

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes**  
**October 18, 2004**

(Note audio tape (#3) dated October 18, 2004  
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

*(This document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript)*

=====

## **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Steve Clayton at 6:00 p.m.  
Chair Bill Dewey took over upon his arrival at 6:30 pm.

## **2. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** Bill Dewey, Steve Clayton, Wendy Ervin, Terri Jeffreys, Tim Wing, Mark Drain and Diane Edgin.

**Staff Present:** Bob Fink, Darren Nienaber, Allan Borden, Susie Ellingson.

## **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the June 14, 2004, June 21, 2004 and July 6, 2004 were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

June 14, 2004:

On page 5 under (#1555) it should read: ...'because there are dissenting opinions'.

On page 20 under (#3005) it should read: ...'boat ramp' ...

On page 22 under (#0222) it should read: ...'anything wider than this exemption' ...

July 6, 2004:

On page 20 under (#2440) it should read: ...'So what do you want to' ...

On page 29 under (#2080) it should read: 'I'd like to see some togetherness there in Belfair'.

## **4. NEW BUSINESS**

(#0240) Steve Clayton: We have two hearings tonight. The first one is for the Comprehensive Plan and adjustments for the Belfair UGA. We reviewed this briefly last month and staff has some further recommendations.

(#0255) Allan Borden: My name is Allan Borden and I'm with the Department of Community Development. These are proposed changes to the Comp Plan within Chapter III-2 on UGA's particularly the section on the Belfair UGA. The new text includes changes in the Comp Plan when the Belfair UGA is adopted. The Department of Community Development proposes revisions to the Mason County Comp Plan to be

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

considered by the PAC following adoption of the Belfair UGA Plan zoning and development standards. The changes are primarily deletions to the current Comp Plan text where certain policies have been updated or replaced by the policies that are included in the Belfair UGA Plan. These changes would go into effect at the same time the adoption of the UGA Plan takes place, so that there are no conflicts as to what policies apply when development is proposed and is under review. Your review tonight will provide the public comment on these changes in preparation of the BOCC hearing on this. There are several pages that are attached. They primarily maintain the general UGA boundary policies but under the Belfair UGA other specific policies are deleted. The ones that remain have to do with provision of services in the UGA while infrastructure like water and sewer come on line in the UGA. Things like residential policies, commercial policies, industrial and open space policies are replaced by what's contained in the Belfair UGA plan. We've already reviewed in June and July the UGA Plan itself. It was forwarded to the BOCC and they haven't scheduled a public hearing yet on it.

I'm here tonight to provide the changes that need to take place in the Comp Plan at the time that UGA Plan is adopted. There is one residential policy that is proposed to be maintained and that's Policy U-309 that appears on Page III-2.7. It says that 'New residential development shall be reasonably accessible to public transportation. New subdivisions should incorporate transit facilities into their site designs'.

(#0385) Terri Jeffreys: The policies that are struck out, who struck those out?

(#0390) Allan Borden: The Department of Community Development.

(#0395) Terri Jeffreys: Did the Department feel that these were addressed in the Plan that we approved or that they were conflicting, or what?

(#0400) Allan Borden: For the most part, they were stated in the Plan and in order to avoid any duplication they were struck out and also so that there's no conflict in what policies come into play.

(#0430) Tim Wing: Is there anything struck out that is not addressed in the Plan?

(#0435) Allan Borden: No, if it's not struck out it's not covered in the Plan.

(#0445) Wendy Ervin: As I read it, the struck out portion is basically guidelines for the urban planning for the Belfair area and then what you've got as additions in here is the accomplished plan. One is a blue print and another is the final model.

(#0460) Allan Borden: That's correct.

(#0465) Steve Clayton: Those aren't additions, though. The ones you call additions are already existing.

(#0472) Wendy Ervin: Right, they're already existing.

(#0475) Steve Clayton: They're already existing in the county plan.

(#0478) Allan Borden: Let me direct you to page III-2.3. There are four subsections that are proposed. When those policies that are actually in the UGA Plan are adopted they will be brought into the Comp Plan under these four sections; having to do with land use, transportation, parks, trails and open space and water quality. The bolded text is actually place holders for those policies.

(#0500) Steve Clayton: So to clarify the items such as 2.10, General Policies, those already exist. The only additions the Department is doing to the Plan is the dark bold on page 2.3. On the further pages 2.6 through 2.10 those are things that exist currently that we're striking out from the Plan.

(#0520) Allan Borden: Right, except for the first policy on the top of 2.7.

(#0534) Terri Jeffreys: Can you tell me if BUGA 5a, the two alternatives, are provided for in some other development regulations?

(#0550) Allan Borden: I can't recall that they're anywhere else. They're strict development standards on

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

providing urban services in the transition.

(#0560) Bob Fink: In the regulations under Title 16, which regulates subdivisions, there are provisions for the adequate provision of services, sewer and water and other public services, and that's all it says there. There's also a provision that to approve a subdivision it has to be consistent with the policies of the Comp Plan. We've already been applying this provision in Shelton, which has similar language, and Belfair, which is existing language, and reviewing subdivisions to see how they address adequacy of facilities.

(#0605) Diane Edgin: On a subdivision, what is the minimum standard street width?

(#0612) Darren Nienaber: It depends on the subdivision.

(#0618) Bob Fink: There's different standards depending on the type of subdivision or short plat and the number of lots.

(#0630) Diane Edgin: I was in a senior subdivision down in Centralia called Hunters Walk. There were cars parked on both sides of the road, and a fire truck or an ambulance would have had a heck of a time getting through there.

(#0638) Allan Borden: That's in another county that's been falling behind on their Comp Plan review.

(#0650) Bob Fink: One of the other things that happens in the review of subdivisions is that they do get reviewed by the Fire Marshall to make sure about the width of the street, cul-de-sacs, number of access points. There are a number of people who are advocating for smaller streets and there have been some communities like Pierce County who work with their Emergency Management providers and come up with creative ways to have both smaller streets and adequate access, like with turnouts and other tools that can be used to provide for adequate access.

(#0700) Steve Clayton: Do you have any other thoughts on this, Allan? Do we have any public testimony? Let the record show that there is public here but no public input participation. We will now close the public testimony portion of it. Any thoughts?

(#0715) Wendy Ervin: I think this is all very straight forward and has all been covered. What I see is we're formalizing what has come before us already.

(#0730) Tim Wing: Wasn't it the case that the Belfair Village Plan was inserted into the Comp Plan because it was required and at a later date the sub-area planning group was formed and made a more comprehensive examination of the Belfair area and came up with a plan and now we are just taking out a lot of this old Belfair Village Plan and replacing it to create a new place for the Belfair Plan when it's approved by the BOCC?

(#0745) Allan Borden: That is correct. It was in 1999 when the Village Plan was updated and placed in the Comp Plan as the most current planning effort in the Belfair UGA.

(#0758) Terri Jeffreys: By inserting the Belfair Plan by reference in here does that also insert the background reports that were prepared to assist that plan, like the economic market report and the transportation report?

(#0768) Bob Fink: That hasn't been done yet but that was the intent, as I understand it, except in your recommendations you did have some conditions on that so I would think that would be the intent when everything gets approved would then be all part of the same package incorporated by reference and become an appendix to the Comp Plan.

(#0784) Terri Jeffreys: By approving the Belfair Plan are we required to or were we asked to make a comment or recommendation on the EIS?

(#0795) Bob Fink: You've already taken your action on it. The SEPA review was released in draft and it still hasn't been put in final form yet. The requirements under the law is that it be finalized in the FEIS, or supplemental EIS, be issued at least seven days prior to any action by the county, which will be made by the

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

BOCC. Although we could certainly provide you copies of that, there's no need for action by the PAC on it prior to action by the county.

(#0820) Terri Jeffreys: So the draft that we saw may get some revision and the folks that will determine whether they want to accept that version will be the BOCC?

(#0825) Bob Fink: Right, the BOCC can change your recommendation and the SEPA will be probably changed in response to comments received and drafts in response to some changes you recommended be done to the Plan. There's still the public process involved before the BOCC.

(#0835) Tim Wing: I move we accept these changes as recommended.

(#0840) Mark Drain: I second that motion.

(#0845) Steve Clayton: Okay, we have a motion and a second to accept the changes dated October 18<sup>th</sup>. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Next up staff put together a Comprehensive Plan for Capital Facilities.

(#0865) Allan Borden: I'm going to hand out something that I got today. This is a Mason County Facilities & Grounds Capital Improvement Program plan. It goes from 2004 to 2009. It is for a six-year planning horizon. It actually would be inserted following page 40 in the version of the CIP. This deals with the physical buildings that are county facilities. What I am presenting to you is the review of the proposed CIP's for water and sewer, solid waste, parks and recreation, transportation, facilities and grounds for the program periods from 2004 to 2010. The Mason County Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Element addresses the infrastructure and services to be provided by government and utilities to support anticipated population and economic growth in the planning period of 2005 to 2025. As part of the beginning of the Capital Facilities Element update for 2005, the Department of Community Development proposes a review of the CIP's improvement programs of several county departments as these departments prepare their portions of the Mason County budget for 2005 and for subsequent years to 2010. Such CIP's enable the BOCC to understand the goals and projects to be undertaken in each of the program years, propose funding strategies to support these projects, and facilitate a coordinated approach to remain concurrent with infrastructure needs as population and economic growth progresses in various areas of Mason County. The PAC's role in this review of the CIP programs for each of the departments is to understand the scope of the anticipated programs. The tables for 2004 or 2005 program year to the 2010 program year represent anticipated revenues and costs that tie in directly to the Mason County budget for these program years. So the actual document here that starts off with Capital Facilities this is the format we're currently going to use to update the Capital Facilities Element. The real elements I wanted you to understand are the different tables that indicate revenues and expenditures for the years 2004 or 2005 to 2010. The primary emphasis here is to move forward with the scope of budgeting over the next five fiscal years. Some of the chapters actually don't have up to date information in them; we anticipate that that information will be either updated or expanded as we work towards the update of the Capital Facilities Element.

(#1130) Terri Jeffreys: I'm looking at page VI.4-15 for the Rustlewood Water System. There's costs shown but no anticipated revenues shown. Missing from this table would be where are the revenues coming from?

(#1145) Allan Borden: The revenues are on the bottom of each one of the tables; Cost and Funding. Some of the utility programs actually generate their revenues from service rates and some of them through grant funds.

(#1165) Bill Dewey: What exactly are you expecting from the PAC? The way the cover reads the charge is to understand the scope of the anticipated programs. Are you looking for input from us or are we just supposed to understand it?

(#1178) Bob Fink: You have an understanding of the goals and policies of the county and the direction the county is heading in. To some degree these capital projects implement several of those goals. So there's an interaction between what you do and what these capital plans are. Also, as a technical matter, these amendments are a part of the Comp Plan and it's one of your responsibilities to make recommendations on

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

changes to the Comp Plan. What we would expect is that you review this in light of your understanding and knowledge of the Comp Plan and see if there are any issues you're concerned about. These programs are all developed by the departments responsible.

(#1245) Diane Edgin: What does the asterisk next to 'Grants' under the Rustlewood Sewer Worksheet mean? It's not marked on the other systems.

(#1265) Allan Borden: The Utilities and Waste Management Director gave me this information so I'm not sure. All I can anticipate is that they might be pursuing grant funds to relieve the burden of loans that tend to add overall costs to projects.

(#1300) Darren Nienaber: The 'Total Costs' and the 'Total Funding' are both \$1,712,000.00 and it looks like the 'Loans' and the 'Rates' are \$1,712,000.00 so it looks like they weren't intending to have any grants for Rustlewood.

(#1315) Allan Borden: Each one of these tables kind of balances out.

(#1320) Terri Jeffreys: The departmental space needs ... there are huge deficits but no lists of actual ways to alleviate that. I don't see any specific projects in the document you just passed out. I see a general 'Capital Improvement Report' for existing facilities and I'm assuming that ...

(#1335) Allan Borden: This is a table from probably 1995 ...

(#1340) Bob Fink: Right, it was done prior to the adoption of the Plan in 1996. There was a facilities study done regarding the space needs of different departments. To answer your question, as part of their ongoing projects, they have spent a certain amount of money each year in making capital improvements and some of those have included space expansions. Some of them have been in reconfiguring space in moving different departments. So there has some additional space but the table hasn't been updated since that time. There are no specific plans at this point for providing additional space.

(#1400) Steve Clayton: So we're going to be approving this for next year and it's going to be brought back to us more current?

(#1420) Allan Borden: This Chapter VI - Capital Facilities Element, when it comes back to you mid year next year it will be updated and any portion with new information will be integrated into it.

(#1435) Steve Clayton: So where it says the jail it doesn't give any credit that it was expanded and things like that.

(#1440) Allan Borden: That's correct. It's a little confusing because if I had given you a document that had five or six table with revenues and expenditures you would have even been more confused than you are right now in the sense that now you have a context of how those tables of funding programs apply.

(#1455) Bob Fink: Right. We will update the Comp Plan next year and this wasn't intended to be a complete update but we do need to keep our six year capital plan current and that's what was intended here. When we do a major revision in 2005 then we'll update the other sections that are informational things.

(#1484) Terri Jeffreys: So the line in the table 10 that says Capital Improvements / Repairs Existing Facilities where it shows \$250,000 running from 2004 to 2009 it that just somewhat of a placeholder or is that ongoing maintenance?

(#1494) Bob Fink: I would say it's ongoing projects of various types and they haven't identified any more detail exactly just what those projects will be. For instance, this last year they did some remodeling in several of the county buildings; in Building 3, where they remodeled the entire building where the Permit Assistance Center is. It's much more user friendly and more space for the applicants we're dealing with. They also remodeled this building and expanded Building 8. So they've taken a more general approach in this case in saying they're going to budget so much for improvements because you can see there's a large number of deficits.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

So every year they'll do a certain amount but not necessarily identifying the specific project.

(#1550) Terri Jeffreys: And the 'Debt Services' line, that's just an accumulation of many bonds or what?

(#1565) Bob Fink: There is a bond that has been issued by the county. There are some debt services and they're basically put in here for the county. They're not necessary information for the capital improvements part of this table but they're included as information to help you identify what resources are available. Or in the case of bond services, not available.

(#1585) Allan Borden: We're going to come back on an annual basis with another CIP.

(#1590) Bob Fink: We're moving to better integrate the CIP with the annual budget process. As they finalize the budget for the coming year then we would come back and update the CIP with the final numbers for the coming year, plus extending it for another year, for the six year program. Each year you'd have to add another year if you want to have a six year program.

(#1620) Allan Borden: New projects come into the program in that additional year and projects are completed and new ones come forward.

(#1628) Bob Fink: This is part of the process in identifying those and it's something we're trying to get more formalized and combine it with the budget process.

(#1638) Allan Borden: Public Works has a transportation improvement program that they call their six year transportation program. That's been in the news for the last five years. We're trying to establish it for the other departments; Parks and Recreation, Facilities, as well as Utilities and Waste Management. There's a lot of infrastructure that's anticipated to come on board in the next several years because of improvements in Belfair and expansion of services in North Bay.

(#1668) Tim Wing: You said that the purpose of bringing this to us is so that we can understand the scope of it? I see that as different than approving it. I understand the scope of it but what do you want us to do with it?

(#1685) Bill Dewey: I heard from Bob at the beginning that they're looking for input from us on this so what specifically are you looking for? Are we supposed to amend it and then adopt it?

(#1690) Bob Fink: First, to hold a public hearing and then to make a motion that would be a recommendation to send it forward to the BOCC as proposed or if you have a recommendation of some change then you could certainly make that recommendation.

(#1710) Bill Dewey: Let's go ahead and open the public hearing and take testimony. Are any of you folks here tonight to take testimony? Okay, we'll close the public hearing and note that no one here offered any testimony.

(#1725) Steve Clayton: There are some things here that are planning policies that are from the Department of Community Development and then there are some that are from individuals. Like on page 6, CF-206, and it appears to say that we need to sewer the entire county and I think it would be better if we were to remove the word 'sewer' because we're on septic on most of the county and this policy says it applies to the entire county.

(#1755) Allan Borden: It's an incorrect inference. We should probably add 'adequate sanitary sewer or septic system'.

(#1770) Steve Clayton: I can live with that. Just as long as we address that the bulk of the county is not on sewer and not planning to be on sewer.

(#1780) Allan Borden: It's under the concurrency policies and concurrency isn't necessarily confined to UGA's where sewer would be provided.

(#1790) Steve Clayton: On the next page, under Essential Public Facilities, the way I'm reading that is we're

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

looking to just do essential public facilities in the rural areas. The whole concept there appears to direct us to putting those in unincorporated areas.

(#1810) Wendy Ervin: Could that be because the UGA plan for those urban areas takes care of that and this is for non urban areas?

(#1820) Allan Borden: Technically, the UGA's are still unincorporated. Unless they become a city they're still unincorporated.

(#1830) Darren Nienaber: Outside the City of Shelton it's all of Mason County.

(#1838) Allan Borden: It is a matter of terminology and you could say 'UGA's and Rural Areas'.

(#1840) Steve Clayton: So we're not just directing these facilities to unincorporated areas? So we're just looking to direct them in unincorporated areas because that's all we have jurisdiction over?

(#1850) Bob Fink: That's right.

(#1852) Steve Clayton: I can accept that as an explanation; we don't have jurisdiction within the incorporated so the text here is addressed at essential public services in part of the county we do have jurisdiction over.

(#1862) Bob Fink: That's right.

(#1865) Bill Dewey: In that same section I had a question. Should it state somewhere in there that we should be trying to work cooperatively with the tribes, as well?

(#1880) Allan Borden: That third sentence in CF-401 it says 'Work cooperatively with the City of Shelton and neighboring counties' ... we could certainly add 'tribal entities' in there.

(#1910) Bill Dewey: Under CF-50, do we still have RAC's?

(#1916) Allan Borden: Yes, Hoodspout and Union and Taylor Towne.

(#1939) Bill Dewey: So you're going to require businesses in those RAC's to connect to sewers, but based on this they're not given the option of locating their business on septic?

(#1944) Allan Borden: If there's no 'existing' and there's no 'proposed' then they would connect to their own septic system.

(#1948) Wendy Ervin: How about 'existing or proposed public sewer system, if available'?

(#1952) Steve Clayton: That reads clean; if there's a sewer there they have to hook up and if there's not ...

(#1960) Bill Dewey: So you're saying that reads clean as it is?

(#1962) Tim Wing: No, I don't think it says that you can put something there on a septic system.

(#1975) Diane Edgin: I think 'if available' needs to be in there.

(#1980) Wendy Ervin: Yes, new development is required to connect to proposed public sewer systems. Well, if they're only proposed they don't exist and so the way this reads you'd have to wait until you got that proposed public sewer system.

(#1995) Mark Drain: I like the way it is.

(#2000) Tim Wing: My problem is that if there's no proposed or existing system can a business be built in a RAC? And it should be allowed. I know they'd have to put in a septic system.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#2020) Mark Drain: I don't think this disallows it; I think this just states that when those are available they have to hook up.

(#2028) Bob Fink: Right. This provides the basis to put a condition on a building permit to require a connection to the sewer if the sewer is extended to service the site.

(#2038) Bill Dewey: So, Bob, in your opinion, you feel this is clear?

(#2040) Bob Fink: If there's disagreement about its meaning there may be a question about how clear it is but that's the intent.

(#2050) Tim Wing: I don't think it's clear at all.

(#2052) Darren Nienaber: Do you want us to insert 'if available'?

(#2054) Tim Wing: I think it has to say that or otherwise somebody is going to tell them they can't build that building because there isn't sewer there to hook up to.

(#2064) Bill Dewey: I think we should add 'if available'.

(#2068) Wendy Ervin: What they're telling them is to either hook up or design for the future.

(#2074) Steve Clayton: There's another part of the Comp Plan that says that they can be provided via septic, right, Bob?

(#2078) Bob Fink: There are DR's regarding this. It's addressed in a number of different places but basically a building that requires waste water treatment has to connect to a waste water treatment system of some type. What this provision was intended to require was that if a public system was available they were required to hook up to it or when it becomes available.

(#2115) Tim Wing: Why does it have to be municipally organized and owned? Why does it have to be owned publically?

(#2130) Steve Clayton: There's Alderbrook. You can't force Alderbrook to accept neighboring residences or businesses to their private system.

(#2140) Tim Wing: I'm not asking them to require that but it just looks like they prohibit you to hook up to a privately owned system. I guess that is a privately owned system. If you had a business and Alderbrook had the capacity to take care of their effluent, why would it have to be owned by a municipality?

(#2148) Bob Fink: It requires the development to hook up to the public system that's available, if there is one or when one becomes available.

(#2165) Bill Dewey: Tim's point is that maybe there could be a situation where a public sewer system is owned by a private entity.

(#2175) Bob Fink: A public system has to be owned or guaranteed by a public entity. Public water systems are owned by private companies that don't need to be guaranteed by public entities. There's nothing in here that prohibits you from having a community, on site septic that would not qualify as public because it doesn't serve enough houses to be required to be a public owned system. It's state law that any waste water treatment system that serves more than about 39 houses or more than 1 business has to be public.

(#2250) Tim Wing: I just don't want something in here that would allow somebody that wanted to stop development to say you can't build with private money a small sewer system to take care of some businesses. There's two of them in Belfair. One of them is the Safeway complex and the other one is Belltown Square. They were not put in by the county or managed by the county.



## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#2300) Bob Fink: This is not my area of expertise. Your question should be addressed to the Health Department, as far as the technical aspects go. I do know that this was not the intent to prevent community systems or other legal ways of dealing with septic and require hook up. It was intended to require hook up to the public system if the public system is available.

(#2355) Tim Wing: I have a problem with that. I just don't want someone to use this to stop development by saying that you have to have a public system here.

(#2365) Bill Dewey: Is that second sentence in CF-502 required?

(#2368) Steve Clayton: Well, actually, it's a safeguard. As an example, Robin Hood in Union there which is a RAC. You could say Robin Hood can't build there or have a business there because there's a sewer in Union in Alderbrook but Alderbrook doesn't want them so now they're in a Catch-22 and without that second sentence we're saying you can't build there because there's a sewer but they can't hook up to the sewer.

(#2388) Tim Wing: That's not my intent.

(#2392) Steve Clayton: I know but that's a justification to me for this is to enable us to build a business in an area that has a private sewer but the sewer system may not want them.

(#2405) Wendy Ervin: I think this is covered by CF-501 where it talks about maintaining a safe, efficient and cost effective sewage collection and treatment system. If you have an approved collection and treatment system that's one way of satisfying this. I think if you say in CF-502, 'Require all new development within designated UGA's and RAC's to connect to public sewer systems when available' that means if it's available today you connect to it; if it's available in ten years you connect to it. I think that takes care of it.

(#2450) Diane Edgin: That makes it work.

(#2452) Bill Dewey: That's a lot cleaner.

(#2460) Steve Clayton: What do you think, Bob?

(#2462) Bob Fink: I think that would be alright.

(#2464) Bill Dewey: You think it's okay to leave the second sentence in there?

(#2468) Mark Drain: I don't know how we cover Tim's concern. If you come up with something besides a public facility or ...

(#2490) Wendy Ervin: CF-501 covers a private system.

(#2495) Allan Borden: And it also covers septic systems.

(#2500) Mark Drain: Okay.

(#2505) Bob Fink: If you'll look at the previous one, CF-206, I just wanted to clarify that a sanitary sewage system isn't a public sewer system that you're thinking of. It's actually defined as 'all facilities, including approved on site disposal facilities used in the collection, transition, storage, treatment or discharge of any water borne waste, whether domestic in origin or a combination of domestic, commercial or industrial waste'. So the term 'sanitary sewer system' includes individual on site systems so my preference would be to leave CF-206 as it is.

(#2570) Steve Clayton: I started with my comments on page 6. Does anybody else have any comments?

(#2580) Bill Dewey: I have a comment on the top of page 8 under CF-504. It talks about the septic operation and maintenance program. The onsite rules; the state is about ready to change them this fall and will actually

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

require the county to develop a risk based written plan on how it will manage onsite sewage in the county. It's premature because the rules aren't adopted yet so if we're coming back to this next year we can make the corrections then.

(#2615) Steve Clayton: Under CF-704, it carries over to page 9 and it says 'Update the current 1991 Comprehensive Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan' ... is going to be updated in 1996 so maybe we need a better update date.

(#2635) Allan Borden: That will be covered in the 2005 update. You currently have spent 25 minutes editing things that we will be looking at May of next year in a different form.

(#2655) Bill Dewey: This is all for clarification. It wasn't clear to us in the beginning of this exactly what you're looking for.

(#2660) Allan Borden: That's true. If we wordsmith the current text too much it may be edited in the future but we do appreciate the input on things that are overlooked.

(#2672) Bill Dewey: On this same Parks and Recreation section, should there be any reference to the county's current effort with the Trails Committee?

(#2682) Allan Borden: Yes, that would be appropriate to add a statement in there about that.

(#2700) Bob Fink: Yes, CF-704 will be updated or modified to be less specific because the 1991 Plan was updated in 1996 but any dates you put in there would quickly become outdated. You should be looking at the parks plan and updating it on a regular basis. That's all it should say is that the County Comp Parks, Recreation, Open Space Plan should be updated on a regular basis based on future demands and should define acquisitions, etc. It should be rewritten in more general terms to establish a policies of a regular updating of the county parks plan.

(#2760) Allan Borden: I'm wondering if we should expand that to say 'Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails.

(#2768) Steve Clayton: On my comments I skip back to page 11. Did anybody have anything before that? Okay, on page 11 it says 'To the extent possible, projects will be funded through'; and then it lists four items. Currently we do collect impact fees for some things, school districts, etc.; do we want to include impact fees here, which may or may not be in the future a large chunk of it? Especially on something like wastewater which is an expensive item. Is that overreaching our scope?

(#2850) Bob Fink: Yes, I do appreciate the comment, though. We actually have on our work plan looking at impact fees but we're a long way from taking any action on impact fees so I think it's premature to put that in here at this time.

(#2890) Steve Clayton: Rather than addressing them as impact fees, if somebody hooks up to a sewer system; currently in Allyn there's a fee that's assigned to them.

(#2900) Bill Dewey: It's under rate revenues.

(#2902) Steve Clayton: It's more than rates; it's a system development fee. Is that considered a rate?

(#2920) Bob Fink: That doesn't fall under the term 'impact fees' defined in the statute.

(#2925) Terri Jeffreys: It's a hook up fee; is there a better word for it, I don't know.

(#2930) Wendy Ervin: The hook up charge is generated from the cost of initiating developing that system so it is a development charge but it does become a bill at the time of the hook up.

(#2950) Steve Clayton: It just would look funny as put in item 1) as a hook up charge when ... we could use

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

whatever words we want, but don't we want to address that that's a source of income for funding a sewer plant?

(#2968) Bob Fink: I think the problem here is over the terminology that it's not necessarily clear to the lay person what they mean by rate revenues and I think they include all the revenues generated by the charges for the services, including hook up charges. That's my expectation but it doesn't say that here.

(#2995) Tim Wing: I would think that rate revenues are what you pay per month and hook up fees would be something else.

(#3000) Terri Jeffreys: User fees would probably be more encompassing.

(#3008) Bob Fink: There's probably a term in the utilities business but I can't tell you ... they don't define it here or explain it so I think that needs to be accomplished.

(#3015) Bill Dewey: I would reading into that list to the extent possible projects will be funded through ... then you have that list. That would lead it to be that it may not be all inclusive.

(#3030) Steve Clayton: I don't know that we need to specifically address this tonight since it will be coming back before us at a later date but perhaps that's something they should look at revising before it's brought back.

(#3060) Wendy Ervin: I would like to go back to something that Allan was addressing on 2-8 regarding Parks and Recreation. He said maybe we should add Open Space and Trails. Considering the discussion with David Overton and the worry they had about open space designations being interpreted by the public as being available to play in as park land I would think that that wouldn't be a good idea adding open space to that section because some properties designated as open space are not public.

(#3120) Steve Clayton: That's a good point.

(#3125) Bill Dewey: Is that the current title of the Plan?

(#3128) Wendy Ervin: No, he just opined that we should add open space to the recreation section ...

(#3134) Bill Dewey: I heard something different; I heard him adding trails to that section.

(#3138) Wendy Ervin: We've had considerable discussions ... it's not in this title but he just sort of let out the opinion that maybe we should change it.

(#3150) Bill Dewey: On the bottom on CF-704, it says 'Update current 1991 Comprehensive Parks, Recreation, Open Space Plan'.

(#3165) Allan Borden: That is the title of that plan.

(#3168) Wendy Ervin: I don't like the idea of the open space as we discussed it between Belfair and Allyn.

(#3185) Mark Drain: It's a difficult thing because the GMHB has their interpretation of open space and then there's the tax classification which has a different interpretation of open space. It's a sad thing that they're two different things but I don't know how you can back up on either one of them.

(#3210) Darren Nienaber: On the play area, besides David's comment, that's the first time I've ever heard anybody ever seriously think it was a play area. I thought he was making a fair argument to not have his own land listed as open space. Everybody that's going to make that case has got a fair right to make that argument but realistically does anybody think they're looking at it as a play area? When you know it's private property?

(#3235) Wendy Ervin: No, not necessarily. We no longer own it, but in our family we had some tidelands

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

along Hammersly Inlet. And time after time, and the tidelands were privately owned, we would have to go out and prove to people that we had the title to those tidelands and they could not dig the clams, etc., because they said all tidelands are open to the public so they assumed ...

(#3278) Darren Nienaber: That's totally different from open space.

(#3282) Wendy Ervin: No, not as Mr. Overton was describing it.

(#3285) Darren Nienaber: Well, the jury is still out on that. I personally think that every shoreline in the state on the beach, you've got a right to walk across that; even privately owned.

(#3300) Wendy Ervin: But not to dig clams off of a privately owned beach.

(#3305) Darren Nienaber: You've got a right to cross it, though.

(#3310) Wendy Ervin: There was no objection to that; I'm saying they felt they had a right to utilize the clams that were on a private beach and they don't. Yes, the State of Washington owns the tidelands but at one point the state saw this little handy revenue producer and they sold chain after chain of tidelands and those are privately owned.

(#3330) Bill Dewey: That's a little bit different situation than Overtons. I understand your point and I don't disagree with it but I will offer some clarification on the tidelands in that there's probably greater confusion there than there would be in forest land because in every other state in the union tidelands are kept in the public trust; Washington is very unique in selling them to private ownership so people coming here from other states may not know that.

(#3355) Wendy Ervin: I just think that they looked at a sentence that says all the tidelands in the state are owned by the state and they figured they could use and it would be the same way they would look at a map and say that this is open space and it's a play area.

(#3375) Diane Edgin: There is a connotation there for a certain segment of the population.

(#3400) Bill Dewey: We've had some good discussion on this as a PAC and we've heard some public comment on it and I think expressing from the PAC to staff that this is an area that they should be sensitive to and be careful with it. We need to, as a county, plan our open space and utilization of that accordingly but we want to be careful about prematurely identifying open space in any documents that reference parks and public use to avoid that abuse.

(#3450) Steve Clayton: I want to go back to page 4-17; they just need to put a date for when the tank was built.

(#3480) Bill Dewey: I had a general question on the Water and Wastewater Utilities. Looking at the table that's on page 4-13. Underneath those dollar amount that are budgeted into these facilities do they factor saving towards replacement costs for those facilities?

(#3520) Tim Wing: I believe that is part of the North Bay system. I was told that when they raised the fees from \$1,500.00 to \$5,000.00 they were trying to generate a fund so that when it came time to expand the plant they would have some money.

(#3550) Bob Fink: This document here doesn't address rates specifically. This just specifies that there are certain capital improvement project. A lot of these are drawn from the system plans. I've talked to the Director so these number are drawn from the sewer plans as to the timing and nature of what improvements will take place within the six year period. When the rates are established it's really something different than this. They do incorporate more than just ongoing maintenance. They include replacement and future improvements.

(#3750) Steve Clayton: On page 32, hopefully it will be cleaned up but it says 'In recent years' and it

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

references 1992 and 1993. We need to have more current figures. Also, on page 35, if I get the gist of the chart there, we're proposing to reduce the level of service we're giving on the first three items; softball, baseball and soccer fields.

(#3832) Allan Borden: Yes, that's the way it appears in the current plan.

(#3840) Steve Clayton: So currently, in the softball field, we have an existing level of service of one field per every 2,500 people and we're proposing to reduce that to 1 field for every 5,000.

(#0110) Bob Fink: This is already done; this is the existing language. The level of service was adopted at 1/5,000 which is the same as the NRPA standard and that's the level of service that was adopted but the actual level of service in the county is higher than that. We have twice as many facilities as we need. The idea meaning that the level of service should be met or exceeded. You could say we're currently in the 1/2,500 and we need to build new facilities as the population increases. At 1/5,000 we wouldn't need to build new facilities until the population essentially doubled.

(#0145) Tim Wing: We're only providing services in three areas and we're not providing them in about ten others.

(#0152) Bob Fink: We don't have any level of service standard adopted. There's no specific levels for these standards adopted.

(#0155) Wendy Ervin: But some of these facilities exist.

(#0160) Bob Fink: I don't think the county actually has most of these facilities.

(#0162) Allan Borden: The county doesn't have a golf course, or a pool.

(#0166) Tim Wing: My point is that the National Standard there, there's a whole lot of facilities for the population and you only have three types and so it looks like we're providing more services than the national recommendation but, in fact, we're probably providing way less services because they're recommending that we have golf courses, and handball courts, and basketball courts. Am I reading that wrong?

(#0178) Bob Fink: The plan didn't adopt any levels of service standards for most of the facilities that we could adopt standards for. Here's a list of different types of facilities and we could adopt a standard for the level of service for each of the facilities or for any combination. But at the time it was just those three that were selected to be put in the Comp Plan.

(#0200) Bill Dewey: It seems like the county provides a lot of these other services and they're just not acknowledged. A lot of our county parks would provide for picnicking, swimming, boating; but we don't have any existing level of service noted here.

(#0212) Bob Fink: It wasn't done at the time.

(#0218) Steve Clayton: At least in the North end a reason not to adopt it would be because we have two state parks that are local and accessible and it would show us as having a low level of service because all we've got in Belfair is one county maintained park.

(#0235) Bob Fink: With some of this there wasn't the background available when the parks plan was put together so they weren't identified. When we look at trails, one of the outcomes of the study of that would be to adopt a level of service target based on that study and the same thing when they update the park plan.

(#0260) Bill Dewey: So back on Water and Wastewater, specifically if you look at Harstine Point on page 4-13 and you look at the numbers going across there, the two pages that provide the details for that number are 23 and 24 they don't add up. So I'm wondering where the numbers on page 4-13 came from? So it looks like those numbers are incorrect.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#0298) Terri Jeffreys: Did you just pull that one out to check?

(#0300) Bill Dewey: Yes, I haven't checked the other ones yet.

(#0304) Allan Borden: He probably took the information from the construction line rather from the total.

(#0310) Bob Fink: Actually, that may be where the numbers came from but I think the point is taken that if you look at the numbers for Wastewater versus Water for Harstine Pointe, the numbers on the Water were total numbers and not just the construction numbers so one or the other is wrong; they're not consistently stated.

(#0325) Allan Borden: I'll bring that up to them.

(#0330) Steve Clayton: My next item was the chart on page 36. It's a table for the parks. We have Mason Lake County Park identified about half way down and then under 'Unnamed' is Mason Lake Picnic Area, which I believe is also the county park. So we appear to be duplicating lines and we need to either consolidate them .. If that's appropriate.

(#0355) Allan Borden: There may be a difference because the county park is off of Mason Lake Drive W, and there's property on Mason Lake S.

(#0364) Darren Nienaber: We just acquired that last month just for closing costs.

(#0370) Steve Clayton: So the \$101,000 in 2009 is to put a boat dock there? I guess we'll find out. On to page 39. Administrative offices; we don't address that there's an annex in Belfair that we lease and there is an annex in Belfair that we own that has some problems with the building so ...

(#0384) Allan Borden: We'll update that; we'll get the Facilities Manager to update the table.

(#0388) Bob Fink: The Belfair Annex is under the Sheriff and the Auditor. It is listed there.

(#0400) Terri Jeffreys: Let's go back to the parks table. Would these projects be outlined the way the utilities were?

(#0404) Allan Borden: I didn't include them but there are detailed worksheets like the utilities.

(#0406) Terri Jeffreys: Where would those be? Will they be in a special parks element?

(#0410) Bob Fink: I would think that when the parks plan is updated that's where the detail would be. We do have the worksheets but I guess Allan didn't send them to you. We can get them and pass them around to you. There is that level of detail.

(#0425) Terri Jeffreys: I just want to make a comment for the record that I made a comment to the BOCC that the Oakland Bay property acquisition using REET 2 funds is probably not a legal use of those funds.

(#0460) Darren Nienaber: Yes, the BOCC is already aware of that and appreciate you bringing that to their attention. I think they're probably looking at REET 1 instead so we'll need to make that adjustment if that's appropriate.

(#0488) Wendy Ervin: Can someone explain the table on page 6-40, Departmental Space Needs - Current and Projected. Everything appears to be at a deficit except the Juvenile Detention Center ...

(#0500) Allan Borden: You have to remember that this is data from the mid 90's. Much of the areas have already been improved.

(#0515) Diane Edgin: Wasn't the Juvenile Detention Center only to be temporary for five years?

(#0520) Bob Fink: It originally had a temporary permit from the city and they recently modified that to a

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

permanent status, or at least a longer term.

(#0528) Steve Clayton: You corrected me on the Belfair annex, Bob; I missed those on the sheet. Do we have an annex or a facility in Hoodspout?

(#0532) Bob Fink: Not that I'm aware of.

(#0540) Steve Clayton: On page 41, under Jail Facilities, that will get updated, too?

(#0542) Allan Borden: That is correct.

(#0544) Darren Nienaber: Are those current numbers for the jail expansion?

(#0548) Bob Fink: These are 1995 numbers.

(#0550) Darren Nienaber: So the BOCC are going to adopt this?

(#0552) Bob Fink: This is existing language.

(#0555) Darren Nienaber: Right, but if they're going to readopt the capital facilities element ...

(#0557) Bob Fink: I don't see this as a readoption of the whole element; I think we're just going to adopt these changes.

(#0564) Steve Clayton: On that same page under Law Enforcement, addressing 30 persons, I'm wondering for what year that is?

(#0566) Darren Nienaber: Right.

(#0568) Steve Clayton: And if the BOCC wants to adopt something that's a decade out of date, that might not be a good idea.

(#0572) Bob Fink: Allan probably should have identified that most of this language is existing language and most of the questions you've had really have to do with existing language that we weren't proposing to amend and didn't evaluate for how they might be amended and updated. What we were bringing to you for amendment is basically the six year plans and some of the narrative that described the six year plans and projects, rather than addressing the policies generally and some of the other things that should be updated at some point and presumably will be updated next year during our Comp Plan update. We should be careful when we draft the notice in the ordinance that it's clear we aren't updating the whole thing. We're just adopting changes in certain sections.

(#0608) Tim Wing: I have a question about capital facilities that aren't on the list. The county does own buildings they're not using. How does the old annex building in Belfair come into this plan?

(#0615) Bob Fink: I haven't heard.

(#0620) Darren: It's a building that's not being used and the intention is to sell it as soon as possible.

(#0630) Wendy Ervin: On that same vein, this house over here that has a very peaked roof ...

(#0636) Allan Borden: The one formerly occupied by the Public Works Department?

(#0638) Wendy Ervin: Right. I understood that building was to be removed at some point in the future.

(#0650) Darren Nienaber: I don't know that it has to be removed. It is an old building that's not in the finest condition now and it might have some fire issues.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#0668) Bob Fink: Public Works did have to move out of it and it currently is a vacant structure.

(#0670) Darren Nienaber: There are a few offices being utilized there now.

(#0700) Diane Edgin: I'd like to bring something up. As the county has grown it has expanded around the courthouse and if you think of the terms of the City of Shelton and where the business core is and how it can expand it's in trouble because there's residential on the out fringes and with the county government taking up the core of it where does future businesses go? I'm saying this because I want to go on record as an advocate possibly for the City of Shelton because this is ground that could be expanded for business and yet the county has the ability to go elsewhere but sadly enough the citizens have not made that connection that the business base could be expanding right here and they can't because the county needs to expand.

(#0740) Bill Dewey: Are you suggesting the county consider a separate complex elsewhere?

(#0750) Diane Edgin: Yes, sometime in the future.

(#0780) Steve Clayton: Okay, I'm through with my comments.

(#0782) Bill Dewey: Well, I would be remiss with my interest in shellfish not to say something about the stormwater chapter. I'm concerned that the county currently has no stormwater plan and I think the problems we're seeing in Hood Canal are systemic of what we're going to be seeing elsewhere and I wish the county would take a more aggressive role in planning for stormwater impact. I just think Mason County isn't doing their job as they should be in regards to stormwater and looking at this it doesn't look like they're planning to anytime in the near future.

(#0815) Allan Borden: Remember, this is old language from 1996; it's not been updated.

(#0820) Bill Dewey: Maybe I'm confused by that discussion because there are things in here about the Belfair sewer system and Hoodsport and ...

(#0832) Allan Borden: All of the text language is from 1996, except for Water and Wastewater Utilities. That's the only section that was updated at the beginning of this.

(#0840) Tim Wing: When is the text going to be updated?

(#0842) Allan Borden: March or April of next year.

(#0844) Tim Wing: Who is going to be involved with that?

(#0846) Allan Borden: The PAC and the public and eventually the BOCC. This will be Chapter VI in the Comp Plan.

(#0850) Bob Fink: Right, and there's a statutory requirement that the county revisit its Comp Plan and update it by December of 2005. So we have a schedule to address it over the next year. We'll probably be starting to bring things to you in June if not earlier for discussion.

(#0870) Mark Drain: So for now we don't have to give our stamp of acceptance to this but just pass along our criticisms and look forward to an updated version?

(#0878) Bob Fink: Right, the only thing we were updating for now, and what we are proposing to change, is the six year facility plans and some of the tables having to do with the budget. There was some updating of the text having to do with Water and Wastewater Utilities. That's all we really looked at and that we're trying to address in this go around; not the whole element but just the six year plan.

(#0915) Allan Borden: I can go over the relevant pages that you need to be reviewing. The pages I should draw your attention to are pages 11 to 31 that include on page 13 the Water and Wastewater Utilities Capital Improvement Program for 2005 to 2010. Page 36, the Parks Department Capital Improvement Program for



## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

2004 to 2010, page 40A, which is the insert I gave you tonight on Facilities and Grounds. Also, page 45, which is the Public Works Transportation Improvement Program for 2005 to 2010. Those are basically the four departments of the capital improvements and we recommend that you pass a motion on, primarily for budget purposes, to acknowledge the scope of revenues and expenditures for those programs. I imagine by the time we get to revising, updating and approving the Capital Facilities Element, there will be new Capital Improvement Program spreadsheets for the years 2006 to 2011.

(#0985) Mark Drain: And those we will see in March or April?

(#0990) Allan Borden: Those will probably be towards the middle of the summer when those departments are beginning to discuss their budgets for the program year 2006.

(#1015) Mark Drain: I wish that more of the material were updated. A lot of the pages, to me, are worthless with some of the dates that are involved and then to ask us to pass judgment on these budgets ... the only way I could do it is just with faith in the departments that created them right now and hope that they're right but I don't know if that's the right way for me to approach it.

(#1055) Diane Edgin: Also, what Terri said about the REET.

(#1058) Steve Clayton: And also the bond debt service.

(#1060) Terri Jeffreys: And to not have actual capital improvement projects outlined in this budget, let alone backed up in here, just saying we need space but not knowing what it's for and we're looking at the money, there's not enough detail here for me to pass judgment and if this is for public input, I would really recommend going back to this 40-A and provide some detail regarding what these costs are for. For instance, is the bond debt service line is that projects that we've already done and we owe money on ...

(#1085) Mark Drain: The detail may be somewhere and we may be overwhelmed if we had it.

(#1088) Bill Dewey: I think the points are well made that you're asking us to pass judgment on numbers that we don't have any justification for.

(#1094) Tim Wing: Why do you need us to do anything with it?

(#1096) Terri Jeffreys: Is it county policy that these yearly capital facilities plans go through the PAC as a form of public involvement and then on to the BOCC?

(#1105) Bob Fink: This is a portion of the County Comp Plan and the process there is to get the recommendations of the PAC.

(#1112) Mark Drain: In the past we've dealt more with policy land use and all of a sudden we're ...

(#1118) Terri Jeffreys: Money is policy.

(#1120) Bob Fink: Generally what's in the Capital Improvement Plan can be fairly general in other communities and often is but even the numbers are part of what's in the Plan and we could have more detail on the parks to show you but I don't have more detail on the Facilities and Grounds projects. As far as I know their approach is more one of allocating the amount of money and then coming up with the projects based on the needs that are the highest priority at that time.

(#1150) Diane Edgin: I've been around this stuff for ten years and this is the first time this has ever come up

(#1154) Bob Fink: These numbers were all in here when the Plan was adopted.

(#1158) Diane Edgin: We were never asked to get into them.

(#1160) Terri Jeffreys: One of the ways that you make a Comp Plan, other than bringing in a document, is to

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

do this exercise every year and to make sure that the money follows the policies and the planning of the Comp Plan and to tie these two together is essential and I think we're in the beginning of learning how to do this but I think there are definitely some improvements that need to be made so that we can yearly go back and look at a line item and go back to the Plan and say that we're doing what we said we would.

(#1177) Allan Borden: You will be able to do that starting at the end of next year.

(#1180) Bob Fink: You're right; we are learning how to do this and it's something that we've been trying to get done and the other departments are learning how to do this, too, as well as you're learning how to look at it. Our intention is to make this an annual thing and to coordinate it with the annual budget. Those of you who are familiar with the six year plan, the TIPCAP, they are an advisory group for the six year road plan. The road plan goes through an approval process and the BOCC approves it. It's a formalized process, and it's a legal requirement. It's build into the budget and the annual review. We're developing that process right now so I appreciate your comments. What I've tried to get from the other departments is information like what the Utilities provided; fairly project specific broken out. That information isn't necessarily available from all the departments yet. In lieu of waiting for that we brought forward this plan because we would like to get our Capital Facilities Plan updated generally and so that's why we're moving forward with this particular proposal.

(#1245) Tim Wing: Without actually moving this, here is a possible motion I'll just throw out for discussion. I move that the PAC acknowledge receipt of this draft of the County's Capital Facilities Comprehensive Plan and that the PAC recommend that the staff return the plan to the PAC at a later date when increased detail and more current text is available. That doesn't say that we like it or dislike it; we just said we see it. Do you need some sort of acknowledgment that you brought it to us?

(#1270) Bob Fink: I don't know that that does anything for us as far as process goes.

(#1274) Bill Dewey: What would be the motion you'd be looking for us. A lot of times you have a staff recommendation for us. We don't have that tonight. What would that be?

(#1280) Bob Fink: You could recommend it with those changes that you noted, like the REET, for consideration by the BOCC. Essentially I would understand Tim's motion to be that you wanted us to bring it back to you before it went to the BOCC. I'd like to see a recommendation, even if it says that certain parts be further developed before approval.

(#1320) Terri Jeffreys: I'm delighted with the level of detail on the Water and Wastewater Facilities.

(#1325) Bob Fink: We probably should have provided you with the Parks, too. We do have it and could easily provide it to you.

(#1340) Tim Wing: You can't ask us to approve this or wordsmith it; it isn't even the text that you're going to use. It's old text; we just can't do that. I don't see how we can do that. If you want to go back with the feedback you got tonight, that's fine but you're going to have to bring it back more done before we can do anything about it.

(#1360) Bill Dewey: Maybe we should try to move on motions more specific to the pages that Allan referenced ...

(#1366) Steve Clayton: Even what Allan mentioned, Water and Wastewater, even though it's well put together even you brought up one example ...

(#1372) Bill Dewey: That's the only one I could find. I just went back through the comments and in that particular section, from 11 - 30, the only comments I found were the discrepancy I found in that table.

(#1385) Darren Nienaber: Bob, is there enough time to bring it back to them this year? If not, is there a way we can take some of it and get a recommendation and send it on to the BOCC? So they don't have to do any action that might have an implication of approval on other aspects of the Plan that they don't feel comfortable making.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#1410) Bob Fink: That's essentially what I was suggesting. If there are parts of it that have adequate information for you to consider that you can act on those sections and we can bring you the Parks element, as well, and give you fifteen minutes to look it over. The only thing we don't have detail on is the Facilities and Grounds. With regard to some of the text, there's been no evaluation or consideration of changes in the text might be updated. If you're going to make a recommendation it has to be made now. One of the ways to look at this is are there things in the budget numbers that are inconsistent with the policies of the county? Are they spending money on things they're not supposed to be spending on? I don't think you'll find that's the case.

(#1500) Tim Wing: There are some things. It's my personal opinion that they're going at it the wrong way but it's been hashed out publically and that's the direction they're going. To be specific, I don't agree with spending so much money on improving Highway 3 through Belfair and putting a sewer through there, although I do want a sewer there, I think if you do all that work there you're going to have a bigger town there and it's not good for the Canal and it isn't good for growth there but that's all been hashed out over and over and there was a conclusion reached. I do have my own opinion on it and that's not the direction the county is going. Bill has some concerns about stormwater, as do I, so where do you want to go with this?

(#1550) Bill Dewey: It sounds like we might be able to get somewhere tonight if we stuck to the specific pages and made a motion specific to those pages. There's the Water and Wastewater Utilities starting on page 11 and going through page 31. Within those pages the Harstine Pointe numbers were discussed. Then we have page 36 and on that table is that \$675,000 that Terri raised the issue on.

(#1600) Steve Clayton: Looking from an unknowing point of view on that, of course you're trying to balance the REET income with the \$3,548,478 so if we take that \$675,000 out but also looking at the Mason County park and the Unnamed with those funds listed, without some sort of explanation that that's actually a plan and not just a way to use up that money ...

(#1635) Bill Dewey: It sounds like you're uncomfortable with this Parks Capital Improvement Program without seeing the detail which is available so maybe we need to take a few minutes to review it. Then the last one was this table 40-A and whether we're going to be comfortable with the \$250,000 across the board for capital improvements for existing facilities.

(#1665) Steve Clayton: Also, the question on the bond debt service on that page.

(#1675) Terri Jeffreys: I'd like to comment that to use the total receipt of REET 2 funds for park improvement might not be a totally wise choice. That money is intended for things such as sanitary sewer, water, and some of the expenditures to accommodate growth. The county has a policy that they've chosen to take all of that money and use it towards parks and I think that it doesn't acknowledge the intent of that money being authorized. I would like to see the county use some of that money to take care of some of our stormwater and sewer issues.

(#1730) Diane Edgin: Bill, you're probably more up to date on what's going on with the stormwater issues in Olympia. I keep hearing there are going to be new regulations coming.

(#1735) Bill Dewey: Yes, onsite. I'm less familiar with the stormwater issues.

(#1745) Diane Edgin: Listening to you and your concerns I have so often seen over the years that they tend to address things when it gets to the critical mass and it costs us tremendously by doing that. I'd like to see us address us.

(#1760) Terri Jeffreys: Because one of the toughest things that's going to come out of that is the requirement for DOH's to have an O & M program, which basically there's no funding for and we're talking about under funded service as it is, that would be a perfect example of how to use that REET 2 funds.

(#1785) Bill Dewey: Let's take a break while we're waiting for the additional information on the parks.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

*Break in meeting.*

(#1825) Bill Dewey: While we had a break we were provided detailed copies of the Capital Improvement Programs for the Parks Department that were multiple spreadsheets with breakdowns of each element. For me it gives me a greater level of comfort with the earlier information that was provided. Has anybody come up with a fresh approach on how we might be able to move forward on action tonight?

(#1865) Terri Jeffreys: I don't know about moving forward on action tonight and I personally would prefer to ... I was not prepared to come in here and make a motion on this tonight and I did not read the documents for that reason and then we were provided with some pretty important stuff, although not complete, that would help make us make better decisions. I'd prefer not to take any action tonight and I know that puts us behind and I for one would be willing to come back for a special meeting to do that provided we have more detail, especially on 40-A.

(#1900) Steve Clayton: It's disappointing in a way, correct me if I'm wrong, but the Parks Department is talking about spending over 3 million dollars for the period of 2004 - 2009 and this is the public's first ability to comment on it? We spending millions of dollars and there's been no input; both advertised ... The TIPCAP committee is available to the community and for a parks project not to be available to the community for input is unusual.

(#1950) Allan Borden: You might ask how it's been done in the past.

(#1955) Wendy Ervin: How has it been done in the past?

(#1960) Steve Clayton: And the same thing on the capital improvement program. I don't believe there's any public process involved in that and the county is designating millions of dollars and it's on a side item on a PAC agenda and that's maybe not the best public involvement that we should have on these items.

(#1970) Allan Borden: The BOCC have a public hearing on the budget for the coming year every year either mid November or the beginning of December and they typically do not adopt the budget in its final form until the last or second to the last hearing date in the year.

(#1992) Wendy Ervin: They put out the budget in a booklet form and it's out there for people to peruse and come and ask questions.

(#2000) Allan Borden: Yes, I've seen that for several years. The departments typically ... the Budget Director calls for preliminary budgets in July and they begin to formulate in their departments what projects are and it gets submitted to the Budget Director and presented at a public hearing. The county doesn't have a county parks board; there's not similar public review process that the TIPCAP has. TIPCAP not only is mandated by law but you're talking about federal funds that need to be out there in the public early on. If you do have a concern about how these CIP's get developed you might question our current process.

(#2070) Bill Dewey: Steve raises a concern and based on your explanation I would think, especially with Parks and Recreation, that if the public was made aware of the opportunity there probably would be a greater interest in having input into the county's future development of the parks.

(#2090) Allan Borden: My thought is that the county Parks Department has a certain number of physical facilities around the county and they are constantly in need of maintenance or repair or whatever so that's probably why this list appears in great detail.

(#2110) Bill Dewey: When it comes to stormwater and septic systems I don't think you're going to pack a room but I might be able to get a few shellfish growers here.

(#2118) Tim Wing: I think there many elements to this Plan and basically it's a roadmap of the capital expenditures for almost ten years of the county's money and I think it's way too much to digest in one night.

(#2135) Darren Nienaber: Just to clarify, this is not updated every ten years. It's an every year update. It's an

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

excellent point but it's not like you're binding your hands for ten years.

(#2150) Tim Wing: Part of the reason you want us to do something with this is that you have an obligation to the Comp Plan process, correct?

(#2155) Bob Fink: Yes.

(#2157) Tim Wing: What is that?

(#2160) Darren Nienaber: It comes straight from the GMA.

(#2162) Bob Fink: Right. One of the statutory provisions is that the PAC exists to make recommendations to the BOCC. It states that you hold hearings and make recommendation to the Planning Department which are then given to the BOCC. This does modify the county Comp Plan and therefore this is the process for doing that. I don't disagree with you and it's unfortunate that the directors of these different departments aren't here to answer some of the questions you have that I can't answer. I can't even tell you the public process that some of these people went through. There may have been processes that we're not aware of.

(#2225) Tim Wing: I don't feel like I want to make any kind of final decision on this tonight and if you need us to say we recommend that this be looked at carefully, that we recommend that we be given more information, that we recommend that in future years there be more opportunities for the public to have input on it; we can make lots of different kinds of recommendations all of which can acknowledge the fact that we looked at it in your process timeline but I just don't feel like I know enough about it to deal with it all tonight. I am willing to stay here as long as other people want to and if we want to take it page by page that's fine with me.

(#2265) Bill Dewey: I'm sensing a level of discomfort both from Tim and from Terri and others as well. We're being asked to make a recommendation on something that we don't really have enough background on to do.

(#2278) Diane Edgin: This isn't the first time that the PAC has been in this position and we just had to come back and have the staff give us more information.

(#2288) Bill Dewey: If we're not comfortable with that I'd like to at least give some specific recommendations to staff so they know what they're charged with doing if they're going to bring that back to us.

(#2300) Darren Nienaber: Bob, do we have time for a special meeting?

(#2310) Bob Fink: It would have to be next week.

(#2312) Darren Nienaber: Can a quorum be here next week? Four members?

(#2315) Bill Dewey: I can be here next week.

(#2320) Diane Edgin: I will not be here next Monday.

(#2325) Tim Wing: I won't be here either.

(#2328) Bob Fink: We can make it another day other than a Monday.

(#2330) Wendy Ervin: Tuesdays and Wednesdays are bad for me.

(#2332) Continued discussion on possible attendance for special meeting.

(#2400) Darren Nienaber: What about giving Allan sufficient time to respond to the answers and get them mailed off to the PAC. Or maybe we could do it by e-mail.

(#2420) Bob Fink: We may not be able to get all the answers prepared and out to the PAC by then.

(#2425) Mark Drain: If I knew more specifically what ...

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#2430) Darren Nienaber: You mean like a strike out version?

(#2437) Mark Drain: Or an outline of those most pertinent issues.

(#2455) Bill Dewey: So it sounds like we could get a quorum.

(#2465) Darren Nienaber: We need to figure out what we need to send back to Allan and that might dictate when the meeting might be.

(#2482) Bill Dewey: It sounds like we've got the opportunity to make a quorum next week so let's talk about what we want Allan to come back with next week and then we can decide what day we do it next week. Let's try to articulate to staff where we'd like clearer and additional detail.

(#2500) Tim Wing: So the text is from 1995 and we're not going to deal with that at all, are we, at this point? You're saying the text is all going to get redone later.

(#2512) Darren Nienaber: That's why an underline / strike out version would help.

(#2533) Bill Dewey: Okay, it sounds like Terri had some clarification she wanted on 40-A on the Bond Debt Service.

(#2545) Terri Jeffreys: Yes, I'd like to know if the numbers in the line item for Bond Debt Service, are those current liabilities or are they anticipated liabilities? And what are they? I'd like to know also the same on the Interfund Loan and what is ER&R?

(#2600) Darren Nienaber: Equipment Rental and Revolving Fund.

(#2615) Terri Jeffreys: So that money is an expenditure so that means that that money exists ...

(#2625) Bob Fink: Is being paid back.

(#2630) Bill Dewey: So this table was previously approved and was the highlighted section the only addition to it?

(#2640) Bob Fink: No, what's been approved is the budget for 2004.

(#2655) Steve Clayton: As in the 2004 budget we have Total Resources of \$1,314,926 but it appears the only expenditures we're making for Capital Improvements is \$250,000 that is undetermined. So I don't understand why on a Capital Improvement budget program with that budget and we're spending a quarter of a million of undetermined expenditures. In TIPCAP you have specific projects that are laid out where the money is going. There's no specific projects that this Capital Improvement Program identifies.

(#2700) Allan Borden: What you need is the equivalent worksheets under Facilities and Grounds. You need the worksheets like you got for Water and Wastewater ...

(#2712) Bob Fink: I don't think those worksheets exist.

(#2720) Steve Clayton: Or something like TIPCAP says where their money is going and Parks says where their money is going ...

(#2725) Tim Wing: Well, Repairs of Existing Facilities, I'm just guessing but it's a good chance that's for something like if a roof caved in and they'd have to spend money for that. We don't know in advance that's going to happen and that kind of stuff does happen to these buildings.

(#2742) Allan Borden: They may not have specific projects but they may have a list of tasks that typically are incurring expense, like electrical repair or maintenance of a roof.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

- (#2765) Darren Nienaber: Right, you may not know it needs fixing until the roof caves in.
- (#2770) Allan Borden: Also, the BOCC has to approve that expenditure before it's paid out or even the contract goes out.
- (#2780) Darren Nienaber: We can talk to Mike Rutter if he has any thoughts for these repairs.
- (#2785) Steve Clayton: We identify facility needs and the lack of ... it identifies the square footage of each building but our Capital Improvement budget doesn't identify any fulfilling of that need.
- (#2800) Allan Borden: I can ask Mike Rutter, the Facilities Manager, and see if he has current information on the facilities and the size of them because you really can't go by the survey because that survey is not really valid anymore because of the improvements that have been made in the last eight years.
- (#2825) Terri Jeffreys: I was told by the County Administrator that the planned acquisition of the Malaney Creek property will come out of the REET 1 funds so I'd like to see how that will affect the budgeting.
- (#2842) Darren Nienaber: I think he wants to borrow money from ER&R and pay it out through time but you're right that it needs to be reflected.
- (#2856) Tim Wing: So they borrow money from ER&R, buy the property and then use REET money on an annual basis to make a payment back?
- (#2862) Darren Nienaber: Right.
- (#2866) Bob Fink: That's as opposed to collecting money over time and then paying your expenditure at the end when you've collected enough money to make that expenditure.
- (#2875) Darren Nienaber: Or to take it straight from cash balance.
- (#2878) Bob Fink: Or issue a bond and paying it back; there are different mechanisms you could use.
- (#2888) Wendy Ervin: On table 10-8, Mason County Transportation Improvement Program, down in #11 is Johns Prairie Walkway, which I personally would like to know what that is. It's a small dollar amount but ...
- (#2920) Diane Edgin: If it says 'walkway' I'm thinking they're trying to sidewalk it at some time.
- (#2940) Bill Dewey: I was thinking there was a proposal to make that a walking trail.
- (#2955) Mark Drain: The Skookum Creek Bridge is complete now but it shows it in 2005.
- (#2975) Wendy Ervin: It shows that it costs more to put in a walkway than a bridge.
- (#2988) Bill Dewey: So I'm unclear about this and a marked up version would be helpful but at least the pages you listed off earlier, Allan, are we supposed to be commenting on the Transportation Improvement Program?
- (#3000) Allan Borden: Yes.
- (#3010) Terri Jeffreys: So the process is to go from TIPCAP to PAC to the BOCC?
- (#3020) Allan Borden: We're trying to establish a process.
- (#3025) Tim Wing: So this last page 45 is actually from TIPCAP, isn't it?
- (#3028) Allan Borden: Yes.
- (#3030) Tim Wing: That's a public process ...

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#3032) Bill Dewey: So this has already been through a public process.

(#3035) Allan Borden: Right.

(#3038) Tim Wing: So what do you want us do with it?

(#3040) Allan Borden: So you can say you understand the scope of what Public Works is proposing for the next years and subsequent four years.

(#3045) Wendy Ervin: Just so that we understand what it is.

(#3050) Darren Nienaber: You make a recommendation on it. It's not just to understand it.

(#3055) Allan Borden: I guess in the case of the table that's on page 45 you would say you recommend what TIPCAP is proposing.

(#3065) Tim Wing: I've got lots of things I could say about this but I also see that citizens have already had a lot of input into it.

(#3075) Darren Nienaber: That's true. Unlike the Belfair Plan there was some deference to what the whole, multi-year Belfair planning effort did so by the time it came to you there were a lot of issues that had already been flushed out. There's only a few specific issues that you really had to deal with there.

(#3100) Tim Wing: It looks to me like a lot of people spent a lot of time coming up with this list; TIPCAP.

(#3110) Bill Dewey: And we can acknowledge that as a PAC. Is there anything else related to 40-A? On the Water and Wastewater we just had questions on the budget tables to verify their accuracy, specifically Harstine Pointe.

(#3150) Tim Wing: I don't have any other concerns on that one. Do you want us to take an individual look at each of these projects on Wastewater? Or just the overall direction?

(#3175) Allan Borden: I guess that's up to you but I'm not sure ...

(#3200) Bill Dewey: The detail has been provided to justify the cost.

(#3210) Allan Borden: Yes, each of the separate sheets has a justification.

(#3225) Bill Dewey: The Parks Department Capital Improvement; they've got a budget but they don't necessarily have a justification and narrative like with Water and Wastewater. Is that going to be adequate for folks? Are the spreadsheets that have been passed out tonight for the Parks and Recreation adequate?

(#3240) Terri Jeffreys: I think so. Probably one thing to think about for the future I'd love to see how it matches up with the population allocations to make sure the money is getting spent in the areas that you assume that the growth is going to be allocated. The internal consistency of the plan is the ultimate goal.

(#3265) Tim Wing: Does the development of this Parks plan, is there any public input into that?

(#3280) Bill Dewey: We've discussed that already and Allan's explanation, at least from prior years, the extent of the public input was when the BOCC considers their budget they have a public hearing.

(#3300) Tim Wing: But it's in there with everything else.

(#3306) Bill Dewey: Yes. There isn't specifically a public process for Parks and Recreation.

(#3314) Tim Wing: It seems to me that one of the recommendations we could consider making is that they have some kind of a citizens body that helps develop this plan. I'd not like to see our group host all of the



## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

public hearings for all the different groups but if there's no public input as to how this is developed then maybe there should be some kind of a citizens group.

(#3340) Bill Dewey: That was a comment I made earlier that at least specific to Parks I think that is an area that we would find a lot of interested citizens willing to contribute their time to that effort. I agree that maybe that could be a recommendation.

(#3355) Steve Clayton: Even on tonight's agenda it's not listed on here that the PAC is reviewing the Parks element.

(#3375) Diane Edgin: I think from my own standpoint and the people that I know I think they would like to see some preliminary drawings as to what is proposed for Latimer's Landing so they can have some input in it. There is such a conflict on that dock right now because people want to use it for fishing and crabbing and they've got to use it to tie their boats up.

(#3400) Allan Borden: So now you can tell them to contact the Parks Department.

(#3420) Bill Dewey: Let's try to stay focused on the matters at hand here. Right now I'm not seeing an insurmountable list at this point.

(#3428) Tim Wing: I think we should consider recommending that the Parks Department establish a group similar to TIPCAP that would look at parks projects and have an ongoing public dialog for capital improvements.

(#3445) Wendy Ervin: I think that's a good idea.

(#3455) Bill Dewey: Are there comments specific to the Water and Wastewater pages? I think we've covered that. Page 36, the \$675,000 for the Oakland Bay property, we need clarification on that. On page 40-A we've covered all the issues and Page 45 is the TIPCAP table.

(#3480) Steve Clayton: Actually, on 40-A, I'm beginning to understand after looking at it more and more of what it's trying to say. The quarter million is for repairs to existing facilities but what we aren't seeing in the darkened area is how much money is available for new projects and acquisitions. So there's a large number there that's blotted out to us that is available for new projects and acquisitions and as part of planning for ...

(#3510) Bob Fink: It's not intended to be blotted out; it's just a poor copy.

(#3530) Steve Clayton: If you read between the lines what we have is a capital improvement program with a very large number that's available for new projects and acquisitions that aren't identified. So if we're in a planning process, what plans do we have to use this very large amount of money. If you read through this, ending fund balance accelerates from currently 2004 from \$786,816 to \$3,977,155 in 2009.

(#3568) Bob Fink: That's because we don't spend it.

(#3570) Steve Clayton: We don't spend it; we don't plan to spend it; we don't plan our capital improvement plan so somebody needs to do that.

(#3588) Wendy Ervin: What is the loan repayment reserve for rodeo? Why does the rodeo need to borrow money?

(#3600) Steve Clayton: That's last year in 2003.

(#3615) Allan Borden: The second line that's dark has the appropriate number to make \$250,000 plus the number in that column equal whatever it is in the Total Ending Fund Balance. So for revised 2004, you have \$250,000 from capital improvements existing facilities and the Unrestricted Ending Fund Balance is \$568,831 when you add those two together you get \$786,816.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#3658) Bob Fink: Right. You take the Unrestricted Fund Balance and you subtract that from the Total Ending Fund Balance and you'll find out what the mystery number is.

(#3672) Steve Clayton: But basically we have no plan for future capital improvements.

(#3674) Bob Fink: It hasn't been committed. They may be building up a reserve for a major project. For instance, the expansion of this building and improvements to the Courthouse was about a 21 million dollar project so a 3 million dollar cash balance is not a lot of money to do a major project.

(#3700) Steve Clayton: Or to buy the property for \$675,000 is coming out of that line.

(#0002) Allan Borden: You can see they have money available and on a yearly basis, other than maintenance and catastrophe, they probably have a project for 2005 that would commit some of these funds.

(#0008) Steve Clayton: So they basically live year to year instead of planning ahead.

(#0012) Bob Fink: There was a plan; you saw the deficits. In 1995 and 1996 they had plans; there was a need to update the facilities and the courthouse, which was a major project, and the need to expand space for various departments, which was identified as far back as 1995. Even though they've addressed some of that need and they haven't updated exactly what they've addressed, there's still a large unmet need for facilities and for updating. We're talking about several millions of dollars. So a 3 million dollar cash reserve is something they're allowing to build up until they have enough money that they can undertake a major project.

(#0035) Steve Clayton: But what we do in the TIPCAP is we have money and we lay it out in future years with the various projects. If the CIP was to do the same thing ...

(#0040) Bob Fink: TIPCAP is still a six year plan.

(#0044) Steve Clayton: Right, but if the CIP program was to do a similar sort of thing then we would see those various projects that need to be done laid out on a spreadsheet and in theory an idea of when they might be done rather than you're the only one that knows.

(#0050) Bob Fink: I don't disagree with that concept I'm just saying this is my understanding of what's being presented; that it is an uncommitted cash reserve. Since it's beyond the six year scope of the plan is why they didn't address it but elsewhere in the capital plan there is these needs addressed for expansion of facilities.

(#0078) Tim Wing: What else do we need to address to complete our work here tonight?

(#0080) Bill Dewey: We're waiting to see how much work we're giving Allan before scheduling that meeting. I just want to verify that we've talked through the issues again and I have a sense that there aren't that many issues. I'm wondering if we still need a special meeting or are we getting closer to some action tonight.

(#0094) Mark Drain: Let's do the action tonight and be done with it.

(#0098) Tim Wing: I don't have any problem with doing that.

(#0100) Diane Edgin: We are getting closer to understanding this.

(#0102) Mark Drain: Yes, we have a better understanding and more faith in the numbers you've presented to us.

(#0105) Bill Dewey: Just for clarification, Allan, on the list of pages you were suggesting you'd be looking for advise from us on, you didn't include the Stormwater section. Is that because there is no budget and no proposed expenditure there?

(#0112) Allan Borden: I included page 45.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#0118) Bill Dewey: That's the TIPCAP table; that's roads. Are you saying that's where our stormwater is dealt with; through our roads?

(#0122) Allan Borden: According to Public Works; yes.

(#0126) Bill Dewey: So essentially you are saying pages 43 to 45.

(#0135) Bob Fink: There are no amendments proposed on pages 43 and 44.

(#0138) Tim Wing: That's the text and that's from 1995 or 1996, correct?

(#0140) Allan Borden: That's correct.

(#0142) Tim Wing: What is that going to be replaced with?

(#0144) Bob Fink: It will be updated next year. How long it will take to get a county stormwater plan, I don't know. We're working on watershed plans for most of the county now and those watershed plans will deal with water quality. We don't know what recommendations are going to come out of that. There's the Hood Canal project underway where they're looking at ways to address the crisis in Hood Canal. We don't know what recommendations are going to come out of that. There's two ways you look at stormwater. One way is through regulation and the other way is through capital improvements. Your capital improvements isn't a major part of that in a rural county because stormwater capital improvements ... storm sewers are only allowed in urban areas. You can't put them in rural areas. They're urban services so you're really talking about regulatory in ways to address stormwater.

(#0175) Bill Dewey: So is there funding to address stormwater in the Belfair UGA?

(#0180) Bob Fink: It's part of the project they're looking at now and the report will be out at the end of the year and there's an estimate of at least hundreds of thousands of dollars to address stormwater but it's stormwater related to the road where they're taking the drainage from offsite that comes to the road ditch and finding ways to redirect the streams so the streams no longer mix with the road water runoff and now can bypass the runoff from the road rather than polluting it.

(#0200) Terri Jeffreys: Are you referring to the stormwater that's coming off the residences and commercial?

(#0205) Bill Dewey: I'm thinking of stormwater in general, not just highway runoff.

(#0210) Tim Wing: We just opened a new building and there's a huge piece of land that's taken up by bioswale and detention pond that is taking care of every bit of runoff from all the impervious surfaces. So I think that's already in place with new construction.

(#0215) Bob Fink: They're looking at stormwater as one of the topics in Belfair but they're looking at improvements to the road drainage system, part of which addresses offsite because currently offsite drainage runs into the road system and they want to separate that out. There's also some streams that actually run into the road ditch and then run out. They want to make a separation there and they want to have better treatment for the road runoff. You can consider this capital improvements for county projects so much of the drainage that's in there is either county roads or it's storm sewers that the county is building as part of an overall system. The only place we can provide storm sewer is in the urban areas. The Belfair one, at this point, we're relying on onsite improvements. At some point in the future, in Allyn and Belfair, they may look at retrofitting or trying to address existing stormwater issues through nonroads related improvements but we're really not at that point yet.

(#0260) Bill Dewey: Are we ready to make a motion to move ahead on this instead of having a special meeting next week?

(#0270) Tim Wing: We're basically going to say that we received and reviewed and are acknowledging that we're familiar with it and that we made recommendations for changes to it that I assume the staff has noted.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2004

(#0280) Wendy Ervin: Must it be a motion or can it be an acknowledgment that we have observed or perused these things and made considerable recommendations but ...

(#0295) Bill Dewey: Darren is suggesting that it be in the form of a motion.

(#0300) Bob Fink: Your recommendations can be your motion that we review the material and recommend the following issues be addressed or the following modifications be made and then we'll list those. That's one type of motion you could make if that's the direction is sounds like you're heading in. Presumably the things where you're not recommending changes on or either not addressing because they're old language or they're okay because they're adequately addressed.

(#0325) Tim Wing: I move that the PAC refer the Capital Facilities Plan to the BOCC for their consideration with the changes as noted to the staff by the PAC.

(#0375) Mark Drain: I'll second that motion.

(#0385) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#0400) Darren Nienaber: I think part of your recommendation was to form a Park Advisory Board, correct Tim?

(#0402) Tim Wing: That's correct.

Meeting adjourned.