

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

July 14, 2009

1. Call to Order – The Chairperson called the regular meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance – Rose Swier led the flag salute.
3. Roll Call – Present: Commissioner District 1 - Lynda Ring Erickson; Commissioner District 3 – Ross Gallagher. Commissioner District 2 – Tim Sheldon – absent.
4. Correspondence and Organizational Business
 - 4.1 Correspondence
 - 4.1.1 Pam Kiesel submitted comments on the proposed temporary outdoor public event ordinance.
 - 4.1.2 The Washington State Liquor Control Board sent notice of a new liquor license application for El Puerto de Angeles Mexican Restaurant in Hoodspoint and notice of a special occasion liquor license application for Colony Surf Club.
 - 4.1.3 The Washington State Department of Ecology sent notice that Charles Buschbom successfully completed the required Water Conservancy Board training and examination.
 - 4.1.4 The Washington State Office of Financial Management sent their official 2009 population determinations.
 - 4.1.5 The United States Board on Geographic Names is seeking comments regarding the proposal to adopt the name "Salish Sea" to describe the inland waters adjacent to Washington State and southwest British Columbia.
 - 4.1.6 The Mason County Sportsman's Association is seeking a suitable property on which to build a shooting range.
 - 4.2 Staff Recognition – Public Health. Vicki Kirkpatrick, Public Health Director, read a letter from Star Lake Community Club regarding Rose Swier's attention to unsafe and unsanitary properties in their community.

Cmmr. Gallagher presented Ms. Swier with the Green Star Award.
 - 4.3 New Release – Planning Advisory Commission Vacancies. Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development Co-Manager, presented the news release announcing two vacancies on the Planning Advisory Commission.
 - 4.4 Charlie Butros, Public Works Director, announced the bid award for County Road Project Number 1905, Belfair Tahuya Road –Tahuya River Bridge Replacement. The contract has been awarded to the apparent low bidder, Quigg Brothers, Inc. at a bid amount of \$1,190,193.70.
 - 4.5 Charlie Butros announced the bid award for the Solar Lighting Project, County Road Project 1923-1933. The contract has been awarded to the apparent low bidder, Taurus Industries, Inc. at a bid amount of \$ 200,150.00.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson noted this project is extremely important to her. It will increase safety at many dark, rural, arterial intersections. There will be many other counties watching to see how this project comes along.
5. Open Forum for Citizen Input – There was no citizen input.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 2**

6. Adoption of Agenda - **Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to adopt the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; G-aye; S-absent.**
7. Approval of Minutes – July 7, 2009 regular meeting minutes.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve the July 7, 2009 regular meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; G-aye; S-absent.

8. Approval of Consent Agenda:
 - 8.1 Approval to schedule a public hearing for August 4, 2009 at 9:30 a.m. to consider adoption of a resolution revising resolution 136-98, Establishment of Abatement Repair/Demolition Fund, Fund No. 118-000-000.
 - 8.2 Approval of Warrants

Claims Clearing Fund	Warrant #s 159342-159976	\$1,957,672.60
Salary Clearing Fund	Warrant #s 2607-2754	\$ 855,906.59
Direct Deposit Fund	Deposit #s 13508-14290	\$1,153,175.75
 - 8.3 *Approval to appoint Gary L. Carlberg to the Port of Hoodspport Commissioner Position #1 that is currently vacant. This is per RCW 42.12.070 (3). This position is up for election in November 2009 and the appointed person shall serve until a qualified person is elected (and the election is certified). A letter was received from Richard McEachin, Director of the Port of Hoodspport, requesting the County Commissioners fill this vacancy.*

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve Consent items 8.1 through 8.3 with the addition of the text "and the election is certified" to item 8.3. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; G-aye; S-absent.

Cmmr. Gallagher called a recess at 9:25 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:31 a.m.

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

- 9.1 Public Hearing to consider proposed revisions to the Curbside Recycling Ordinance, No. 147-08.

David Baker, Utilities and Waste Management Program Manager, stated that in December of last year an ordinance was passed that was designed to give Mason County residents the opportunity to have a convenient program for recycling that reflects the service that is available through the garbage collection company. When the ordinance was passed everyone was very excited that the opportunity had finally come to Mason County. Since that time there have been a couple of little issues that have come up that need to be revised in the existing ordinance. There are four items to address in the revisions. The first item is the code number. When the ordinance was filed it was filed under Chapter 6, which is primarily the Health department. It should be filed under Chapter 13, which is the Utilities department.

The second item to address is the implementation schedule. When the program was drafted it was believed that a substantial amount of time would be necessary for the hauler to implement a multi-phase approach for bringing countywide curbside recycling. The implementation schedule was designed to roll out over a period of years so that specific areas could phase in the program step by step. It has been found that it is advantageous to implement the whole program countywide starting this summer. For those who have been long waiting for this program this is great news.

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 3

The third item to address is the materials accepted. In the last year there has been a lot of turmoil in the recycling markets. One of the things that has been discussed at a statewide level is the materials accepted in recycling programs. A big challenge is the dairy tub, which is something like a yogurt container or margarine container. When programs add this type of material it creates confusion with the public. One of the biggest problems is that dairy tubs have a number and people think they can recycle them. There are different chemical components in the item and it is hard to separate out. Programs that add this material have an increase in volumes and contamination. The contamination ratio is two or three times that of the volume increase. It is a net loss for a recycling program.

The other item to address is the commodity credit. The commodity credit is a rebate brought back to the customers for participating in the program. The commodity credit adjustment allows the hauler to retain a percentage of the rebate. The percentage is set by the Utilities and Transportation Commission. When the hauler is allowed to retain a portion of the rebate it must be through the blessing of the County and it must be for very prescriptive reasons. The reasons that have been brought forward from the hauler to the County are to support the glass recycling program, customer service and management of the program.

These four changes to the existing ordinance are the only changes being discussed at this time. Recently people have received notification about other issues they would like to address and the County would also like to answer questions that are of concern to people. A few things to clarify about the existing ordinance can also be found in a new release on the County's website.

One of the primary questions is "Why is the County doing this to me?". There are three different agencies at play. One is Mason County Government, which is represented by the Commissioners and staff. The County's job is to provide the infrastructure for utility services and waste management. Mason County Garbage is a privately held company that provides a service to the community. They are regulated by a State agency called the Utilities and Transportation Commission. The UTC has the responsibility to do an investigation to establish a fair and equitable rate for the hauler. A fair and equitable rate is a rate that is equal across the entire jurisdiction. All of the areas in Mason County are fairly distant to travel to. In order to provide a reasonable collection program it only makes sense to stop at every house. One of the considerations of the UTC is to make sure everyone in the area has the same service at the same price. The only way to do that is to increase the customer base to reduce the per unit cost. That means that everyone is a participant.

Mr. Baker stated he has heard a lot of "you didn't ask me". Everyone's input is valued. He has received countless calls about establishing a recycling program that works. The blue boxes were very inefficient, expensive, and there was a huge problem with illegal dumping and abuse. Many people who have moved to this jurisdiction from somewhere else are use to a higher level of service. The people who live in the most remote areas, who would most benefit from this service, seem to be the most unhappy about it.

The other point he would like to address is the fact that everyone pays for the service whether they use the service or not. By making everyone in the county eligible for the program it imposes the cost on all of the participants. It reduces the per unit cost and it encourages recycling.

A lot of people have said they do not want to use the program because they take their recycling to the blue boxes. The John's Prairie site will be closing this year. The four County drop boxes in Shelton, Belfair, Hoodspout and Union will be the only sites in the county for self hauling of recycling, with the exception of Wilson Recycling. The Pickering and Matlock sites will also be closing. One of the reasons the County scaled back on the blue box program is the cost. The lack of alternatives was the only reason the County held on to the program as long as it did. The City of the Shelton, Thurston County, Pierce

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 4

County and the City of Olympia all have this curbside recycling program. It is an effective system. In order to provide an effective and available program, this is what it takes to implement it.

If you opt out of collection service you can use the County drop boxes for garbage and recycling. It is important to consider the true costs when making that choice. This isn't just an imposition of a fee it is a program expansion that will allow people to better manage their waste. If you currently subscribe to garbage service and you have one can picked up every week your monthly cost is about \$14 per month. When this service is added it will increase the cost by \$7 per month making the bill about \$21. If you choose to self haul you will pay for the garbage at the transfer station. If there are more than two people in the household and you have not been a diligent recycler, the program can save a great deal of money. If you have been subscribing to two cans per week or every week service, you will probably find that you can reduce your garbage to one a week or every other week. The recycling container is very easy to use. It is one container with wheels and you can put various materials in the one container. Take moment to think about how easy it is to have someone come to your home to do something for you. This program is not a premium service, it is a standard that is available across North America at this time. It makes sense to have that level of service here.

Questions for Staff

An audience member asked if single household residents would be required to recycle if they don't have enough to fill a recycling bin in a 6 month period.

Mr. Baker stated there are a lot of situations for which the program is not ideally suited. For those situations a self-haul program may make more sense. You have to think about what makes the most sense for you.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson noted there is no requirement to sign up for service with this private company. They are changing the service they offer and there are not two options, just one option. It is not the County that is doing that.

Mr. Baker further clarified that this is a private company that can charge what they wish and that amount is overseen by the Utilities and Transportation Commission. That amount is not regulated by the County, nor is this program supported by the general fund or tax dollars.

An audience member asked if the original ordinance was written with the input of a citizen's advisory committee.

Mr. Baker stated the ordinance was developed with the assistance of the citizen's advisory committee know as the Solid Waste Advisory Committee. The SWAC meets every month at an open meeting. The Committee did consider this very extensively. It was a topic of discussion when putting together the Solid Waste Management Plan, which is a State requirement. It was noted that a curbside recycling program would be advantageous to Mason County. A survey was also mailed out to customers last year.

The audience member stated he understood this originally called for a voluntary effort and it is now mandatory if you receive the service. That is a large difference from the State guidance. A voluntary program would be more acceptable.

Mr. Baker stated what has been found is when there is a voluntary program there is a minimal amount of participation. There was a pilot program in Mason County with voluntary subscription and based on those numbers it would be impossible to justify rolling out a full scale countywide program. That is why it was switched to a mandatory program

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 5

An audience member stated he understands if you elect not to participate in this program you will be denied regular garbage pick up. It will be costly to Mason County Garbage if a lot of people cancel their service.

An audience member stated she lives at the top of a hill with six families. They leave their garbage at the bottom of the hill for pick up and there is not place for recycling bins. What does the County suggest they do?

Mr. Baker stated there are provisions in the ordinance for special exceptions on a case by case basis to allow for special situations. The program is a standard program and there are going to be situations that will require a form of accommodation.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked the representative from Mason County Garbage to clarify what can be done in special circumstances.

Rik Fredrickson, Mason County Garbage, stated there are allowances in the ordinance for their company to come out and check a roadside situation. By using the service you could go to an every other week service. One week your garbage would be out and the next week your recycling would be out, or go to once a month.

The audience member stated if the recycling bins are left at the bottom of her hill other people will dump their garbage in them. It is an impossible situation.

An audience member asked if he rejects the recycling program would his regular garbage service be discontinued.

Mr. Fredrickson stated the rate being proposed to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission includes the solid waste service and the recycling service. If you opt out of the recycling service the rate will remain the same whether you use the program or not. If you do use the recycling program you will receive the \$1.15 commodity credit per month.

An audience member asked what portion of the recycling rebate is retained by the garbage company.

Mr. Fredrickson stated 70% is rebated back to the consumer and 30% is retained by Mason County Garbage. The material volumes and commodity pricing must be submitted to the UTC yearly, so it is adjustable. That was one of the issues with the blue box program. There were no commodities returned to the consumer. Under this ordinance that is part of the rate structure.

Cmmr. Gallagher asked if he would be paying \$21 per month for every other week service for both services.

Mr. Fredrickson stated it would be \$4.52 for one garbage can per month and \$7.41 for the recycling cart.

Mr. Baker stated it is also worth noting that if you have once per week garbage service and twice per month recycling service it would be about \$21 per month. If you reduce garbage service to one can every other week the garbage component goes down to \$8 month plus the \$7.41 for recycling. Essentially, your bill would go from \$14 a month to \$15 a month for overall garbage collection.

An audience member asked how many subscribers only have one can a month.

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 6

Mr. Baker stated in the City of Shelton they have a mandatory pay, voluntary use program for garbage and recycling. In the beginning it ruffled a lot of feathers. Now, a year later, over 50% of the city has gone to every other week garbage collection. Once this program is up and running and people have adapted to it they will find they have a lot less garbage to throw away.

An audience member asked what the cost of the blue boxes were verses the cost taxpayers will pay for mandatory pick up.

Mr. Baker clarified that the cost of the program is not funded by tax dollars it is funded by ratepayers. The cost of the blue boxes in 2008 was almost \$100,000. The ratepayers will pay \$7.41 per month.

The audience member stated he would like to know the amount ratepayers are paying total.

Mr. Fredrickson clarified that exact figures can be obtained from the Utilities and Transportation Commission.

Cmmr. Gallagher asked who would pay for a centralized neighborhood program.

Mr. Baker stated that would be determined by the neighborhood.

Greg Skinner asked if this is a private company, why is this decision before the Board?

Mr. Baker stated the County is responsible for the ordinance that stipulates that residents will have service. The haulers provide the service, but people have questions they would like answered. The UTC is the rate setting authority so some of the questions should be directed to them, some questions should be directed to the hauler. It is the County's responsibility to provide the ordinance so this is the forum where those questions can be identified.

Mr. Skinner asked if the decision is before the Board because the ordinance is about to be revised.

Mr. Baker stated he believes people are here today because they received a notification letter that generated questions and concerns. He doesn't think people really have a problem with the proposed revisions to the ordinance.

An audience member asked if the County Commissioners have an option to revise the ordinance to change the mandatory part of the recycling program.

Mr. Baker stated the Commissioners have that option if they so choose. Rates are set by the Utilities and Transportation Commission and there is a public hearing on that at the end of the month.

Janet O'Conner, Solid Waste Advisory Committee member, stated in December when this ordinance went through, Mason County Garbage ordered all of the supplies such as the large containers and trucks. This discussion has been going on for ten years. Going back now on the ordinance would be a hardship for the people that do want to recycle.

An audience member asked if the mandatory recycling was part of the ordinance when it originally passed.

Ms. O'Conner stated that was the only way it could be done. It was adopted in a public meeting.

An audience member asked why this meeting wasn't advertised.

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 7

Ms. O'Conner stated this meeting was advertised for the original proposed revisions to the ordinance.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson noted that the letter that went out regarding rates generated a lot of questions the Board decided needed to be addressed.

An audience member asked why permits were given to the new recycling outfit if this was already on the table.

An audience member asked how meetings are publicized because he doesn't read the paper. The only reason he knew about the meeting was because he went to the Commissioners office.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated things are put on the website and meetings are published in accordance with the law. These are things all government struggles with. We don't know always who is interested in what and we get the word out the best we can. There is a lot of interest in a lot of things the County does.

An audience member asked how large the Mason County Garbage customer base is.

Mr. Fredrickson stated they serve approximately 10,500 residential customers in the summer.

An audience member asked about recycling glass. The program being instituted is the best thing the county has ever had, but potentially people will still have to go somewhere to dispose of glass.

Mr. Baker stated unfortunately, when glass is collected in the same format as other materials it has a negative impact on the overall recycling stream. Separating paper from cans is relatively strait forward, but when you add glass it creates challenges. The breakage of glass contaminates paper. When glass colors are mixed up and bottles are broken it is hard to get the pieces sorted. Other jurisdictions have chosen to keep glass recycling at the curb in a separate container, which requires and additional truck, additional staff and additional cost. Other places have gone to a blue box program for glass, which is a lower cost. The other issue is that it doesn't belong in the trash. It is infinitely recyclable, but unfortunately recovering glass is very costly when compared to making glass from scratch. Sand is the most abundant material on the planet, so making new glass is the least costly method for generating container glass.

An audience member asked about the implementation of the program. It was originally to be phased in over a period of years and now it is being done all at once this summer. What changed?

Mr. Fredrickson stated the original idea was to use split body trucks, which are used in the city. Other jurisdictions used split body trucks to dump garbage on one side and recycling on another. That was the early plan to implement an automated service. After discussions with the people at the UTC it was decided that in order to get the rate and get the program started they would just do a stand-alone program. They would leave the solid waste routes the way they are and do recycling with recycling trucks. Input from the SWAC and the County was to implement the program all at once.

Mr. Baker clarified that after the ordinance was adopted in December he received numerous phone calls from people who were excited about the program. When people found out they weren't in phase one they were very angry. Some people would literally be across the street from people who could use the program when they could not.

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 8

An audience member asked if Mason County Garbage has considered how many people may drop their service. If 30% of ratepayers decide to haul their own trash will that affect the others rates next year?

Mr. Fredrikson stated they did make an estimate on how many people will cancel service. Every year they file a report with the UTC and they can apply for a different rate at that time. It depends on operating costs and the customer base. It is a possibility but there are no guarantees.

Public Testimony

Gerald Hard stated he appreciates the recycling service provided with the ordinance, but it should be an option based on the needs of the citizens. He is in a family of two 73 year old people and they have their garbage picked up every other week in a 30 gallon container. They haul their own recycling once per month. They do not need a 96 gallon recycling cart the same day of garbage pick up. He does not want or need this recycling service. He resents this decision. The Board was elected to represent the citizens not to dictate to them.

Judy Scott, Port of Allyn, stated this was a long difficult situation regarding the blue boxes. The boxes used to be housed at the Port park and the upkeep was very difficult. They are in support of the recycling program. She has empathy for the people who can't afford the increase. When the boxes were removed from the Port there was a group called the Neighbor to Neighbor Network who has really stepped up to the plate. People who can't afford the increase should get involved with one of those groups. She is in support of the ordinance because Belfair doesn't have any recycling ability. Those that can should join and there are other alternatives for those who can't.

Sandy Tarswell stated she comes from someplace else where there is a recycling program. She thinks the programs are wonderful. She did see a decline when recycling is mandated. Not everyone wants to be on the program and eventually they found a lot of trash in the recycling. They had to pay trash monitors to inspect trash cans. She is concerned about starting down that road again. It is a slippery slope.

Jay Hupp stated he has done some basic math and if the County was paying \$100,000 per year for recycling in the past and there is a base of 10,000 customers, we have just generated $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million dollars to Mason County Garbage that was not there before. If it is going to be mandatory it should just be to pick up the cost to the County at \$1 per month. He has objections to this.

Jim Newman asked why the meeting with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on July 30th was scheduled in Olympia and not in Shelton, since it is the concern of Mason County citizens. When there are meetings with other State agencies they are gracious enough to hold the meetings in Shelton.

Cmmr. Gallagher stated the UTC is made up of people from around the state and the Board has no say on where they meet.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson noted that it could at least be requested that they meet here.

Harlan Tormanen stated he has lived in Mason County for seven years and recycled for seven years. He doesn't like that this says, "you have to do this my way and you have to pay me". He considers that repressive government and there will be consequence to those who implemented it in the coming elections.

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 9

Cmmr. Ring Erickson thanked people for raising good questions. She would like to take more time to look at the issue to find out what additional options there might be. She re-emphasized that this is not a service that Mason County provides. It is a private company that offers what they offer. The County just provides the opportunity for the service. Instructing a private company on what to do would be gross government interference in the private sector.

Mr. Baker stated a lot of people have a lot of questions. He encourages people to look at the cost of the service and how they generate waste. See if the program may be a good fit for you.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to continue the public hearing to consider revisions to the Curbside Recycling Ordinance to August 4, 2009. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; G-aye; S-absent.

Cmmr. Gallagher called a recess at 10:36 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 10:42 a.m.

- 9.2 Public Hearing to consider the petition of the Skokomish Indian Tribe to Vacate a portion of Bourgault Road, Vacation File No. 369.

Rick Brush, Public Works Property Manager, stated this hearing is to consider vacating a portion of Bourgault Road. The Skokomish Indian Tribe has requested this vacation. It is the portion of the road that is easterly from mile post .45 to the intersection with Purdy Cutoff Road. The segment of the road includes two bridges that would become the responsibility of the Tribe should the vacation be approved. The Tribe is the sole owner of the property abutting this portion of the road. The purpose of the vacation is to enable a wetland mitigation project to be undertaken by the Washington Department of Transportation. The project will involve the removal of one bridge and 800 feet of road bed to restore natural water flows and riparian habitat.

In compliance with State law, Public Works staff has examined the portion of the road to be vacated and has reached a conclusion based on the vantage point of operation and maintenance of the County road system. The roadway is not presently in use by the general public, the road is not in good condition, it is not passable by vehicular traffic and it is not deemed necessary to preserve the road for the County road system in the future. The general public would benefit from this vacation because it will enable the mitigation project and relieve the County of the obligation for maintenance and legal liability. Staff recommends the passage of the order of vacation.

Questions for Staff

Cmmr. Gallagher asked how long this is.

Mr. Brush stated approximately ½ mile.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked how long this has been a matter of consideration.

Mr. Brush stated under the present context of the mitigation project, perhaps a year.

Greg Stairs asked which bridge the Tribe plans on removing.

Mr. Brush stated the east bridge.

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 10

An audience member asked if the length of road contains two bridges.

Mr. Brush stated that is correct.

Public Testimony

Greg Stairs stated his concern is public access. The road is just maintained down to the easterly bridge. That provides public access to Purdy Creek. Hunters, fishers, trappers and people with their dogs walk out on that road. It is not drivable past the first bridge because it is gated off. It provides public access to the waterway. Quite a few agencies use it to clear the creek out of beaver dams and log jams. Allowing the County to maintain the road makes it available for public use. He uses the area at least once per day and there is always at least one vehicle parked there. It provides a safe pull off area. It costs the County nothing to keep it in the condition it is now. It would be nice to leave the bridge to get across the creek. He has been using the area for recreation since he was 10 years old. Some people did access it off of 101 but that won't be available with the road the way it is. It just provides a parking area for public access to the waterway.

Pat Carney stated there are a lot of concerns from the public that uses the area. He has talked to the State and they use it for access to clean the beaver dams to let the fish up to the hatchery. With the vacation there could be problems with their access. There are a lot of people that use the access to fish the creek. He mentioned it to Commissioner Sheldon and he said he would like to have it held up until he is back.

Ron Figlar-Barnes, Skokomish Tribe Natural Resources, stated this project has been in the books for about three years. The bridge confines the river and it ultimately will be eroded away. It will end up being a blockage to the system. There is an opportunity with the 101 project that the Department of Transportation has undertaken to use the area as a mitigation. It will open up the wetland and remove the pavement, barbwire and fence posts. It will create habitat for migrating salmon and out migration. There are areas where water is receding enough to allow pools to develop in the road system, which has captured Coho out migration for years. Hundreds of Coho will get trapped in the small pond systems so the Tribe is actively working to restore that part of the road. The bridge has confined the channel, stopped the original floodplain from developing and reduced the number of ponds and pools available for fish. If the floodplain is opened up there will be less problems with beaver. Ultimately, the Department of Transportation project will enhance the fisheries for the Skokomish.

Cmmr Gallagher stated there is parking on Purdy Cutoff road and people want access. Will that still be granted?

Mr. Figlar-Barnes stated it is tribal land on either side of the road that they acquired from Joe Bourgault. They have an agreement with Joe Bourgault so he has access to his hay field. He will be allowed access to that as long as he lives. The other bridge will be taken out. The public still has access to the river system by going down Old Highway 101. It is a good project. The road is not being maintained and the bridge will be eroded out of there during the next flood event.

Mr. Carney stated the bridge isn't a big bearing on the river. Any obstacle that will slow down the flow to the main river is an asset. He has lived here since 1945 and has fished and hunted there every year. The flow of water goes over the road and the bridge so it is not a real issue. Access to the area should overpower the project.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated Charlie Butros had called her and told her Commissioner Sheldon had talked to people about this issue and asked that the matter be tabled.

BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS
July 14, 2009 - PAGE 11

Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to table the public hearing to consider the petition of the Skokomish Indian Tribe to Vacate a portion of Bourgault Road, Vacation File No. 369, to July 21, 2009. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; G-aye; S-absent.

10. Other Business (Department Heads and Elected Officials) – There was no other business presented.

11. Board's Reports and Calendar - The Commissioners reported on meetings attended the past week and announced their upcoming weekly meetings.

12. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MASON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Absent 7/14/09

Tim Sheldon, Chair

ATTEST:

Lynda Ring Erickson, Commissioner

Shannon Goudy, Clerk of the Board

Ross Gallagher, Commissioner