

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes  
May 8, 2006**

(Note audio tape (#3) dated May 8, 2006  
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 Chair Bill Dewey at 6:00 p.m.

## **2. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** Bill Dewey, Tim Wing, Steve Clayton, Terri Jeffreys, Jay Hupp and Diane Edgin. Wendy Ervin was absent.

**Staff Present:** Bob Fink, Steve Goins, Barbara Adkins, Allan Borden, and Susie Ellingson.

## **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the March 20, 2006 and April 17, 2006 were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

March 20, 2006:

Under item (#0682) it should read: 'Tim Wing inquired as to when staff will be preparing the draft for us'.

Under item (#1200) it should read: 'He said the surveys need to be done ...'

Under item (#1260) it should read: 'Terri Jeffreys suggested that side by side there should be ...'

Under item (#1400) it should read: '... by giving interviews and put in announcements regarding this'.

## **4. NEW BUSINESS**

(#0140) Pam Bennett-Cumming opened her presentation with an overview of the Watershed Planning Progress in Mason County. When the Watershed Planning Act was adopted by the legislature, they wanted to find a more cooperative, grass roots way of looking at current and future water situations in the WRIA's around the state. A WRIA (Watershed Resource Inventory Area) is an area of land where if you stand on the boundary, the water that falls on one foot is going to go on one area, and the water that falls on the other foot is going to go into a different one. These are imaginary lines drawn around the areas that feed stream systems and river systems. The lawmakers wanted to provide local citizens, along with local governmental groups, an opportunity to participate in a larger planning process. Through this, Mason County has

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

participated in several watershed planning efforts. We're lead entity for watershed planning in WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, and in WRIA 16 - Skokomish-Dosewallips. This work is funded through grants from the Department of Ecology, provided specifically for watershed planning. In addition, the county has participated in WRIA 15 - Kitsap, and WRIA 22/23 - Chehalis.

As you are aware, Terri Jeffreys is on the watershed planning for WRIA 14 and she is a really great resource for your group. The watershed planning groups consist of representatives from county, city, tribal and state governments, as well as local stakeholders including developers, farmers, water purveyors, environmental groups and local citizens. The planning unit membership lists for WRIA's 14 and 16 are attached to the staff report presented to you.

Water shed plans must attempt to balance competing resource demands. By statute, plans are required to address water quantity by undertaking an assessment of water supply and use within the watershed. This includes recommending long term strategies to address water quantity for people, streams, fish and habitat. The Act also provides that planning units may address several optional plan elements, such as instream flow, water quality, and habitat. In the case of WRIA's 14 and 16, the planning units elected to include the optional elements on water quality and habitat. In 14, instream flow was set in the 1980's by Ecology rule, and in 16, the planning unit made the decision not to address it in the plan.

As an outcome of the watershed planning process, WRIA's 14 and 16 are making recommendations to DOE for their 2007 and 2009 Biennium budget building process. We indicated that looking at 14 and 16, looking at water quantity is an issue and there would have to be more hydrogeological studies to do that. Both of the WRIA's put forward recommendations to DOE and there still isn't funding for that. In terms of characterizing the two planning processes, not only are the lands very different, but the processes of the watershed plans were very different. In 14, the actual planning part started in 2000. The major recommendations out of the plan are monitoring and data analysis, sewage management, stormwater management, future water quantity and quality planning, conservation, habitat, public education and outreach, compliance and enforcement. The draft plan is completed on that. The Squaxin Tribe has expressed concerns about the plan, and as the planning units are voting on this, it has to be unanimous for the plan to be adopted and then move on to the BOCC review. The WRIA 16 plan process started in 1999. The elements addressed were water quantity, water quality, habitat, and recognizes key issues and conditions in the watershed. They recommend that more data be gathered. They're looking at water conservation, supply and use, on-site septic systems, animal waste, stormwater, Hood Canal, funding, education and outreach, enforcement, support for ongoing activities, information gathering and implementing this plan around these recommendations. This draft is also completed. These drafts and supporting newsletters can be viewed on the DOE website under watershed planning. In terms of status for the future, there's a very strong sense at both the county level and in the planning unit level that the plan will go forward. Those are two very different characters of watershed planning processes.

(#0600) Mike Jensen inquired about WRIA 16 and the water quality at Webb Hill and has there been extensive tests there.

(#0610) Pam Bennett-Cumming responded that Webb Hill is a very large application site for biosolids and it's regulated by the State DOE and they have the ultimate say on whether it can keep going on not. There's also a permit at the county level through the solid waste part of the health department. Both the health department water quality people and DOE people do monitoring on a quarterly basis. I'm intimately familiar with the health department aspect of this as I worked very closely on that at the health department and up at that site on a regular basis. What I've seen is that there's one wetland near the site that has ever so slightly elevated nitrate levels. It's not clear what has caused it, or even if it's from Webb Hill. Further study is being done at the federal level and through the Hood Canal Dissolved Oxygen Program, including the US Geological Survey. The spotlight is really on the Hood Canal right now.

(#0725) Jay Hupp inquired as to where do we go from here if the plan is not adopted and recommended to be forwarded to the BOCC.

(#0740) Pam Bennett-Cumming responded as to how that structure works. When a plan is voted at the planning unit level, from there, if the vote is positive, it goes forward to the BOCC as a public process through

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

a public hearing. The BOCC may choose to accept the plan submitted by the planning units or reject it, or remand it back to the planning units for modifications. The BOCC cannot change the document themselves. If the watershed plan, at the planning unit level is not voted in a positive way and not adopted, then it does not go any further to the BOCC. In the first scenario, when a plan does get voted on and adopted at the planning unit level, and it goes to the BOCC, as with WRIA 16, a parallel process would be happening with the Jefferson County Commissioners at the same time and if both BOCC's voted to accept the plan, then the next public process would be the joint boards having a public hearing to adopt the plan.

(#0775) Jay Hupp further inquired what happens if it is not voted in. He stated that we've had these watersheds closed down for further consumptive use of surface water for about five years now. He inquired as to how do we get out of that box.

(#0800) Pam Bennett-Cumming responded that we're looking at a separate issue than whether a watershed plan gets adopted or not. Where you've got closed basins that's a closed basin determined by DOE, regardless of what the planning unit does. She further stated that the planning units can make further recommendations regarding that, but they're not the same issue. Terri, you may have some comments to interject.

(#0830) Terri Jeffreys added that was one of a lot of people's frustrations that WRIA 14 was not addressing water quantity and abilities to allocate more water to needed areas. The process does not even address that, even though it is in the statute that that is one of the purposes. Our state water laws don't allow for it. There's no political will to do that at this point. There are two conflicting authorities and the law was not written in a way that could make those two meet. She further stated that where a basin is threatened to be closed, like up in Jefferson County, they're looking at including in the planning unit process in developing what they call the instream flows rules so that they can assure water will be available to meet future growth.

(#0888) Tim Wing stated that in reviewing the documents, there doesn't seem to be anything in here that this leads to any action. There's planning, grants to do more planning, and there's talk about data gathering and outreaching, etc.

(#0900) Pam Bennett-Cumming responded by saying that water rights are not addressed in the documents. Instream flows are not addressed in either plan. Those things that are often very important to people who are looking at development issues and growth for the future, are not in there. That part of water quantity in WRIA 16 is on a separate track, and in WRIA 14 the instream flows have been set separately.

(#0935) Tim Wing inquired what 'being on a separate track' refers to.

(#0940) Pam Bennett-Cumming replied that they're being worked on separately from the planning unit process; there are different people in that respect. They're governed by different laws. What happens next is that we move into the implementation phase. That releases funding to actually do work on these recommendations on the ground.

(#1000) Tim Wing stated that he knows that if people ask for a Class A water system where water rights are involved, it could take them ten to fifteen years to get their permit to the top of the pile. At that rate we won't have any places for people to live. He inquired as to if this plan were full implemented, would it supersede the authority of DOE.

(#1035) Pam Bennett-Cumming replied that it would not. It's not going to do anything to change the way Class A water systems are applied for, except that if our recommendation is accepted by DOE, and they really do something to streamline the system, that's the kind of change we would have. The plan recommendations specific actions around how this is looked at; it doesn't have the authority to change state law.

(#1080) Terri Jeffreys interjected that as they've gone through the watershed plan process, DOE was very interested in making sure the plans included any kind of recommendations that needed to go to the state legislature or a specific agency. At one point, there is an audit of how this planning process is working and the idea is that all the watersheds around the state have a resounding cry for the state legislature to act.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

That would be a voice for a need to change.

(#1100) Jay Hupp stated that he had a misunderstanding of what these planning units were all about. He further stated that some years the basins were closed and the planning units were put in place to put local input into how the basins were going to be handled in the future after they were studied.

(#1135) Terri Jeffreys responded that it goes again into the implementation and how is the recommendation going to be implemented by the agencies that are statutorily responsible for the rules. Up in Jefferson County, with WRIA 17, it's the first time DOE is saying that they will not write in instream flow rule. We will take the recommendations and it goes from there. There is nothing in the statutory authority to demand that DOE adopt the plan; they will take it into consideration. There's been a verbal promise by DOE to take into consideration the planning unit's recommendation on the flow rule. How that acts out, we'll have to wait and see.

(#1185) Diane Edgin added that because Jefferson County is so dry, she believes that Jefferson County has more pieces already in place to work down this path that we're trying to do.

(#1200) Pam Bennett-Cumming believes that parts of Jefferson County are so water poor that they're already there; they've already had to deal with this some years ago.

(#1215) Terri Jeffreys stated that the theory that is being looked at by DOE to loosen up these water rights is to create a water bank and start allocating water rights out of this bank. It was first started up in Skagit County.

(#1350) Diane Edgin inquired about the reuse of water.

(#1400) Pam Bennett-Cumming explained about reclaimed water. It would mean taking water that has gone through a large treatment system and taking it to Class A reclaimed water standards so you could water golf courses with it, etc. You wouldn't want to drink it for a long period of time because it's fairly high in nitrates. Water that is treated to those kinds of standards could be used for flushing toilets, or maybe put it back into an aquifer and over time it would percolate through and be cleaned and come back as drinking water.

(#1450) Bill Dewey stated that we should start to think about reclaimed water, especially when we're putting in sewers and fire protection.

(#1500) Jay Hupp stated that what is frustrating to him is that there has been no hint at any time during this entire process that there's an inadequacy of water quantity in Mason County.

(#1550) Tim Wing inquired as to what the PAC should be doing with this tonight.

(#1575) Pam Bennett-Cumming responded that it was purely for informational purposes.

(#1600) Tim Wing stated that he would hope some of these efforts would lead to some serious efforts on conservation. Also, education is very important, especially to our young children. Implementation of conservation measures is very important. I'd like to see more effort on that part. I just don't know what they think is happening is a positive result of not allowing Class A systems to be built, or taking ten years to be approved.

(#1670) Steve Clayton inquired about pump-outs for RV's. He stated that the only places these are located are at state parks.

(#1700) Pam Bennett-Cumming replied that there is a recommendation to access pump-outs to see if there are enough for the various uses.

(#1725) The PAC thanked Pam for her presentation.

(#1750) Bob Fink introduced Tim Walsh from the Washington Department of Natural Resources who will talk about some of the background information and context of the landslide hazard areas, as well as discussing

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

some of the other areas of his responsibility with hazards.

(#1800) Tim Walsh started his presentation by stating that he is with the part of DNR that is called the Division of Geology and Earth Resources. He stated that he will talk about Growth Management / Critical Areas planning and will show how that is worked into a philosophy for how communities deal with their growth management issues for geologically hazardous areas. In response to problems associated with rapid urbanization, the Washington State legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA) of 1990, which mandated comprehensive planning in the fastest growing counties and their cities. GMA also required those cities and counties to designate and protect critical areas, including geologically hazardous areas which are those subject to landslides, other erosion processes, seismic and volcanic hazards, and abandoned mine settlement. In 1991, GMA was amended to extend critical area protection to all Washington cities and counties. Some were required to be amended by 1991, and others by 1992. WAC 365.190.080(4) described them as follows: 'Geologically hazardous areas include areas susceptible to erosion, sliding, earthquake, or other geological events. They pose a threat to the health and safety of citizens when incompatible commercial, residential, or industrial development is sited in areas of significant hazard. Some hazards can be reduced by engineering, design, or modified construction practices so that risks to health and safety are acceptable. When technology cannot reduce risks to acceptable levels, building in geologically hazardous areas is best avoided'. A more practical working definition is: 'Geologically hazardous areas are those areas that are more hazardous than the region as a whole by virtue of the presence of or proximity to geologic conditions that have a significant probability of causing or accentuating hazards'. Implicit in that is the notion of probability. We have thresholds for geologic hazards that trigger responses and at some probability level we don't worry about them because they're too unlikely to occur. Also implicit in the definition is the notion that the designation of geologically hazardous areas makes distinctions between hazardous and relatively less hazardous areas. Under this definition, remote hazards or really uniform hazards would not be explicitly addressed in zoning but rather in building codes.

The WAC recommended 'that counties and cities should classify geologically hazardous areas as either:

- i. Known or suspected risk
- ii. No risk
- iii. Risk unknown'

What we're trying to do is reduce our risk. Risk = Hazard x Value x Vulnerability. Hazard is a natural event with negative consequences and some probability of occurrence for a specified period of time. Value is the total value of the elements at risk (people, property, stock). Vulnerability is the varying susceptibility of different things to destruction by the same hazard. Vulnerability is a function of three factors:

1. Risk amplification measures, which include the effects of unwise land use and poor construction practices;
2. Risk mitigation measures, which include both structural and nonstructural approaches;
3. Risk perception factors, which may either increase or decrease vulnerability depending on how much importance the prevailing public opinion places on the recognition and management of geologic hazard risk.

Risk is only present when something of value is at stake. Before you would take some action on it there needs to be some minimum probability threshold to trigger protective plans or actions. It is easy to see that risk increases when there is more that can be lost, even if the hazard stays the same. Losses from future earthquakes that are similar in magnitude to those that have affected Washington in the past will be much greater, at least because the value is greater and possibly also because of growth pressures drive development into marginal land and so increase vulnerability.

Reducing hazard of earthquakes is limited to ameliorating some of the secondary effects of earthquakes - the probability of earthquake occurrence itself and the associated basic strong ground motion cannot be decreased. However, liquefiable soils can be rendered nonliquefiable by, for instance, grouting or installation of a dense network of pilings. Also, soils that liquefy or amplify can be excavated or compacted. Slopes can be dewatered or slope angles can be reduced and flood hazards can be reduced by flood control dams and other structures.

Reducing value is achieved by limiting the type of intensity of land uses in hazardous areas, such as siting

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

parking lots, parks, or golf courses in the hazard zone, or through total avoidance of the hazard. Warning systems can also be used to temporarily reduce the value of assets at risk by allowing people to escape from hazard zones if there is adequate warning, such as for a tsunami or a volcanic mudflow (lahar) from Mt. Rainier or other Cascade Range volcano.

Vulnerability can be reduced through engineering approaches that render a structure relatively resistant to hazards, such as building codes, parapet ordinances, seismic retrofits, bulkheads and retaining walls, or by positioning a structure on a less hazardous part of a property, or by elevating structures in flood zones.

The seismic hazardous areas are areas subject to severe risk of damage as a result of earthquake induced ground shaking, slope failure, settlement, or soil liquefaction. The basic scenario where we get earthquakes is we have a subduction zone, the oceanic crust is being pushed under North America so that gives rise to the potential for huge earthquakes magnitude 9.0 or larger than can happen on the interface between the subduction slab and overlying North America. We can also get earthquakes that happen within that slab and these are historic around here. As the subduction slab dips down into the mantle it undergoes a change so it sinks at a steeper angle. When that happens, the slab is pulled apart and we get earthquakes. That's the kind of earthquakes we had in 1949, 1965, and 2001. This also gives rise with earthquakes that happen within the earth's crust; the upper fifteen kilometers of the crust. This is the kind of earthquake they get in California. They don't get the kinds that we get. We have a much more complex seismic hazard than they do. *(Tim shows liquefaction map prepared for Mason County).*

Tim continues to show examples of landslides around the county. Landslide hazard areas are areas potentially subject to risk of mass movement due to a combination of geologic, topographic, and hydrologic factors. Tim discusses colluvium, which is loose soil material that sloughs down a slope. That mixed with large woody debris forms piles of debris that are gradually winnowed by wave action at high tide.

Tim explained that their funding is being restored as of July 1<sup>st</sup> and he knows we need to move ahead more quickly than that. He stated that they have some other programs that can be of help in establishing our new critical areas ordinance. He indicated that there is a landslide hazard project they're doing through their forest practices division. It is meant to be slope stability for regulatory purposes in timber harvest. It looks at the kinds of slopes that would be exacerbated by forest practices, such as harvest, road building, yarding, hauling, etc. It's not directly applicable but much of what goes into it is something that would be useful to Mason County. We do have LIDAR (laser range finding that's done from an airplane) which gives you highly detailed and accurate topography. We then do a landslide inventory and having the laser range finding makes it especially accurate to do that. From that we put together a landslide susceptibility map. While they're put together for forest practices, they would be reasonably applicable to land use planning because what we typically are saying is these are areas of low to no hazard, moderate hazard, and high hazard when disturbed. Come July 1<sup>st</sup> when we get our funding and start our landslide hazard mapping project, we are going to specifically tailor these things so that they are used for urban hazard planning.

Tim ended the presentation by stating that having a map that shows where landslides happens, but what you want to know as a planner or a planning commission is whether it's safe to build a house on the area next to that landslide. So there are ways you can do that, and what we're doing here is a screening tool. He explained the greater the level of detail that you have to look at these things, the more specific the recommendations can be. That's why your ordinance says that you identify areas that you regard as high hazard and if somebody wants to develop in that area, then you make them get a more detailed analysis of what the source of the hazard is and whether there's a place on the property that can be avoided. I want to help allow you not to have to put people through the expense of a geotechnical report if they don't have to. If you have any questions or need any more information, our website is [www.dnr.wa.dob/geology](http://www.dnr.wa.dob/geology).

(#0800) Steve Goins stated that the City of Shelton is not here tonight for their presentation on the regional water and wastewater planning and also their sub-area plan. So we will defer discussion on those two items. Patty Miller-Crowley is here from the Port of Shelton to give us an update on their Master Planning process.

(#0825) Patty Miller-Crowley started her presentation by stating that they are very early in updating their plan. They will be having various workshops in the very near future to detail out more issues. I will discuss with you some areas of thought where we will be looking to coordinate with both the City of Shelton and Mason

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

County. I will discuss some of the accomplishments and challenges that we're facing right now. Many of you are familiar with the Cole property that is next to the marina. We are in the process of purchasing that property from them and the purchase is contingent on them removing the fuel tanks and also the known leaking fuel. We can't finalize the property transfer until the environmental cleanup is completed.

(#0870) Jay Hupp inquired as to whether that will completely remove the port from any potential responsibility for future environmental concerns in the future.

(#0888) Patty Miller-Crawley explained that there is going to be monitoring afterwards. I feel convinced they think this cleanup will take care of the problem. It's a very extensive removal. That does not address anything to do with tidelands. That involves more than just one property owner. That's an issue for the future.

(#0900) Terri Jeffreys inquired what will be the use of the land.

(#0925) Patty Miller-Crawley responded that they were primarily planning on making it a parking area to expand the marina. The airport overlay zone, which Mason County adopted, the Port had hoped the city would adopt it, also. They're in the process of doing that with their update. She stated another issue is critical aquifer protection. Both Sanderson Field and Johns Prairie are over critical aquifers. Also, there are sewage and water system limitations. It's not been a hugely limiting factor, but as development gets more dense, it will become more and more important.

There is a twelve inch ductile iron water line that's being extended to Belco up on Johns Prairie. They are expanding on the Port property. We sized it so that in the future if there's a regional water system, it's there in the ground. Some of the issues with sewer, stormwater and water are regionalization, phasing, demand, marketability, aquifer protection, and water rights.

(#1050) Jay Hupp inquired about the status of their water rights.

(#1055) Patty Miller-Crawley responded that they are still pursuing them.

(#1060) Steve Clayton inquired with current water rights, what is the percentage of use.

(#1065) Patty Miller-Crawley responded that she did not have that data right now. It's part of our Comp Plan is to get those figures. For the marina update, they've had plans on the books for upgrading the marina, including improving public access. One of the limiting factors has been parking so that's why we're excited about the Cole property. We need to look at operation, recreational opportunities, access issues, sewage, parking, and permitting. The sewer line currently does not extend to the marina and that's a significant issue. We've put in for a grant and we're hoping to work out the street easements with the city.

(#1150) Tim Wing inquired if they were sure they weren't going to inherit responsibility for contaminated soil after they own the property. Is that assurance there.

(#1170) Patty Miller-Crawley stated that she was not familiar with every intricacy of the purchase. The Port's attorney has reviewed the documents and must feel fairly comfortable with the documents. If you monitor it and something does show up, you can go back because that's part of the cleanup. That's one of the reasons we have monitoring wells. There's been substantial research and the environmental documents have been under review by DOE for quite a while.

(#1215) Bill Dewey inquired if this project would be increasing slip space.

(#1220) Patty Miller-Crawley responded that there will be some reconfiguring and building of boat houses and a new breakwater. It will also increase substantially public access opportunities.

(#1235) Bill Dewey stated that as a representative of the shellfish industry, there are already challenges in Oakland Bay and inquired if there's going to be increased recreational boat usage out there, is there a plan to connect to sewer.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

(#1250) Patty Miller-Crawley stated that was their intent for the future.

(#1255) Bill Dewey added that it would be ideal to get a boater pump out.

(#1260) Patty Miller-Crawley stated that was in their plans for the expansion. It includes running a pump out to the new breakwater that would be more easily accessible. She continued on stating that they had a feasibility study done for a rail plan and the Port of Shelton has put some money into siting and it's been very successful but the siting has been bandaged and so one of the things they're studying is, is it cost effective to continue to band-aid it or redo it. We're investigating the phasing of that and whether to expand it. We've also discussed the airport and marina serving as gateways for the community and how they would like it to have landscaping and design standards.

(#1600) The PAC thanked Patty Miller-Crawley for her presentation.

(#1650) Steve Goins introduced Tom Moore who is going to discuss the solid waste efforts that have been going on between the county and the city.

(#1665) Tom Moore stated that he is with the County's Department of Utilities and Waste Management. The solid waste advisory committee (SWAC) has been working on updating the solid waste management plan. In 1993 Mason County closed its landfill and elected to export solid waste to a regional landfill in Eastern Washington. The transfer station is located on Eells Hills Road near Dayton Airport Road. There are three drop off stations in Mason County. One in Hoodspert, one in Belfair, and one in Union. The waste is transported from our drop off stations to our transfer station by private hauler. We then transfer them to long haul boxes that are trucked to Centralia and loaded on rail for transfer to Eastern Washington. We studied a number of options, including opening another landfill and waste incineration and the long haul. We determined it would be most beneficial to stay with the long haul.

I broke down the recommendations from the SWAC into chapters. Chapter 3 deals with waste reduction and recycling. We recommended several issues. Outreach to the public regarding our programs, and the locations of our facilities. We going to continue evaluating the blue box recycling program. We looking at increasing mix paper recycling opportunities. That is one of the biggest commodities we take in. We need to plan for that financially. We want to improve recycling options for employees at local government facilities. We want to divert organics for composting. Chapter 4 talks about solid waste protection and disposal. We would continue to review and evaluate procedures at all solid waste and collection facilities to reduce waiting times during peak use periods. Explore new opportunities for public / private partnerships dealing with improving solid and special waste collection and transporting. Chapter 5 talks about solid waste administration and enforcement. We wish to explore additional abatement and public property clean up funding alternatives. We have a number of properties where the county obtains them by default. They are fined and a lien put on their property and eventually the county ends up with them. We'd like to set up some funding mechanisms that would allow us to go in and clean these properties up.

(#2155) Tim Wing stated that we need to do something with regulations that allows these properties to get to that point.

(#2175) Tom Moore pointed out that there are regulations but unfortunately it's not a high priority for the sheriff's department or prosecuting attorney. Chapter 6 talks about animal carcasses, asbestos, bio-medical waste, biosolids, construction and demolition, disaster debris and tires. Those need to be handled in a special manner. It takes extra processing and attention. We will review these documents are our next SWAC meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>. We'll have a final draft for comment and get this incorporated into the county plan. We need to get the City of Shelton to concur with this plan and once we get that, then the BOCC's approval and then it goes to DOE for their final blessing and it becomes the solid waste guide for us to use for the next six years. It doesn't include any major facility construction in this planning period but we have some large growth numbers planned for the north end of the county and we may be expanding there.

(#2525) Jay Hupp stated that all of our solid waste is hauled out of the county and asked what we are paying per ton to have that done.



## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

(#2538) Tom Moore responded that it's in the vicinity of about \$45.00, and we charge \$63.00. The last time we signed an update for our program we extended it from five years to fifteen years. We've gone from 25,000 tons a year to 35,000 tons a year. We will probably need to increase our rates next year.

(#2800) Diane Edgin inquired about the piles of aluminum and tin and water heaters, etc., and if they were selling those directly.

(#2810) Tom Moore responded that they pay someone a cent and a half a pound to take them away and recycle them.

(#2825) Diane Edgin asked if the items that are set aside are sold directly.

(#2830) Tom Moore replied that they give them away; they are charged to be brought in.

(#2900) Terri Jeffreys inquired if they break even.

(#2910) Tom Moore responded that they are self sufficient.

(#2950) Tim Wing inquired about the tire fund.

(#2960) Tom Moore responded that they get a grant for those funds.

(#2975) Jay Hupp added that for the next five years, those funds will go to specific clean up sites. Mason County does not have any sites with tires being cleaned up right now.

(#2985) Tim Wing stated that manufacturers should take responsibility for recycling the product they make. He inquired about lobbying being done regarding that.

(#2990) Tom Moore stated that there was legislation passed this year where manufacturers of electronic waste are going to fund a program for that. It's done that way in California. That's just for electronics. There are also collection programs for motor oil. We used to have to pay about three cents a gallon to get rid of it but now the hauler gets the motor oil at no charge on the basis that they take away the anti-freeze product. The anti-freeze is filtered and recycled by Emerald Services.

(#3075) Steve Clayton stated that Kitsap County transports their waste directly on rail, rather than transporting it via truck and if that is economical for Mason County.

(#3088) Tom Moore responded by saying that there is no rail siting at their facility. Kitsap County did it via a private / public partnership. Waste Management built that facility for them with a ten year contract to operate it. Kitsap County collects the money and pays them as a contractor. After the contract expires, Kitsap County owns that facility. We built ours ourselves and operate it ourselves on property that we own. He stated that we ship between five and seven trucks a day. Kitsap County ships thirty. However, we are growing all the time.

(#3255) Jay Hupp inquired if there was a facility here in Mason County that was generating 30 tons of ash a day, could the county handle it.

(#3265) Tom Moore responded that we could. However, if it is concentrated heavy metal ash which could be considered hazardous waste, special provisions would have to be made in handling it.

(#3300) Jay Hupp inquired what if the ash was contaminated with salt and became hazardous waste.

(#3320) Tom Moore replied that they would have to load it separately and could be sent to the same landfill.

(#3430) Bill Dewey inquired if the plan had any provisions in it for trying to increase recycling.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

(#3325) Tom Moore responded that they have a plan of going to businesses to talk to them about reducing their waste. That would involve using recycling items in their business and also what they use that is very difficult for us to recycle. That's part of our information and outreach program.

(#3485) Tim Wing stated that there are no provisions for when a new business is built if there is any place inside the building to do recycling. He stated that he works in a brand new building and the paper bin is in the hallway. There is no thought given to serious recycling in the workplace.

(#3525) Tom Moore stated that they have purchased bins for under the desk recycling. That will be our pilot program. Office paper is a commodity that people pay well for.

(#3590) Tim Wing stated that he is more concerned about designing spaces in the building before the permit is even given out.

(#3600) Steve Goins asked Mr. Wing if he thought we should be regulating that.

(#3645) Tim Wing responded that we do and that we need to find ways to do that.

(#3800) Tom Moore stated that he has been in the field operations for the solid waste for the last fifteen years and he does know a lot of the issues. However, we need someone that's passionate about this and we currently have a job opening for a recycling coordinator / solid waste manager to take on this responsibility.

(#0075) Steve Clayton stated that on the consumer end of it, the school districts he goes to and sees, the mentality is there to recycle in the kitchens and food service operations, but the facilities haven't been provided for them.

(#0100) Tim Wing stated that the children need to be taught at a young age through the school system about the benefits of recycling. They can then take it home to their parents.

(#0135) The PAC thanked Tom Moore for his presentation.

(#0145) There was a discussion about the upcoming meetings. A decision will be made this week regarding the upcoming schedule for June.

(#0155) Steve Goins handed out copies of a letter he prepared that he wants the PAC to review which summarizes some of the transportation issues discussed over the last few months. He asked the PAC to review it and comment on it and it will be discussed at the next meeting.

(#0200) There was a discussion regarding the airport overlay zone. Steve Clayton inquired that if the airport overlay zone that we approved is different than the zoning we have for the county, are we going to change our county maps to match.

(#0235) Steve Goins stated that there's not a conflict there. There are further restrictions within those zoning districts based on what the overlay and whatever zone you happen to be in that would apply.

(#0245) Steve Clayton stated that the county land use map might say it's one house per acre but the overlay zone says one house per five acres. So we were going to adjust the county map to show that the density isn't accurate.

(#0260) Jay Hupp inquired when you go to get a permit what applies.

(#0265) Steve Clayton states that you have a land use map on the wall that says you're in this zone in the overlay zone and here's the restriction. It would seem you would want to have an accurate map and not an additional subzone map.

(#0275) Allan Borden stated that most of it is in the UGA and technically not zoned currently.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 8, 2006

(#0280) Steve Clayton stated that's true but we do have a responsibility for a good part of the area in the county that's in the overlay zone.

(#0292) Steve Goins stated that part of the discussion we were hoping to have with the City of Shelton tonight was how they're forwarding their subarea planning and what are the zoning districts that they recommend we adopt would come into that discussion and we weren't able to have that discussion tonight.

Meeting adjourned.