votes not in favor of the LMD #2 roll of rates and charges. The objections totaled \$926.42 during the first assessment period in 2009. The four parcels that were removed totaled \$55.46 during

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 4**

the first year. The assessment goes up 5% each year. The initial district was for a five-year period and this LMD is for a ten-year period. The assessments are based on property value. It was noted the operating expense of the district can go up 5% each year and the assessment could change as the operating expenses go up.

John Komen submitted a one-page memo addressed to the Commissioners dated November 18, 2008 outlining fees paid to the State of Washington in fiscal year July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 in the amount of \$1,529,000.

He noted there is a \$3 aquatic weed fee with the yearly boat trailer license fees. On the boat (vessel license) there are three fees paid \$1.50 for freshwater aquatic weed account; \$1 aquatic algae fee which funds the Freshwater Algae control account; and \$0.50 aquatic invasive species enforcement fee which is paid into the aquatic invasive species enforcement account for a total of all these fees paid to the state \$1,529,000.

He stated the control of aquatic weeds has fallen on the owners of Mason County properties on Mason Lake. The property owners agreed to this and voted on a 10-year plan. The vote passed overwhelmingly in favor, the property owners on Mason Lake are responsible people. They wanted to control milfoil. He felt the vote was taken without full knowledge about what the state already assesses. He commented that if the state is collecting already from the boat owners and the trailer owners it seems the amount the state raises should be tapped by this county. He recommended that an effort be made by the commissioners to the executive and legislative branches of the state government to tap into those fees.

Cmmr. Sheldon responded the County has done that and distributed fees in Mason County.

Mr. Dobe responded the LMD #2 budget proposes a \$55,700 grant from the state to supplement the assessment to do work in 2009.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson also added the sheriff's department gets a fair amount of the boat registration fee and has a separate fund for boat enforcement.

Mr. Komen stated the amount they are liable for over the next ten years is \$440,226. He suggested a more vigorous effort be made by the County to get from the state to fight the aquatic invasion problem in Mason Lake. The County has plans to improve Mason Lake Park, which will bring in more boats throughout the state. It will bring in more boats and they contribute to the problem of evasive aquatic weeds. The property owners are subsidizing the others who are coming in to spread the milfoil or other aquatic weed problem. He recommended stopping improvements of the Mason Lake Park. He suggested the Commissioners void the resolution and start over. Also, he suggested the Board exempt those who are over 65 years of age from this tax. They are now in a global financial collapse. Property values have plummeted, sales of homes have gone down and foreclosures have gone up. They are now paying almost double the taxes while the property values are going down. He agreed to battle the weeds, but he felt there is a better way.

If they don't speak up now he felt elected officials will think there is not a public acknowledgement of what is happening in the economy. He felt this is the beginning of a public outcry, which could go to the legislature to address the problem in a political sense. The end result would be to come up with some sort of solution.

Ronald Moon stated he is aware of the advantages of working with the state. He has been at the lake since 1964. He has been working with the milfoil committee for Mason Lake. He is aware of the advantages of working with the state and others for the milfoil problem. They voted to go ahead, and

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 5**

know it will cost money. They are aware there are different ways to control the weeds. The biggest problem they see is the fact the county has put in a public boat launch. He did not believe there is enough room. People park all day and leave vehicles parked at the boat ramp. People are out until early in the morning having a party on the lake. In the winter it is not so bad. The summer is a problem as there is no place to rinse off the boats. The property owners around the lake are not against paying assessment to control this, but a good majority of the people working on the milfoil are permanent residents. They are happy to have a sheriff patrol the water.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated she understood this is hard. She has heard the public that does not live on the lake should pay more and also non-residents should have their access restricted at the same time. She guessed that the average boat owner that does not live on the lake and pays a fee feels they are making a contribution. The other thing is the Sheriff has adequate staff according to national standards. If the sheriff chooses to assign staff at the lake that is a conversation with that elected official. The rule of thumb is one officer per 1,000 people. Mason County polices about 48,000 people and there are 55 officers. She urged the community to continue the conversation with the sheriff about this issue.

Cmmr. Gallagher commended Mr. Komen on his investigation. To divide the number of lakes in Washington State into the \$1.5 million could result in a low dollar amount for a contribution from the state. The residents of the area passed this. People spend money at Mason Lake. It is additional sales tax revenue. People come to visit the recreational areas.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted they had a public meeting at Mason Lake and had a good attendance. They heard from a lot of people about the issue of the boat ramp. The Director of Parks and Trails is working with a group on how to change the proposal to provide a caretaker at Mason Lake park. There is a real tax revolt going on in Washington State, which will continue. The citizens have voted overwhelmingly to tax themselves. They know it is going for a specific purpose. There is an active and localized group that has been working on this for a number of years. There is a lot of volunteerism by the group. The effort and networking with the state has been good. Things are better with this particular fee in place. He would agree with the citizens that voted for it that it does make great improvements to the water quality and tourism and the quality of life and home values at Mason Lake.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to adopt the resolution confirming and approving the roll of rates and charges for Mason County Lake Management District No. 2 for Mason Lake (LMD #2), removing parcel #22108 43 90040 (Records); 22108 43 00050 (Wide); 22108 43 00060 (Baltzley), and 22233 32 90013 (Hogle) as presented by staff. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye. Resolution No. 120-08 (Exhibit A)

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to adopt the resolution prescribing interest and penalties for late payments of rates and charges set under RCW 36.61.270 for Lake Management Districts. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye. Resolution No. 121-08 (Exhibit B)

The 35th legislative district got more money back per capita than any other district in the state two years ago and was the second highest per capita in return of state dollars this last session. Mason County is fairly aggressive about getting state dollars back into the county.

- 9.2 Public hearing to consider supplemental budget appropriations and budget transfers to the 2008 Public Health Fund Budget, the Current Expense Fund Budget and the Trial Court Improvement Fund Budget.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 6**

Ione Siegler, Budget Director, presented the staff report for the budget appropriations to the Public Health Fund \$48,618 for 2008 wage and benefit increases; Current Expense Fund: \$23,000 grant from Dept. of Ecology for a new van for litter cleanup and \$11,500 which is reimbursement from Dept. of Social Health Services for attorney fees for sexually violent predator cases; Trial Court Improvement Fund \$29,346 for an operating transfer from Current Expense Fund to match District Court Judicial salary contribution. These are supplemental and would partly be financed by transfers from the ending fund balance in the Current Expense Fund. The operating transfers out of Current Expense total \$91,964 to Public Health \$48,618 and Nondepartmental/Risk Management \$14,000 for insurance premiums; and \$29,346 to operating transfer out to Trial Court Improvement Fund.

Ms. Siegler stated they estimate what they expect to receive from the state for the District Court judicial salary contribution. They actually received more money and the county is required to match that amount.

No public comments were submitted.

Cmmr. Gallagher/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to approve supplemental appropriations to the 2008 Budget for the Current Expense Fund in the amount of \$34,500, a supplemental appropriation to the Public Health Fund Budget in the amount of \$48,618, a supplemental appropriation to the Trial Court Improvement Fund in the amount of \$29,346; and approve 2008 Budget Transfers from the Ending Fund Balance in the Current Expense Fund in the total amount of \$91,964. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

- 9.3 Public hearing to consider amending the speed limit on Public Works Drive from 25 mph to 35 mph.

Public Works Director Charlie Butros stated when the Commissioners authorized to proceed with the construction of Public Works Drive; the initial anticipated traffic and condition of the road was construction traffic on a gravel road. At that time, the speed limit was set at 25 mph for those reasons. At this point, the road has been constructed and paved. The construction is mostly complete. The recommended action is to modify the speed limit to 35 mph based on its current condition and use.

Cmmr. Gallagher/Ring Erickson moved and seconded the Board execute the Resolution establishing a speed limit change from 25mph to 35mph on all of Public Works Drive (County Road No. 40100). Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye. Resolution No. 122-08 (Exhibit C)

- 9.4 Public hearing to consider the designation of 15 historic places in Mason County as historic landmarks on the Mason County Historic Register.

Kell McAboy, Planner, gave some background. She noted that the Mason County Historic Preservation Commission recommended that all of the listed sites and properties on the Washington Heritage Register and/or National Register within Mason County be adopted to the Mason County Historic Register.

She also noted that the county became a certified local government under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act in June 2007. The county appointed an active commission and nominated its first site as well as launching a new website.

The list of 15 sites were read: Allyn Church; North Hamma Hamma River Bridge; South Hamma Hamma River Bridge; Harstine Island Community Hall; Hamma Hamma Guard Station; Big Creek Archeological Site; Cushman No. 1 Hydroelectric Power Plan; Cushman No. 2 Hydroelectric Power

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 7**

Plan; taba das; High Steel Bridge; Adams, Almerion, Barn; Libby, Willard Barn; Oakland Site; Vance Creek Bridge and Dalby Waterwheel.

Mr. Frank Kinney, North Mason Chamber of Commerce, noted they do the county's tourism website. He stated they would like to work with the county to post them somewhere on their website.

Ms. McAboy suggested they could possibly link them to the Historic Preservation website.

Valerie Johnson stated she represented the Dalby Waterwheel relocation project. She was on the committee of moving the Dalby Waterwheel from the location where it was out of public view to where it is now in public view. It was a unique project as it was a grass roots project raising the funds privately. They received no money from the public or any grants. Part of what they did was applied to the state to be assigned a position on the Historic Register. They are glad the county is now considering adopting the waterwheel for historic registry. Also she thanked the Board for appointing her to the Mason County Historic Commission.

Stan Graham, Chair of Mason County Historic Preservation Commission, noted their approach was they were already through the paperwork process once. They concluded they might be interested in being listed with Mason County as well as the state and in some cases nationally.

Michael O'Sullivan stated that he received a master's degree from the Burke Museum in the University of Washington. He moved to Allyn ten years ago and became active with the renting and improvements of the church in Allyn. He noted they spent \$50,000 in the ten years that he has been. The bronze bell was cast in 1885. He gave a brief history on repairs.

Mary Lindsey also gave some history on repairs to the Allyn church. She noted the upper level is the historic part. The basement was added somewhere in the 1950's.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated the history of Mason County is fascinating and there are more people that are interested in the work in getting the story out. These registers bring more life to Mason County. There are people that will benefit from this and it is good for tourism.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson noted this is one of the first things she started working on four years ago. This is a nice observation of something that works well. It acknowledges spots that are unique and important to Mason County's history. She complimented all the volunteers and staff that were involved.

Cmmr. Gallagher commented he attended several of the Historic Preservation meetings. The people are dedicated to the preservation of history in Mason County.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve all of the listed sites and properties on the Washington Heritage Register and/or National Register within Mason County be adopted to the Mason County Historic Register. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

The Board took a break at 10:35 a.m. until 10:48 a.m.

- 9.5 Public hearing to review the request by Steve and Jack Johnson L.L.C. to rezone the west portion of one parcel (9.60 ac. area) within the Belfair Urban Growth Area from Residential 5 zone to General Commercial/Business Industrial zone.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 8**

Allan Borden, Planner, stated the property is located at the end of Peninsula Place. There is a non-conforming commercial building and a parking area that are currently on the property. Adjacent zoning to the subject property is Residential 4 zone to the north and Residential 5 zone to the south and west. A map of the Belfair Urban Growth Area (UGA) was displayed.

The subject parcel is a larger parcel that straddles both the east and west side of the railroad. The property has split zoning. In 2004, it was zoned general commercial/business industrial zone on the east side of the railroad and residential 5 on the west side of the railroad. This request is to ask for the west portion of the property also to be zoned general commercial/business industrial zone.

Mr. Borden noted there was a permit for the existing building that began in December 2004 when the Belfair Urban Growth Area Plan and zoning were approved by the county commissioners. If the zone is approved, the applicant can establish new commercial and industrial buildings on the subject property.

He summarized that every rezone request is reviewed for eight (8) criteria. The review concludes whether each criterion is met or not met by the request or conditions on the subject property.

Staff concluded that criteria #2 is not met because the current residential 5 zone is the most consistent designation for the west portion of the parcel. Criteria #3 is not met because it permits the expansion of commercial industrial uses into the residential area of the UGA. The criteria #6 is not met because it will allow a site development on existing slope critical areas and an area that is already viewed from the west to east as vegetated and open space. If the proposal were to be approved, it would expand commercial/industrial land uses to intrude into the urban residential area. Criteria #7 would not be met because it would set a precedent for other future rezone requests in Belfair Urban Growth Area (UGA) for other portions of the county that have split zoning.

At the September 29th Planning Commission meeting there were several comments made. The applicant made comments concerning the improvements on the property in years past, including water, power, railroad crossing, a left turn lane on state highway. They wanted to develop 6 – 7 commercial sites with 9,000 – 10,000 square foot buildings. They would provide buffer separation, access, parking, roads to connect the different buildings and storm water. Other comments from the public had to do with the existing industrial uses on the east side of the railroad already do cause odors, noise and light problems. There was concern about additional traffic in the Newkirk Road area whether it was adequate to serve anything more than the existing residential.

The Planning Commission discussed whether the site was already more industrial than residential, whether more residential development on the west side of the railroad attracts traffic through the commercial industrial zone and if it would be a safety hazard.

The Planning Commission also made comments that the railroad does serve as a separation of land uses. Some of the members thought it separated the commercial industrial land on the east from the residential on the west side. They asked if they could put a limit on potential development by restricting the kinds of land uses that could occur on the property under general commercial business industrial. In their discussion, they raised some comments. Some of the members thought the request did not expand the industrial area any more than it currently has. Also, granting approval would not be a precedent. Many of the members felt they could support the request but considered putting a condition of approval to include a certain range of land uses that would be allowed under the zone.

The Planning Advisory Commission recommended 5 to 0 for approval of the rezone request from Residential 5 Zone to General Commercial Business Industrial Zone, with a condition to limit the range of possible land uses (such as light manufacturing; vehicle parts, service and repair; or building

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 9**

supplies) and expand the buffer separation area around the portion of subject parcel to a distance of 75 feet.

After the Planning Advisory Commission meeting, Robert Thorpe, Consultant, provided a more detailed presentation of how the land uses could be amended to include, as a condition of the rezone approval. There would be a 30' perimeter buffer and 20 to 25 foot setback in areas that have graded slopes.

Ken VanBuskirk proposed that further action be deferred until storm water concerns are addressed.

Constance Ibsen felt that approval of the rezone request could be considered spot zoning and would be in conflict with the Growth Management Act. She noted that a reasonable person could see that on the Belfair UGA zoning map that the railroad tracks along the ridge is a logical divide of land uses and that no mapping error was made.

Mr. Borden, Planner, stated the rezone request fails to meet four of the 7 or 8 rezone criteria.

Cmmr. Sheldon clarified that both of the specific properties are to the west of State Route 3, but they are split by the railroad track. The consideration of the rezone is the piece that is to the west of the railroad tracks and is 9.6 acres. The piece that is along the highway has been zoned commercial since December 2004.

Frank Kenny stated it seemed the Planning Advisory Commission was in favor.

Mr. Borden responded there were six members present and the chair did not vote. The chair typically does not vote if he does not have to. The vote was 5 to 0 in favor of recommending approval.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson questioned if the general access would be across the railroad tracks to get in to the current commercial area. She asked if it is commercial development on the west side of the highway just before you get to the railroad crossing.

Mr. Borden replied there are some houses, but there is a self-storage facility.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted the site has been disturbed. He asked if most of the timber is removed.

Mr. Borden responded, yes, it was around 2006.

Cmmr. Sheldon questioned if gravel or dirt were removed or material brought in to the site.

Mr. Borden stated there had to be some site preparation for the building in 2004. When the building was proposed for construction, zoning was not in effect. The building predates the zoning by about two weeks. The building is approximately 9,000 square feet and is located next to the railroad and north of the Peninsula Place alignment.

Included in the staff report was information submitted by Mr. Johnson's consultant that was received during preparation of the staff report.

Cmmr. Sheldon referred to the PAC vote of 5 to 0 with a condition to limit the range of possible land uses. It sounds unusual. He questioned if the County has ever had one of these or if there is a precedent.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 10**

Mr. Borden stated the County has not done that in the past. When the commission reviewed a rezone request in the past, it was with a full range of land uses called for in that zone. There is history of other counties and cities approving with a conditional zone.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated that based upon what they have been told in the past that it is problematic, she would like a little bit more information about that. She questioned if the county will automatically get sued as it relates to the Growth Management Act.

Cmmr. Borden replied the rezone request is within the Urban Growth Area. It is expected that land uses will change depending upon demand and need. It would be different if it were outside the UGA. If approved, there will be a change in the area of sewer demand.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated during periods of challenge, under the Growth Managements Act, the county's money seems to stagnate or go away.

Cmmr. Gallagher clarified if the conditions are about the buffers.

Mr. Borden stated the consultant proposed a subset of the possible land uses that are allowed in the General Commercial-Business Industrial (GC-BI) zone and he also wanted to agree they could provide a buffer separation.

Cmmr. Sheldon commented if there is a parcel that is bisected by a state highway or county road, there obviously are two parcels. He questioned if that is true for railroad tracks.

Mr. Borden replied, he did not have an answer for that.

Mr. Johnson asked that Mr. Borden clarify the Mason County Planning Advisory Commission document that went to the PAC by the Planning Staff.

Mr. Borden stated that the PAC had the document that says "Mason County Planning Advisory Commission, Sept 29, 2008 Public Hearing, Staff Review of Rezone No. 08-06" on the top while they were reviewing the rezone request. This review was from the Planning Staff to the PAC.

Mr. Johnson stated it appears the PAC report is a recommendation from the Planning Staff.

Mr. Borden commented that the PAC does not issue a formal document to the County Commissioners.

A question was raised if the applicant's information comes in under public testimony.

The chair stated the board would have questions of the applicant.

Robert Thorpe, R.W. Thorpe & Associates, Inc., represented the applicant and presented a handout with comments to the Board. He stated he is a planning and landscape architect consultant and has been in business for 30 years. There are three certified planners on his staff representing 70 years of experience. He noted their report is their findings as certified planners.

This shows the property that has been cleared. The topography is flat and next to the existing industrial. There is an asphalt batching plant and a concrete batching plant. The site employs 75 people. The site is level and goes across the railroad tracks. They spent a great deal of time getting permits going across the railroad tracks was a five year process. They developed a left turn lane to service the property. They were issued a valid building permit prior to the adoption of the subarea plan. It is a legal nonconforming use. It is not a spot zone. He has several cases of case law. He

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 11**

referred to a question from the Board about "what is the precedent". He heard at the PAC the Board has not used contract or concomitant agreement. A contract is where the two parties come together. A concomitant agreement, which some counties use, says they are offering these conditions. They listened to the neighbors and said how about a buffer zone of 75'. That 75' represents 30% of the site. If it was used for R5, 6,000 – 7,000 sq. ft. lot they probably would have 10% open space. They are saying they will limit the uses to light industrial. Heavy industrial is along the highway. There is steep topography and have quite a unique site. To simply, the staff is saying it will create a precedent. He did not think they would find any other site like this in Mason County that has exactly these characteristics. The ability to use concomitant agreements, he has a letter from Dennis Reynolds, a well-known attorney on case law on the ability to use concomitant agreements. There are a number of cases in the state going back several decades that say this is a viable process. They were saying and hearing from the staff. This is a unique site, has the existing building and shop. It is a permitted use and is taxed as industrial by the Assessor. It has an 8" water line into the site. Currently, they are using septic, but as they expand they could use sewer.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if the applicant or the PAC suggested the conditions that were mentioned.

Mr. Thorpe responded, the conditions were suggested by the applicant. The PAC referred to the Planning Staff and noted they like this. The agreement they have, they were going to send them the conditions and the buffer. They sent it to staff; the idea was to take a final look. The criteria that the staff talks about, if they put the buffer zone in, if they have the topographic difference. The neighbors were concerned about the road coming from the North or south. Newkirk Road does not connect. If there is a 75' buffer, the only road going in is the existing road. They prevented any kind of access. It is understood and implied that there will never be any access on the record. The only thing they could use the buffer for other than normal 30' is to put the detention facility or the septic in that area. They could not have a road. There is already a mini storage, an industrial use there. When they talked to the neighbors afterwards they seemed to be comfortable with the idea that if there were no roads, they were comfortable with the use. They were also aware that even if there are some adverse things from any industrial site, it does employ 75 people, which translates to another 75 – 100 people in service jobs.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked what activities are undertaken in the 9,000 sq. ft. building.

Mr. Thorpe replied it is largely office and equipment repair, restrooms. It is a very low-key part. About 10% of any industrial park is the office. That is the office at the end of the building that serves all the other uses. There is some paved parking around the building.

On Criterion 2, they respectfully disagree. They believe the comp plan slopes do create a separate area. The industrial use is tied in with the other uses and is consistent. They were given a permit for the building consistent with county ordinances, and comprehensive plan and growth management. In terms of Criterion 3, it talks about open space. He has testified that there would be 30% open space. With a 75' buffer if you did R4 there would be a 10% buffer. He did not think staff could have it both ways. These criteria should apply both ways. In terms of Criterion 6 that is the 35% open space. They do not believe it would create an impact on fish, particularly if there is a 75' buffer. The site has been cleared before, it would require replanting a 30' buffer with native evergreens. According to Mason County Assessor's map, 40% of this UGA area was in forestry. Vacant, unimproved land totaled 300 acres. There is a lot of land for other forestry and residential uses. He did not think it would have a negative cumulative effect. They think the conditions proposed would address that. This is so unique that would not create a precedent. They think this is a reasonable request. It is taking care of an important business and jobs in the community. He again stated they do not believe it is a spot zone. It is a contiguous property and owned by one owner. It has similar uses and similar topography. They

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 12**

did send a copy of the uses (Letter dated 10/17/2008 to the PAC) and felt that is something the applicants would be willing to attach to the title.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted from the letter it appeared the conditions for use would be imposed on the present owner, but not if the owner changed.

Mr. Thorpe commented, his understanding of the law is that if there were a condition on a property with a rezone, it would remain unless the county commissioners changed that.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked if there is a storm water plan for this property.

Cmmr. Sheldon referred to the list of Chapter 17.24 Commercial and Industrial Districts in the Belfair UGA; 17.24.120 Allowed uses. He noted that there is a large list of items. Some are crossed out.

Mr. Thorpe clarified that the items that are crossed out are not allowed. The other uses listed that remain are allowed uses.

Jack Johnson, property owner, briefly explained the history of the property. They have been working on the property for over ten years trying to get it developed. It took them five years to get a railroad crossing and five years to get utility crossing. They always intended it to be a light industrial use to create an area that they could put shops. They would have the ability to lease for maintenance. Part is for landscaping for services. Part is for Peninsula Top Soils. This is an action to try and correct what the zoning has done to them. It is property that the topography isolates it. It has no access from the Old Belfair Highway, Newkirk Road. IT is somewhat a "hogback" right in the center of the ten acres. The railroad crossing comes into the center of the hogback. The plan was to try and develop the pads on the upper level and then have the buffer around the housing. This parcel is 9.4 acres. They are giving three acres to buffer.

Their only access is through Peninsula Top Soil. It is a very industrial use. If it was residential, that is the only access. No one is going to want to drive through Peninsula Top Soil. He thought it was zoned industrial. He believed that Mr. Borden has helped everyone but the owner. He approached them trying to work out what would fly. Would it be 75'. He helped Ken VanBuskirk, Constance Ibsen but not the Johnsons. He felt that Mr. Borden has been ambitious in trying to get this denied. In his information he calls the metal building, that they constructed, a pole building. He felt that a pole building is a cheaper type of construction, a shorter lasting construction. They built a rigid frame steel building. Staff keeps making the comment that they constructed their building two weeks before the zoning was accepted. He stated that is accurate, but planning for a building, financing, plans, all occurred before that. It was not just two weeks before they decided to have the property become industrial. It has been going on for years. They cannot access through Newkirk Road. He stressed there will not be a precedent. He felt the reason for the rezone process is to try and rectify properties that need to be.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked under the proposal would they be able to use the railroad for rail access.

Mr. Johnson stated the railroad is an important advertiser. It is an amenity to the property.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he went up Newkirk Road and it is very steep. He drove up a ways and looked up. He asked if the building was the shop.

Mr. Johnson responded, yes.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 13**

Cmmr. Sheldon noted that the road is very steep and must be extremely expensive. If the road was built, it was not proposed to go through the property. He asked how much of the 9.4 acres can be developed.

Mr. Johnson responded, that steep slopes could be contoured. They would improve all six acres of the property. They are not stuck on seven buildings, if six buildings were less an impact. He pointed out that North Mason Fiber has 22 acres on the west side of the railroad tracks zoned industrial. They believe the best use for the property is what they are doing. He urged the Board to understand it is hard to get permits. It takes a long time to get permits. They cannot be quick. The intent of the property has been the same for years. They are trying to rectify that. The other thing is they are in the residential business. If they felt it was prime residential property that is what they would do with it. They believe the best use for the property is what they are doing. If the rezone is denied, the property will sit for an undetermined amount of time with one 9,000 sq. ft building on it. Their hands will be tied. He disagreed the shop is nonconforming. The shop was conforming when they built it. There are no critical areas on the site or any wetlands or streams. Storm water has been designed. It has very good sands and gravels. There would be infiltration. He told the engineer, he wanted it over designed for storm water. They want a safety factor. Noise and odors should not be an issue. North Mason Fiber is composting. They can contract this into the rezone. If there were something that somebody does not like they would like to be able to discuss it with someone.

Frank Kinney, North Mason Chamber of Commerce, stated the idea of additional jobs in the area is exciting. They realize that where people work a lot times is where they shop. If they go out of the county to work at the shipyard, chances are they will spend their money in Kitsap County. He has gone to a class for entrepreneurs to get shipyard contracts. He would like to get some of that business into Mason County. He urged the Board to approve the rezone. He felt it is the best use of the property. The UGA is a good place for this kind of business.

Cmmr. Gallagher stated this appears to be a unique situation with a unique area. The Johnsons have come forward with how to make this work with the buffer area. He is still concerned about a storm water plan. He questioned how soon that would be implemented.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson said this is an interesting project. She agreed there needs to be more industrial land and it needs to go in the UGA. They did get a fairly lengthy new document. She thought she read it over, but missed a couple of things. She would prefer to wait one week and check with the county's land use attorney who is not present today. They are hearing something different about this conditional, than is what she has heard a number of times over the last three years. She would like to check it out. She is not adverse to this particular land use. She has been up in the area a number of times and can see reasons for supporting this request. At the same time, she would like to read all the documentation and check with the attorney. She is hearing something different than what she has heard in the past. She would like to table this for one week to catch up and get all the questions answered.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he is familiar with the area. He has worked around that area for a number of years with the Economic Development Council. He appreciates the work the Johnsons have done to take advantage of the property and use it for a very compatible use such as light industrial and building materials. Because there is a building on the property that was legally built, it makes sense. The railroad tracks are a big amenity for property in Mason County to have rail access. He felt it is a very good proposal.

Mr. Thorpe asked if they could get a copy of the attorney's decision.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 14**

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated usually they don't get a written response, they walk over and ask. If they get anything in writing, she would provide that to them. There were some contentious rezones in Harstene Island. She felt that she needed to check this out. She wants to make sure she understands the issues.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to table the vote on this request by Steve and Jack Johnson L.L.C. to rezone the west portion of one parcel (9.60 ac. area) within the Belfair Urban Growth Area from Residential 5 zone to General Commercial / Business Industrial zone for one week, to November 25, 2008. Motion carried unanimously. G-aye; RE-aye; S-aye.

The Board took a break from 11:49 a.m. until 11:54 a.m.

- 9.6 Public Hearing to consider adopting an updated fee schedule for the Department of Community Development-building and planning divisions. New fees ordinance will become effective January 1, 2009.

Kell McAboy, Planner, stated the building and planning department both looked at their current fee schedules and compared to several counties. The Building Department used: Grays Harbor; Thurston, Kitsap, Pierce, Lewis, Clallam and Cowlitz counties. The Planning Department used: Jefferson, Kitsap, Thurston and Pierce counties. The counties varied widely on information that was readily available. Generally, Mason County Department of Community Development fees are below the compared rates.

The Building Department would like to adopt the Building Valuation data table as established by the International Code Council (ICC) for all buildings. Currently, the table is used for non-residential buildings in Mason County. The majority of the counties used in the comparison analysis are already using the ICC table in some form. The fixed residential building values in Mason County Table I would be replaced with the ICC values and automatically updated September 1st annually. This would be in the August edition of the Building Safety Journal.

Cmmr. Gallagher noted, that in the past, when have they seen increases.

Michael Luke, Building Department, explained they took some informal surveys with surrounding counties. In looking at the valuation used by the ICC, they took a typical residence of 2,200 sq. ft., garage, deck and porch for a scenario. He obtained information from ICC to get relevant data back to 2004 to show increases. Coming forward from 2004-2005, the increase in the price of the permit would have been 2.97% -- 2005-2006 – 6.03%; 2006-2007 – 5.19% and 2007-2008 – 3.29%.

From 2004 – 2006 Mason County had no increase. From 2006-2007 they went with what was perceived to be a 10% increase. They thought they were doing 10% increase across the board. The proposed residence percentage only went up 7.68% because it was calculated through another table. When they thought they were going up 5% from 2007-2008 the actual increase was 3.84 %.

When they started in 2004 their valuation was \$66.35 and the ICC was already \$74.68. They are approximately 11.5% behind when they started.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he understood the proposal is for two increases. The increase to go the ICC table and the 7% on all flat fees.

Mr. Luke responded, yes, all the flat fees would be increased by 7%. It would not be 7% on top of the table. They would change the valuation to the ICC's nationally accepted fees. The table only goes

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 15**

down to the level of miscellaneous structures. They are classifying garages, storage sheds as misc. structures.

They are proposing the decks, docks, carports are only going up 7%.

Ms. McAboy stated the building department wants to adopt the Building Valuation Data table; The other is to adopt the 7% flat fee increase on all the other fees in both building and planning.

If both are not adopted, they would like the formatting of the fee schedules be adopted.

Cmmr. Sheldon referred to a situation at Holiday Beach on Hood Canal where an individual had some flooding last year at this time. They had to get an environmental permit to restore their back yard and it still will be a back yard. They were complaining that fee should not be applied to that situation. There are a variety of flat fees and the graduated fee.

Ms. McAboy replied that they did waive fees after the storm event. The fees are typically based on the staff time that it takes to process the fees whether in the resource ordinance or shoreline master program or on the building side.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson understood the county's fees are quite a bit lower than surrounding counties.

Ms. McAboy stated Mason County fees are typically lower. Even after they showed the 7% increase, they were still below most of the neighboring counties that were used.

Cmmr. Gallagher asked if there are any houses being built in the range of \$500,000 to \$1 million.

Mr. Luke responded that is a little used category. He has seen a couple homes in that category come through on the water, but not a large number.

Cmmr. Gallagher stated that most homes are within the \$100,000 - \$500,000 range.

Mr. Luke clarified that Table I is a revision of the old Table IA from the Uniform Building Code (UBC). Some of the counties around us have taken to adjusting this table. They are still utilizing it in the same format with the exception, at the very beginning, they found the cost to process a building permit only comes down to a certain scale. They had a minimum written into the fee table prior. To make it easier to utilize, they brought the minimum forward into the table.

Table 1-A they rearranged to make it easier to follow and utilize. They took the buildings off because the building valuation data table will now become part of this during the annual update.

The \$73.00 is the minimum hourly or one trip rate for a person in a vehicle. That is up from \$68.00. It is designed to cover the cost.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if there is no change in the minimum amount of yards necessary for grading fees. If there currently is no fee for under 50 cubic yards

Mr. Luke replied from the time the board adopted the previous table, to the best of his knowledge, there has been no changes whatsoever, other than a 7% increase.

Tami Griffey questioned if it is the intention for the fees to cover the cost of the process.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 16**

Mr. Luke stated that is the intention. The proposed fees are not a direct relationship to an inspection on one given house.

Ms. Griffey asked if they are intended to operate as an enterprise fund. An enterprise fund would operate within itself and not require supplementation from the general fund/Current Expense. She questioned if they will accomplish that goal.

Mark Core, Department of Community Development, responded that is the intent to cover the costs. However, it is hard to anticipate how many inspections a particular residence will take. Some take more than others. This should result in the majority covering costs.

Ms. Griffey asked if the building valuation table still includes modifiers.

Mr. Core responded, the modifiers were dropped out. They came in with the Uniform Building Code back around early 1990's. The only jurisdiction he is aware of that uses modifiers is Kitsap County. Mason County elected not to use a modifier. They have arranged the end result differently.

Ms. Griffey asked if they are increasing the valuation data table and adding 7% to rates.

Mr. Luke stated that was the previous Table 1-A and some surrounding jurisdictions had taken the numbers within all the categories and increased those numbers. Those numbers are still the same. The only area that they modified is on the low end. They want to make it consistent.

It was asked if the staffing fees proposed for Hearings Examiners on enforcement cases, per hour, equivalent to what they are charging per hour.

Ms. McAboy stated the Hearings Examiner fees for enforcement cases are at cost. What the Hearing Examiner charges will be forwarded on to the applicant. The staff hourly rate for planning is proposed at \$70.

It was noted that an email was sent to Planning Staff from Will Stapleton, Dir. Of Government Affairs of Olympia Master Builders in opposition to the fee increases. The Mason County Chapter is in opposition to any proposed permit fees for 2009.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he is not an advocate for raising any fees today. The economic situation is dire. The sales tax collections have dropped off. They do not see the governor proposing any fees. Locally, they should hold the line. This will mean a difference in staffing levels in both departments if not adopted. Building will continue to drop off. Holding the fees will encourage more development. They need compatible development. They need to find new lots that are not difficult to permit. Many of the lots that are left, are extremely difficult to build on. He knows of an individual who spent more on permits than the actual work cost to repair a rock wall.

Cmmr. Gallagher noted in comparison to other counties, they are still building. He felt they need to be in line with other counties. They need to be prepared for when things turn around. This is a status quo for the department. They may have to look at this next year if they are not adequately supporting this department. They are also looking at and preparing for 2010. He felt this is an adequate increase for the building department.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated she has reached a different conclusion. She heard the property tax in this county and every part of the state is too high. The people who live here cannot continue to bear increases. Subsidizing the permit process is part of that total package. This will have to run as an enterprise fund. It sounds like Mason County is still competitive or under other counties. The reality

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 17**

is people want service. Government is changing. There is no longer the resource available through just raising property taxes to keep offering services. Those services will have to be paid for by the people that want them. She would like to work with staff to look at an actual cost of service proposal. She is prepared to move forward.

Cmmr. Sheldon concluded, if there is an increase in fees, one of the biggest difficulties is the number of permits needed for a project in Mason County. They do not understand up front how many permits they need. The unknown comes up and it is frustrating for builders. It passes on through word of mouth that people feel that government is not treating them fairly or openly or effectively at the beginning of the process. If they just raise the fees and not address the communication of what the fees are for. Health and safety are one big reason.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated that enterprise funds cannot take a profit.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded the Board of County Commissioners shall adopt the new fee schedule for building and planning/land use permit fees effective January 1, 2009 which includes the Table 1 and 7% flat fee to other areas. Motion carried. G-aye; RE-aye; S-nay. Ordinance No. 123-08 (Exhibit D)

10. Other Business (Department Heads and Elected Officials)

10.1 Declaration of Emergency

Charlie Butros, Public Works Director, recommended the Board formalize a Declaration of Emergency. The last couple of weeks beginning on November 6, 2008 the County experienced very heavy rain with runoff causing road damage. Three roads that received damage were: Webb Hill, Eels Hill Road and Beeville Loop Road. The estimate of damage is around \$300,000. He requested the Board adopt a resolution declaring the emergency to be able to submit it to the state in the event the State of Washington declares the events emergencies and reimbursement becomes available.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve a resolution declaring an emergency relating to the November 6, 2008 storm events. Resolution No. 124-08 (Exhibit E)

10.2 North Shore Road Status

Cmmr. Sheldon asked about the status of North Shore Road since it was closed in September. Also an update on the detour routes.

Mr. Butros responded there is concern about the continued sloughing on North Shore or recent incident close to Mrs. Gall's residence. That sloughing precludes the department from re-opening the roads. The work that is planned is waiting Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) approval of the designs. As soon as that approval is obtained they will move forward and make the repairs. There are two locations on North Shore Road that are very close to each other and require repairs (MP 11.121 and MP 11.6). Those will be repaired in that sequence. The detour for traffic that would normally use the road to get to and from Belfair is currently along Belfair Tahuya Road. They have been taking steps to improve the damaged portion of that road which is at the Tahuya River Bridge. The recent steps that have been taken in the last month have been to install signals at the temporary bridge location. Additionally, they are aware they need to monitor the condition of that road because of the increased traffic that has detoured from North Shore Road. They will be doing that as they get into the colder season.

Cmmr. Sheldon passed along a concern about lighting at Kay's Corner. Many roads have a button on the centerline.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 - PAGE 18**

Cmmr. Gallagher stated he saw a unique procedure at their fall conference of nailing a bank. He asked if that procedure would work at these two areas or are they still looking at shoulder piling.

Mr. Butros replied they are looking at shoulder piling those two. That is the design applied. They are considering that application in different places. Some of the places from the most recent storm damage could be candidates for that application. It seems to be an application that is very innovative and works well. They are looking for locations to try it out.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated she has had an interest for the past three years to find some way to use solar technology to light some of these rural more isolated dark intersections. She asked if they could re-energize and look again. In Europe there are a number of examples of that kind of technology being used and it actually feeds power back into the grid and saves the government money. She hoped to be able to try and find a way to facilitate that now. It is a safety and economic issue.

The Public Works Director stated he would look at that again. They have discussed it with PUD as a possible way of partnering with them. If the County lights intersections, typically they have dropped a feed from PUD with a transformer that feeds the lighting.

11. Board's Reports and Calendar – The Board reported on meetings attended since the last commissioners' meeting, November 4 – 18, 2008 and also shared calendar appointments for the upcoming week of November 18 – 25, 2008.
12. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MASON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Tim Sheldon, Chair

ATTEST:

Lynda Ring Erickson, Commissioner

Rebecca S. Rogers, Clerk of the Board

Ross Gallagher, Commissioner