

## BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS

August 4, 2009

1. Call to Order – The Chairperson called the regular meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance – Jean Gall led the flag salute.
3. Roll Call – Present: Commissioner District 1 - Lynda Ring Erickson; Commissioner District 2 – Tim Sheldon; Commissioner District 3 – Ross Gallagher.
4. Correspondence and Organizational Business
  - 4.1 Correspondence
    - 4.1.1 The Washington State County Road Administration Board provided estimated revenues for motor vehicle fuel tax and the County Arterial Preservation Program.
    - 4.1.2 The Washington State Department of Natural Resources sent their projection of income from State forest lands.
    - 4.1.3 The Washington State Department of Transportation sent their summary report for the proposed SR3, Belfair Bypass.
    - 4.1.4 The Washington State Liquor Control Board sent notice of a new liquor license application for Wild Bill N Jo's Last Stand in Belfair.
    - 4.1.5 John Borgert is seeking appointment to the Planning Advisory Commission.
  - 4.2 Employee Recognition – Utilities & Waste Management. Tom Moore read a letter from Shirlee Hrica commending Steve Cole, Bill VanBuskirk and Jeff Palmer for their work on a problem with her sewer. Cmmr. Sheldon presented each of the employees with a green star award.
  - 4.3 News Release – Cooling Centers. Charlie Butros presented the news release announcing that cooling stations have been opened at Fire District 2, Fire District 4 and the Public Works office due to extreme hot weather conditions.
  - 4.4 Charlie Butros announced the bid awards for the Sunnyside Road projects. FEMA road project F119 (milepost 1.02) was awarded to Grading & Excavating, Inc. in the amount of \$35,483.81 and project F126 (milepost .87) was awarded to Sound Excavation, Inc. in the amount of \$46,531.80.
  - 4.5 Charlie Butros announced the bid award for the McEwan Prairie Road project. Ace Paving Company, Inc. was awarded the contract in the amount of \$262,089.40.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted that the North Shore Road project is anticipated to be finished the week of August 24, 2009.

Charlie Butros clarified that there is another project further west of the first project that will continue to keep one lane of the road closed.
5. Open Forum for Citizen Input –
  - 5.1 Brenda Hirschi stated on July 21<sup>st</sup> she asked two questions of the Board and she has not heard back. The first question was what happened to the Current Expense Fund reserve balance and what are the plans to restore it? It is a positive development that the Treasurer has provided a draft fund balance policy for consideration, but there are many people still waiting to find out what happened to the balance. She heard it was spent on the Sheriff. Then she heard the road diversion fund went up for the Sheriff's department.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 2**

Her second question was how is the Department of Community Development going to be restructured to make it sustainable. It appears the Board is working on a band-aid fix. The abatement fund is a one time fix.

Last week she asked whether Public Health needed to take the full \$563,000 for Current Expense in 2009. This is a question that needs to be answered.

Today she would like to talk about the July 2009 expenditure execution. 71% of the total Current Expense budget is for payroll and salaries. There are nine departments or elected officials who are spending their budgets at less than a strait line goal of 58%. There may be some dollars there that can help out Current Expense. By bringing these departments and elected officials to a modest 55% the Board could find \$279,000. That would help out the ending fund balance and special funds wouldn't need to be pilfered.

Some departments and elected officials are overspending their budgets. If they are overspending now they can't catch up. Why is Human Resources at 65%? Last December they had to be bailed out. They have been given a budget they need to be held accountable.

- 5.2 Mary Jean Hrbacek stated she is also concerned about the 2009 and 2010 budgets, but she is taking a different approach. She believes the County has done everything it can do to tighten up the expenditure side. She is looking to the revenue side. The last thing she wants to do is pay more taxes. She has worked with several elected officials and the Department of Revenue in Olympia to check her facts.

There is a misconception that the roads department has their own money. The roads department, not being part of Current Expense fund, has not had to endure the cuts other departments have had to endure. The roads department has an ending fund balance, they get grants and they got more of the property tax money that was collected in 2008 than the Current Expense fund did. The primary determinant of the road fund budget, as well as the Current Expense fund, is what the Commissioners send to the Assessor indicating what the departments need. It is the purview of the Commissioners and the budget they adopt. There are changes that can be made to the roads budget. She recommends that the Board reviews the roads budget the same way they review other budgets and ask them to defer non-essential projects that don't require federal funding.

For 2010 she thinks there should be a levy shift from the roads dept to the general fund. She has spoken with the Assessor and the Department of Revenue and it appears this is doable within the existing levy guidelines. It is important to consider a levy shift because the accounting system for the Auditor's office has been deferred for two years. It is 1988 technology and programs aren't programming for it anymore. The approximate cost to replace it is \$300,000. The Sheriff's office will be required to change it's system for uniform crime reporting as well, which will cost \$50,000. The other concern is the contract settlement with the deputies, who haven't had a contract since 2006. There are significant one time expenses next year and the road levy shift is the way to approach that.

- 5.3 Arthur West stated he has owned property in this county for 5 years and he has never had reason to complain. He thanked the Board for doing a great job during hard economic times. Some of the economic burden involves the court system. As a consumer of the civil justice system he sees they do not have enough money to process the civil or criminal cases as quickly as they would like. He has spoken with the Court Administrator about how the court could run more efficiently and properly and the problem is due to the fact that the court employees don't have enough resources. When making cuts in the County budget he doesn't think the court system should be cut. It is

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 3**

imperative that the civil justice system function efficiently and quickly. He wouldn't object to a small increase in taxes if it would contribute to the proper functioning of the court. It hasn't reached a crisis point yet, but he hopes the Board doesn't cut the court system.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted it is difficult to go from the second fastest growing county in the State to the present situation in this recession. There are a lot of financial issues that need to be addressed.

- 5.4 Judge Toni Sheldon stated she oversees four of the budgets in the general fund, Superior Court, Superior Court Indigent Defense, Juvenile Court Probation Services and Juvenile Detention. She is also responsible for a number of budgets in the special funds, the Mason County Law Library, the Family Law Facilitator and the Family Court budget. She also has interest in other special fund budgets, such as the Murder Fund and Mental Health budget. She is interested to know when the elected officials and public will know which of the budgets may be impacted in the hearing scheduled for next Tuesday. She would like to know which areas of the budget will be impacted and in what amounts ahead of time so she can be prepared to come in and comment.
6. Adoption of Agenda - **Cmmr. Gallagher/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to adopt the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; S-aye; G-aye.**
7. Approval of Minutes – July 6, July 13, and July 20, 2009 briefing minutes, July 28, 2009 special meeting minutes and the July 28, 2009 regular meeting minutes.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson noted that she was absent from the July 28<sup>th</sup> meetings and could not make a motion to approve them.

**Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve the July 6, July 13, and July 20, 2009 briefing minutes. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; S-aye; G-aye.**

**Cmmr. Gallagher/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to approve the July 28, 2009 special meeting minutes and the July 28, 2009 regular meeting minutes. Motion carried. RE-abstain; S-aye; G-aye.**

8. Approval of Consent Agenda:
- 8.1 Approval for the Director of Utilities and Waste Management to sign an interagency agreement with the Department of Ecology to provide funding in the amount of \$125,000 for the purpose of assisting the Stormwater Work Group to develop a regional stormwater monitoring program.
- 8.2 Approval for the Director of Utilities and Waste Management to enter into professional services agreements with Leska Fore, Stillwater Sciences, and Herrera Engineering to assist the Stormwater Work Group with the development of a regional stormwater monitoring program. The cost is not to exceed \$124,000 and is funded from a Department of Ecology grant.
- 8.3 Approval of the interlocal agreement between Mason County and MACECOM for geographic information system (GIS) services data conversion. Compensation for these services shall be at the rate of \$75 per hour, not to exceed \$33,761.
- 8.4 Approval of Interagency Agreement 0963-67105 between the Mason County Juvenile Court and the State of Washington Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA) for the 2009-2011 biennium providing funding in the amount of \$6,000 for each year. This is for the Aggression Replacement Training (ART) program.
- 8.5 Approval of Warrants
- |                      |                          |              |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Claims Clearing Fund | Warrant #s 160805-160871 | \$120,354.87 |
| Salary Clearing Fund | Warrant #s 2755-2766     | \$ 16,145.04 |
| Direct Deposit Fund  | Deposit #s 14291-14671   | \$607,574.50 |

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 4**

8.6 Approval of the following contracts for the 2009 Mason County Fair & Rodeo: Deuce, music festival participant, \$0.00; Affected/Adam Larson, music festival participant, \$0.00; Offshore Radio, music festival participant, \$0.00; Anna's Bay Center for Music, music festival participant, \$0.00; Radio Service, music festival participant, \$0.00; Mary Celeste Band, music festival participant, \$0.00; Lance Shafer/Dokter O, music festival participant, \$0.00; Sideways Reign, music festival participant, \$1,000.00; Mystic Roots, music festival participant, \$500.00; Kelly Lester/Wally Moon, music festival participant, \$250.00; Kursa Latvian School, for entertainment, \$0.00 + beverage coupons; Lynn Hannah, professional services, \$600.00; Old Time Fiddlers, entertainment, \$0.00 + free vendor space; Morning Star Lions, professional services, \$1,100.00; Blue Ridge Mountain Fiddlers, entertainment, \$300.00; Civil Air Patrol, professional services, \$400.00; Walkin H Productions, professional services, \$150.00; Hood Canal Community Church Group, professional services, \$200.00; and Image In Action Design, professional services, \$3,000.00. For a total of \$7,500.00, these amounts are budgeted in the Fair budget.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated she would like item 8.6 removed for further discussion.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked why several of the contracts in item 8.6 were for \$0.

Brooke Ogg, Mason County Fair, clarified that this year in an effort to save money they had a music festival. All of the bands played for nothing upfront. They were competing for prizes for \$1000, \$500 and \$250. Only the groups that won prizes have a dollar amount on their contracts. The fair signed a contract with each group in case there were any issues.

**Cmmr. Gallagher/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to approve Consent items 8.1 through 8.5. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; S-aye; G-aye.**

**Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve item 8.6, with the exception of the contract with Lynn Hannah for professional service in the amount of \$600.00, which is tabled. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; S-aye; G-aye.**

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

9.1 Public hearing to consider the supplemental appropriation to the 2009 budget for the Employee Appreciation Fund due to a \$750 donation received from the Squaxin Island Tribe.

Diane Zoren, Central Operations, is seeking approval of the budget order to place the \$750, which is a donation from the Squaxin Island Tribe, into the Employee Appreciation Fund.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson clarified that this is money that was given to the County by the Tribe to put on the employee appreciation breakfast.

There were no questions for staff or public testimony.

**Cmmr. Gallagher/Ring Erickson moved and seconded to approve the supplemental appropriation to the 2009 budget for the Employee Appreciation Fund due to a \$750 donation received from the Squaxin Island Tribe. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; S-aye; G-aye. Budget Order (Exhibit A)**

Cmmr. Ring Erickson thanked the Tribe and stated this is an event the employees have looked forward to for many years. The County doesn't have the money anymore and the Tribe was very gracious.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 5**

- 9.2 Public hearing to consider adoption of a resolution revising Resolution No. 136-98, "Establishment of Abatement Repair/Demolition Fund".

Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development Co-Manger, stated this resolution was adopted in 1998 to establish the abatement repair and demolition fund. In April of 1999 there was a memorandum from the Commissioners that established that all building code enforcement penalties would be deposited into this fund to be used for abatement and demolition projects, as established by State and local building codes. Over the last ten years the fund has accrued approximately \$261,000.

She is asking the Board to consider revising the resolution to effect how the department puts money into the account and spends money out of the account. All of the revenue that comes from building code enforcement goes into this account. The site investigation fee would go directly into the account, but other fees association with enforcement penalties could be retained in the department's general budget account. They would like to expand how they spend this money to include the staff time used to process building code enforcement activities. Right now all of the money collected by the building code enforcement officer goes into this fund.

Questions for Staff

Cmmr. Gallagher asked what the average amount of time is that staff spends on enforcement activities.

Ms. Adkins stated it is one person's full time job. It is 8 hours a day, 5 days a week.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if this action were taken could the money be used to pay staff salaries.

Ms. Adkins stated it is not enough to pay their salaries, but it would help put something back in revenues.

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if the entire amount in the fund would be moved.

Ms. Adkins stated they would not let the fund go below \$35,000. There is another bond for \$10,000 for a specific project. They could transfer anything above that.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson stated for the last three and half years they have been trying to move Community Development to an enterprise fund. This is part of the operation that has not had the full cost recovery feature. Consequently they continue to run into a hole. It's not appropriate to ask people who get legal permits to pay for the enforcement of those that don't follow the law. This is a way to transfer the burden of paying for enforcement to the people that violate the law.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he's afraid that this would put more money into a department that is now spending more money that it is bringing in. It is a one time infusion of cash and unless there are reductions in spending in Community Development, the department will continue to bleed money from the ending fund balance. He would prefer that the entire fund go to the ending fund balance. He noted that this is the proper procedure to go through with special funds, to amend the resolution and then go through with the action.

Ms. Adkins stated it is her understanding that this would give them the ability to transfer the money and then the budget would have to be amended to balance back out.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 6**

Cmmr. Ring Erickson agreed this is the appropriate way look through these funds. To have the discussion, revise the policy and really understand what is going on with each of the funds.

Brenda Hirschi asked if this would make a difference in the department's 2010 budget.

Ms. Adkins stated she doesn't know the dollar figure, but amending the language will allow them to increase their revenue. She would need to look at the history of the fund.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated this \$261,000 has built up over 11 years and there have been abatements. It might be about \$20,000 a year.

There was no public testimony.

**Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to adopt the resolution revising resolution 136-98, Establishment of Abatement Repair/Demolition Fund, Fund No. 118-000-000, to allow expenditures to include reimbursement of staff time expended in the processing of building code enforcement activities, with revisions to Attachment A, the fees in item 3 should be redeveloped to show a full cost recovery for staff time plus 10% and item 7 should read \$45,000 instead of \$35,000. Motion carried unanimously. RE-aye; S-aye; G-aye. Resolution 67-09 (Exhibit B)**

9.3 Public hearing continued from July 14<sup>th</sup> to consider revisions to the Mason County Curbside Recycling Ordinance.

Cmmr. Sheldon noted that he provided an alternative ordinance to staff. It would make the curbside recycling voluntary.

David Baker, Utilities and Waste Management Program Manager, stated this hearing is about four amendments to Ordinance 147-08. It is not about rates for service. There are three agencies involved in these discussions. Mason County is responsible for setting a minimum service level ordinance that defines the service that is available to the community. The Utilities and Transportation Commission is a State agency that has regulatory authority over rate setting. The third agency is a private company, Mason County Garbage, who provides the service. These three agencies are like tools, each does a specific job. The goal is to provide a service for the community.

The State of Washington has identified a recycling goal for its residents of at least 50%. The goal was reinstated at the State level in 2007. As a result, one of the funding mechanisms Mason County benefits from is grants for the development of recycling programs. One of the ways these programs are identified is through the Solid Waste Management Plan. The Plan is developed by staff with the Solid Waste Advisory Committee to be compliant with State regulation and goals. The Plan establishes that recycling opportunities need to be available for residents. Among the recommendations was to establish a curbside recycling program. Curbside recycling has been proven nationally to have the highest participation, the most material recycled and the least contamination.

The blue boxes have a lot of contamination. The blue boxes were originally funded by a grant from the State. The grant has been shrinking over time so the cost of that service is increasingly on the County. Because of the limited number of options in the county, the blue box program has been kept alive longer than it should have. The program cost was over \$100,000 in 2008. There are fewer sites and they are further being reduced in September. One reason is there is no money and now there is another option available. With the alternative now viable the County has the

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 7**

opportunity to recover some of the expense of the blue box sites. This model has been used effectively by our neighbors and on a national level.

The four amendments to the resolution being proposed today include the code number. The ordinance was filed under Chapter 6 in the County Code and it should be under Chapter 13. The second item is the implementation schedule. Originally it was going to be phased in over a period of years. The hauling company has offered to provide the service countywide immediately. The Solid Waste Advisory Committee and staff were supportive of that action. The third item is the materials accepted. Due to drastic changes in the recycling markets the dairy tub will no longer be an accepted material. The fourth item to consider is the commodity credit. This is a rebate given back to customers to encourage their participation in the program. The commodity credit is being divided 30% to 70%, in favor of the customer. The hauler will retain up to 30% with the understanding that some of that money will be used to provide the recycling of glass. Glass will be collected at the County sites.

At the last hearing on July 14<sup>th</sup> there was a letter written to the Utilities and Transportation Commission with several questions. The UTC responded on July 31, 2009 with answers to those questions. Mr. Baker read the questions and answers received from the UTC.

The four amendments are what are before the Board today and there are a couple of options. To approve the amendments as presented, to not approve the amendments or to recommend further amendments to address the voluntary participation. It is the staff's opinion that additional amendments would require another public hearing. It would also delay implementation.

Questions for Staff

Cmmr. Sheldon asked if this program were voluntary, would it meet the State goal of 50%.

Mr. Baker answered no. Historically the drop box program has had a recycling rate of about 5%. Curbside recycling programs typically achieve 25-75% recycling rates. It is his understanding that when Mason County Garbage offered recycling on a voluntary basis the subscription rate was in the neighborhood of 10%.

Mike Johnson stated he used to own Mason County Garbage so he is familiar with the State regulations. One thing to consider when discussing a voluntary basis is the State regulates the rates. A voluntary system would make the rates higher, which would further reduce the participation. The cost is the same to the company for equipment regardless of how many customers participate. That is why other counties went with the mandatory program.

Sandy Fredrickson stated she understands the concern regarding senior citizens and nobody wants taxes to go up. If this is a concern, what research has been done to help the senior citizens aside from not making the program mandatory?

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he has listened to constituents. He thinks seniors could get together to combine their recycling to avoid an increase. Most of the seniors he knows are on a fixed income. There is still time to make changes to the ordinance. He voted for the mandatory recycling originally, but he doesn't think he had enough information. He made a mistake with his vote and he wants this opportunity to rectify it.

An audience member stated he use to recycle at the bin at Red Apple. The bin there was almost always full. If the bins are always full how is the 5% recycling rate calculated.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 8**

Mr. Baker answered there were 12 blue box sites that were full on a regular basis. Service included a driver and truck coming out to replace the bin. The busier the site, the more the service costs. People also needed to be sent out to keep the boxes clean. Maintaining the site was problematic. Overall, when all of the garbage processed at the facility is compared to how much recycling was processed, all of the blue boxes combined worked out to be about 5% of the total waste processed in the county.

An audience member asked about senior citizens, those on a fixed income and the disabled. How are they going to handle a 96 gallon can?

Mr. Baker stated he agrees. One of the concerns is that the program is a one sized fits all. It is not going to work for everyone. There are allowable exemptions written into the ordinance and there are smaller size containers available.

An audience member asked if the goal is 50% recycling participation.

Mr. Baker clarified that the goal is 50% material recovery.

An audience member stated she used to recycle in Kitsap County and there were small bins. Is there a way to do something like that?

Rik Fredrickson, Mason County Garbage, stated they did have a program that used the smaller bins but most people didn't like it because there were three separate bins and you had to separate the materials. There was a greater participation rate with one cart and material doesn't blow around the neighborhood.

**Cmmr. Sheldon called a recess at 10:29 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 10:41 a.m.**

An audience member asked if how many counties in Washington have this as a mandatory program.

Mr. Fredrickson stated on the west side of the mountains most of the programs are mandatory.

An audience member asked what county Mason County compares to in order to set a rate.

Mr. Fredrickson stated it is his understanding that the company submits their costs, miles driven etc, that's where the rates come from.

Eddie Westmoreland, Waste Connections, stated the same program is being rolled out in Island County and they are being used as a comparison.

An audience member asked if it would be mandatory in Island County and have they looked at alternatives.

Mr. Westmoreland answered yes it will be mandatory. A voluntary program would be \$16 per month with less than 10% participation. They are recycling similarly with a box program. This is the best, most cost effective way to provide the service. The company's collection revenues will go down with this proposal because of people reducing their garbage service. People still have the choice to not subscribe to garbage service and self haul to the transfer station. The State sets the rates and keeps costs at a minimum. The company hasn't raised garbage rates in the last eight years in Mason County. They are not here to make a ton of money. Recycling commodities have gone down 85% since November.

An audience member asked if it costs the County \$100,000 year for blue boxes, what will this program cost the County.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 9**

Mr. Baker stated curbside recycling wouldn't be the responsibility of the County so they would only maintain the expense of the blue boxes. With this proposal the blue box sites would be scaled back, so annual operating costs should be reduced from \$100,000 a year to about \$50,000. The County is not profiting in any way from the new program.

An audience member stated the terrain of Island County is nothing like Mason County so how can they be compared. Mason County is considerably larger.

Mr. Westmoreland stated length-wise Island County is a little bit longer than Mason County. The terrain isn't taken into consideration. It is the distance traveled between customer collections. Island County will also have a higher rate.

An audience member asked it has been determined how many subscribers Mason County Garbage will lose if this becomes mandatory.

Mr. Fredrickson stated they have already had approximately 200 people stop their service and they estimate about 500 people total will stop their service. In conversations with their customers they have been able to show that by participating in the recycling they can change their garbage service levels and save a little money. There have been more people that have changed their service level that way.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson went over the statistics of Island County versus Mason County and noted they are comparable counties.

An audience member asked if the reason the blue boxes are being taken away is because lack of grant money. Could taxes be raised \$2 per person in order to pay to keep the blue boxes?

Mr. Baker stated they have less grant funding to support the blue box program. They will only be able to maintain 4 blue boxes in the county. There are jurisdictions where tax assessments are used to fund utilities such as garbage service. He hasn't fully explored that option given the current economic climate for adding taxes. It isn't a model used in Washington State as far as he is aware of.

An audience member asked if this is being done because it is a State mandate or because it is the best thing for the county.

Mr. Baker stated the County is mandated by the State to have a recycling program and to make it's own determination on what will be an effective program. It is the longstanding opinion of staff and the State that a 5% recovery rate is not acceptable. This model has been proven to increase the recovery rate so that is why the County is looking at this strategy.

An audience member asked if making this mandatory will encourage illegal dumping.

Mr. Fredrickson stated he doesn't believe it will. He believes illegal dumping is a result of laziness and a lack of respect for the environment and neighborhood. It is not a cost issue.

Cmmr. Gallagher asked if the majority of customers have a weekly garbage rate.

Mr. Fredrickson stated the majority of customer have one 32 gallon can weekly. It would cost \$21.06 per month with recycling for that service.

Cmmr. Gallagher asked if garbage service were cut back to once per month, because more is going into recycling, what would be the rate.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 10**

Mr. Fredrickson stated that rate would \$11.55.

Cmmr. Ring Erickson asked what rate relief is available for low income people through the Community Action Council.

Emmett Dobey, Utilities and Waste Management, stated two utility rate discounts are allowed per year for individual customers through the Community Action Council.

An audience member asked what a 20 gallon can with recycling would cost for once per week pick up.

Mr. Fredrickson stated the mini can would reduce the rate by about \$2.

Public Testimony

Gerald Hard criticized the process used to implement this program. He has reviewed the Mason County Commissioners' meeting minutes from October 2008 through July 2009 regarding recycling. He read aloud several passages of the meeting minutes. In general, it appears to him that the Mason County government wants a mandatory recycling program and has implemented it with a policy to ensure minimum citizen participation in the decision. His review of 40 weeks of Mason County Commissioners' meeting minutes reflects recycling addressed in only 4 meetings. It had to have been worked offline for sometime. The vote for the original ordinance was schedule for December 23, 2008 during the holidays and bad weather, ensuring minimal attendance. He thanked the Board for holding this meeting and having the Utilities and Transportation meeting rescheduled.

Larry Blackerby is representing both his wife Beatrice and himself. He is adamantly opposed to the mandatory requirement of this ordinance. He has cancelled his service with Mason County Garbage. If Commissioner Sheldon can get the support another Commissioner to pass the revision to make this a non-mandatory program he will reconsider his garbage service. He will continue his recycling at Wilson Recycling Company.

Sandra Dahlquist stated she emailed all three Commissioners and received a nice response from David Baker. She also received a response from Commissioner Gallagher and Commissioner Ring Erickson. She has not heard from her own Commissioner, Tim Sheldon. She read aloud the email she sent to the Commissioners. She asked the Board to consider the demographics and age of the constituents. They are not up to carrying these heavy cans. She has a steep winding driveway so she contacted Mason County Garbage. They can either deliver a 64 gallon cart, which she cannot handle, or for a price they will drive up her driveway. She just resurfaced her driveway so she cannot have a heavy truck coming up it. She urges the Board to reconsider the mandatory program. She is voluntarily recycling already. She has cancelled her garbage service.

Janet O'Conner stated she is in support of mandatory recycling. If this meeting were at a different time of day when people weren't working, there would be more people here to support it. All of the people she knows are in support of this.

Dave Shepherd stated his concern with the program is the mandatory portion. He would probably opt to have the program but he doesn't like the mandatory portion. He already recycles and does yard waste composting. He also has a concern about the size of the container. The cost of a 64 gallon can is the same as a 96 gallon can. He suspects that education is part of the problem. Everyone needs to know what's in it for the individual. He encourages the Commissioners to adopt Commissioner Sheldon's amendment.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 11**

Tracy Farrell works for the City of Shelton and runs their recycling program as a coordinator. She is in support of a mandatory program. It is a practical and effective way to increase the materials diverted from the solid waste stream. It provides a service to the entire county at the lowest cost. She has managed to reduce costs to the City and its residents, and increase recycling volumes and participation. The cost saved are by way of reduced tipping fees and transportation costs. It is a worthwhile program. It is the best way to go for the entire county.

Rik Fredrickson, Mason County Garbage, stated he hopes he addressed most of the issues and questions people have. People get the agencies confused. They are a regulated utility and their rates are set by the State. Other utilities have base prices and then add on rates. PUD bills, phone service and cable service all have a base prices. This Board has taken the lead to protect the environment of the county. This recovers more recycling and makes it more convenient for people who can't get to a transfer station to recycle. If you realistically look at the cost involved with the service and the convenience of the cart, for \$7 a month you will see it wouldn't be economical to load up your car and drive to the transfer station. There has been a lot of misinformation about their company in letters to the Journal. The company that owns Mason County Garbage is called Waste Connections. They are based out of Fulsom, California and they employ 27 men and women from this community. They return 4 million dollars a year to the county in the form of wages, fuel, rent, etc.

Mike Johnson voiced his support of the curbside program in the in the proposed, non-voluntary way. He believes the voluntary method is a mistake. The rate would be so high that it would be contrary to what is trying to be accomplished.

Conley Watson would like to table this to leave it as a voluntary program right now. There needs to be more concrete answers from the UTC.

Marlene Hohn stated there are 5 people on top of her hill and it is a narrow gravel road. There is no room for the bins at the bottom of the hill. She is concerned about leaving the recycling bins at the bottom of the hill because people will put garbage in them. They are big recyclers and use the blue bins constantly. She doesn't care about the price but they have a problem they don't know how to solve.

Chris Giraldes stated he is the operations manager at Mason County Garbage. He has discussed the program with a lot of people over the past several months. Most of the time when people call they are totally against the program, but it is a matter of education. Once people understand a little more they change their minds. When people get used to it, it will be a great program. It would be detrimental to the county, the community and the environment if this doesn't go through.

Steve Bloomfield thanked Mason County Garbage for doing a great job. He thinks there are other considerations to take into account. People are spending \$8 to get \$2 worth of garbage out of these bins. Recycling is a net loss with truck costs, labor costs, material cost, traffic flow and other issues. It's not cut and dry. This is just exchanging one thing for another.

Eddie Westmoreland, Division Vice President for Waste Connections, thanked everyone for their thoughtful testimony. He oversees the company's Western Washington assets. He also sits on the State Solid Waste Advisory Committee. What is being talked about is real recycling for Mason County in the most cost effective manner possible. Some important considerations for the County to keep in mind are the cost of the blue box system, which is only recovering 5% of the total waste stream. The State has adopted the Beyond Waste Plan, which mandates that everyone get to 0% waste in the future. 5% recovery won't get to that goal. The other potential cost is not adopting a reasonable program that gets closer the 50% levels. The State could withhold the County's coordinated prevention grants from the

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 12**

Department of Ecology, which will impact ratepayers. The savings is a reduction in tip fees from shipping out 95% of waste to a landfill in Eastern Washington.

The County will save approximately \$100,000 on eliminating the blue box system. Some of those funds could be used to offset the costs of the program to the elderly or those on fixed income. His company, due to State statutes, cannot grant those exemptions. In the ordinance that was adopted there are options for those with long driveways and limited mobility. If you can get your garbage can to where it is picked up he can provide a label for another garbage can to pick up recyclables in. The cost of the service is most effective as a mandatory program. There would be no meaning full participation if it were not mandatory. The company is committed to Mason County and making this program a success. Keep this a mandatory program so the rates stay low and it is an environmental sustainable and economically sustainable program.

Cmmr. Gallagher took the gavel for the Chair to make a motion.

Cmmr. Sheldon stated he did vote for recycling to be mandatory last year. He has heard from citizens and he believes if he had that vote to do again he would do it differently. He admits his mistake. He would like to allow this to be voluntary. The way the program has been presented today would be a good fit for many people in the county, but he would like options for the individuals that have contacted him with concerns. It is an increase for people's budgets. When other people realize that, there will be an outcry and a need for a lot of education.

**Cmmr. Sheldon made a motion to amend Ordinance 147-08 to add the phrase "but allows for voluntary participation in curbside recycling" after "Whereas this ordinance enacts a level of service which cover all residents in Mason County", to strike "integral" and insert "voluntary" in Exhibit A, Section 1 B, number 1, to add "Residents requesting curbside solid waste service may opt out of curbside recycling service" to the beginning of the paragraph in Section 3 A, number 3, and to strike "all" and add "recycling programs for those solid waste customers choosing the curbside recycling option" to the first paragraph of Section G.**

The motion died due to a lack of a second.

Cmmr. Gallagher read the background material provided regarding the proposed amendments.

**Cmmr. Gallagher made a motion to approve the minimum levels of types of service for the collection of residential recyclable materials in the urban and rural areas of Mason County, excluding the City of Shelton, through a residential collection program as set forth in Exhibit A, attached to the latest ordinance.**

**Cmmr. Ring Erickson made a friendly amendment to Commissioner Gallagher's motion to amend ordinance 147-08 relating to minimum levels of service to include four technical amendments supporting a basic policy change in December of last year, with instruction to staff to work with the Utilities and Transportation Commission to look for a senior rate and to work with the hauler to provide the best levels of service.**

Cmmr. Sheldon noted the code revision should be part of the motion.

Cmmr. Gallagher withdrew his motion.

**BOARD OF MASON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PROCEEDINGS**  
**August 4, 2009 - PAGE 13**

**Cmmr. Ring Erickson/Gallagher moved and seconded to approve the amendments to Ordinance 147-08, to remove Chapter 6.72.045 and create Chapter 13.30 to replace the former chapter and implement Exhibit A. Motion carried. RE-aye; G-aye; S-nay. Ordinance 68-09 (Exhibit C)**

10. Other Business (Department Heads and Elected Officials) –
  - 10.1 Cmmr. Ring Erickson instructed Utilities and Waste Management staff to work with the Utilities and Transportation Commission to develop a senior or low income rate for Mason County Garbage customers and also to work with Mason County Garbage to provide the largest number of options available.
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 12:02 p.m.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
MASON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tim Sheldon, Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lynda Ring Erickson, Commissioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shannon Goudy, Clerk of the Board

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ross Gallagher, Commissioner