

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
August 18, 2008

(Note audio tape (#2) dated August 18, 2008
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 at 6:00 pm by Chair Bill Dewey.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bill Dewey, Tim Wing, Dennis Pickard, Jim Reece, Diane Edgin, Debbie Jacobs, and Don LeMaster, our newly appointed member.

Staff Present: Barbara Adkins and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the June 16, 2008 meeting were approved as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0050) Charlie Butros, Director of the Public Works Department, introduced the workshop on the Transportation Element of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan. Charlie explained the last update was in November of 2005, and the update prior to that was approximately 10 years prior. They are trying to work at getting an annual update of the Transportation Element, and that is what you see before you. We are updating the attachments and exhibits by referencing links and tables. Hans Cregg, our Transportation Supervisor, has updated this element and is here tonight to answer any of your questions. He is responsible for the transportation portion of the work we do. We haven't change the approach or basis for the way we manage the work. We are continuing to develop a transportation system that distributes cost and benefits equitably to the citizens. The maximum return from expenditures of county funds will be accomplished through revised use of limited resources. The county has a responsibility and challenge to make the best use of the limited funds available to finance transportation projects. In prior discussions that we've had, there was some question and challenge about how we applied our priorities and our resources. We explained at the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 18, 2008

time, the approach we generally use is to maximize the benefit that we have from grant funding from state and federal grants for bridge replacements, culvert replacements, road upgrades for safety improvements. Those grants come with a requirement to match the funds, generally at anywhere from 15% to 25%. The funding that we have available we use and apply in a way that maximizes the benefit we get. We get funding from road taxes, property taxes, gas taxes.

(#0200) Hans Cregg noted it is a chore to keep this document upgraded so I could send you a CD which has all the maps and information, and as the information changes.

(#0220) Bill Dewey stated there was a memo that came from the PAC with a number of different of issues related to transportation, and he wondered if Charlie could elaborate on those.

(#0235) Charlie Butros noted the first issue was how we prioritize the work. Planning from the prospective of complying with GMA requirements is the primary responsibility of the Planning Department. We tie in and coordinate with the Planning Department on those issues. We have in the package a future roads plan. The old version is in your package, and I have here the latest one prepared by the Public Works Department, which I will pass around. The new version reflects some of the proposed future roads that we have planned for the county. Several of them are in the UGA's, and several of them are outside the UGA's. We have used that as a basis for our coordination with the Planning Department on where we see the future needs for roads. A lot of that is driven based on growth and road use.

(#0275) Miscellaneous discussion regarding the 6-year program versus the long range plan for roads. Discussed the necessity to put into high priority those roads hit hardest by the storms, and how much help can be given by FEMA for their repair. There was a discussion about Johns Prairie Road, working with DOT to improve the intersection there with Highway 3, and having little support from DOT.

(#0600) Diane Edgin noted the brush and trees need to be maintained better in order to have proper viewing when pulling out onto Highway 3 from Johns Prairie Road. Diane inquired about the trucks using that hill, and how many trucks stall out going up that hill.

(#0630) Charlie Butros explained they are very concerned about the grade there and that's out part of the road. That's why we were proposing rebuilding that road.

(#0675) Tim Wing stated he has studied this new element carefully and compared it to the 2005 element, and doesn't see any changes, except for the list of projects.

(#0685) Charlie Butros explained the approach and philosophy, the general standards that we use that this describes have not changed.

(#0700) Tim Wing inquired of Charlie how his department interacts with the Planning Department to integrate rules of the GMA into your prioritization system.

(#0720) Charlie Butros explained we don't have a very definable structure. We interact with planning through a lot of the development applications, but from a long range standpoint, our responsibility is rather limited. The drawing I sent around for you to view as it relates to future road planning is primarily our contribution to that long range planning effort. We take existing traffic counts, projected areas of future traffic needs, and tie them in to try to identify areas in the transportation network in the county that need additional attention. We have identified areas both in the UGA's as well as the rural part of the county that we feel are needing that attention. However, sitting down and participating in a long term planning effort relating to future needs of the county, I'm not sure we have such a thing.

(#0750) Bill Dewey suggested adding 'Planning Department', and 'Planning Advisory Commission' under Goals and Policies regarding coordination policies with other departments.

(#0785) Charlie Butros stated the effort we have undertaken on this transportation element was one of trying to streamline it. In talking to the Planning Department, prior to the 2005 update, the element hadn't been updated for ten or twelve years. We agree that's way too long. Last year we had a discussion that we really

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 18, 2008

need to update it every year, but that seemed too frequent. Basic approach and concept hasn't changed, but some of the exhibits and information that are in the tables do change. We do need to tie transportation in with a multitude of other things that are tied into planning, but at this point that is not a step that is in place today.

(#0835) Tim Wing noted that none of the input from the PAC has been added to the element. It's fairly well understood by most people that GMA intends to send about 65% of the future growth of the county to the UGA's. However, when we look at the map of future roads, where are the roads inside the UGA?

(#0865) Charlie Butros noted they were in the plan.

(#0875) Tim Wing stated they are at the bottom of the list, and almost everyone of the other projects are fixing rural roads. Yet the plan says that you're going to integrate the county's projected population growth into the prioritization of urban road money.

(#0900) Charlie Butros asked Tim if he was a resident of a UGA, would he limit the use of the road network in the county to only the roads in the UGA? Obviously you would not. The majority of the roads we have in the county are meant to serve the county population between origin and destination. Even though the majority of the growth is intended to be in the UGA's the users of the roads don't limit themselves to the specific areas where they live. They use all the roads in the network. The highways, the collectors, and the rural roads. The roads that we have identified are the ones we could identify at the time. Today if we were to project the development of the UGA in Belfair, where the bypass is going, do we have an idea of where it's logical where roads go there?

(#0950) Tim Wing stated where you build roads, population grows. There's no plan inside Belfair for a road network. There's no effective plan inside Allyn, even though there's already sort of a road network there that's not developed. So until the county says where they're going to build roads, I can't say that's where the population is going to be. However, the plan says 65% of the growth is supposed to go there, so how can the growth go there if there aren't any roads there?

(#0980) Charlie Butros stated the philosophy as it's described, and as it is carried out here and elsewhere, is that growth has a responsibility to pay for growth. If a developer is planning a large development in a certain area, the responsibility of that developer is to pay for road access, utility access, and plan for the development accordingly. We did receive a \$25,000 grant for the road planning in Belfair. In our intermediate plan, it takes quite a while from the conceptual approach that we need an additional road in this location, to the point where we're doing a ribbon cutting to open up the road. That takes, in many cases, longer than 6 years. By the time you get it laid out, planned, you talk to some of the people that have property that may be affected either positively or negatively by putting a road through their property, by the time you get through the permitting phases, the design phases, and getting the packet out to construction, and then construct the road, that period of time is extensive. It's longer than a normal 6 year would allow. So the fact that these roads are at the bottom of the list is primarily because they're new to the list.

(#1070) Tim Wing stated it's because Lynda Ring Erickson insisted that those roads be added to the list, that your department opposed. If it weren't for her adding those to the list, they wouldn't even be on the list. Tim stated there isn't a system within the element that deals effectively with the county's future plans for roads, and for growth. Whatever system you're using has built one of the best rural road systems you could ever want in a county, and it even says in the back of the element that it's suffice to say that Mason County has very few capacity concerns. It also says that the roads are adequate for the next 20 years. Yet the roads that are coming up in the priority system you have been using are completely devoid of any place which deals with the GMA goals of encouraging the availability of affordable housing, for example. The last part of Grapeview Loop Road, which is on this list, is not going to create a single new housing location. Most of these roads are in the rural area where there can't be any significant economic development. It's the system of choosing what roads are going to be built in the future. I'm well aware it takes a long time for these roads to move up this process, but if they never get onto the list, they can't get in the process. It seems a lot more emphasis should be put in the areas of future growth. It's the priority system that I'm concerned about.

(#1200) Charlie Butros stated most of the priorities we have are based on funding availability. The majority of the grant funding we get is allocated to rural arterial improvements. Not to urban road development, or

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 18, 2008

new urban roads, but to rural arterial safety and surfacing improvements. That's an area where we get a substantial amount of our funding. We get five to ten million dollars a year, out of our 18 million dollar budget. That amount of money is, from our standpoint, a substantial proportion of our overall budget. It allows us to stretch our budget dollars to the maximum extent we can. The roads and the network we have are not limited to just the roads we manage and control. We've had that discussion. The roads we manage are the county roads. There is quite a bit of private roads in the county, and a lot of state highways in the county we don't have responsibility for, even though we coordinate with the state as best we can. Our responsibilities, at this point, are focused on maintenance. They're not focused on developing new roads. Should we change our focus? That's the basic point you're making. The answer to that is when we get additional money to allow ourselves to change the focus, we're more delighted to do that. However, today, with the funding we have, which continues to shrink, we are limited in our ability to change the focus and reprioritize the funding applications that we have.

(#1300) Hans Cregg said we actually go out and count the cracks in the road and based on that, we get a certain amount of money to repair them. If you don't do it for two years, funding will stop. It gets put into a data base and from that the state calculates the numbers and that is how it is determined how much money we get each year. We don't have the option of taking the money from one place and investing it in another place.

(#1375) Tim Wing stated his idea is to spend 2.5 million dollars and put a few roads in place where most of the population is going to be. Wheelwright is in the middle of Allyn and it is a 1/4 mile of road that would serve 200 home sites, which meets the GMA requirement of promoting affordable homes, and developing UGA's as places people want to live in and can live in. So spending a quarter of the county's money in a place that makes more sense, makes a lot more sense to me than spending it on some of these projects where the road is a perfectly adequate road. The last third of Grapeview Loop Road needs to be rebuilt like the first two-thirds about as much as I need to fly to the moon. Yes, the developer should pay for their roads inside their development, but the county should have a plan. The county does not have a plan in Belfair or Allyn and when a developer comes and wants to build 20 homes in Allyn, the county told him he was going to have to buy the property and build the road. It's already a road. The county should have a plan so that when the developer comes, the county can say we've already got a plan. We need to at least start to embrace the idea that significant effort should come from your department to put roads inside the UGA's and if that doesn't happen, and we don't see something different in this plan, I won't vote to send this to the BOCC. This has been going on for two years and we've had lots of discussions about it and I see zero movement with this.

(#1535) Charlie Butros stated he disagrees with most of your point on 'there isn't a plan'. There is a plan. We have taken the action to the BOCC in the last year to year and a half to designate Wheelwright, Masterson, and Wade as future county roads. We haven't gone to the point of identifying the specific area of right-of-way needed for those, but we have at least taken the step through the BOCC to identify those as future county roads. As far as the planning process, we've explained and responded on several occasions, that there aren't the resources to do that, but with the grant from CTED we now have some resources available to start that. I'm delighted we're going to be starting that. I don't disagree with you; we need to put plans in place. Where we draw the line to define whose responsibility it is, I have a different understanding of that than you do. I think you're asking for a higher contribution from the county than the county has typically provided before and that is an issue of policy that the BOCC needs to decide. At this point, the approach has been that development pays for development, so if one of those developments in Allyn was quite a ways down Wheelwright, the responsibility would be for that developer to develop the access, and assure that the impact from the traffic of his development would not have an impact on the adjoining properties or the existing road networks. If that development is right on Lakeland Drive, as has been the case with one of the developers that has recently submitted a plan, that developer ended up trying to negotiate for property to put the road in, and was unsuccessful and ended up changing his access directly to Lakeland Drive. Does that change the planning the county has for Wheelwright? No, it doesn't. Our plan is still to connect Wheelwright from Lakeland Drive to Wade. The plan is there; how it gets implemented is the topic of this discussion.

(#1650) Tim Wing stated it's not the topic for me. It's how did this get on the plan? It didn't get there because your department decided that you were going to add it.

(#1655) Charlie Butros stated that is correct. We did not actively drive to get it on the plan.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 18, 2008

(#1660) Tim Wing noted which tells me there's nothing in this plan that would lead you to decide to do anything else inside the UGA's.

(#1675) Charlie Butros asked Tim Wing to compare the other roads that are on the plan. Did we make the unilateral decision on those projects to put them on the plan? Or chose to exclude ones from the plan that are not on the plan today? A lot of that decision making process is not unilateral; it depends on funding that is available, and how projects are prioritized based on safety and need.

(#1700) Tim Wing reiterated he would like some kind of system with the Planning Department that would dovetail your prioritization with GMA population projections, and if that were there, I wouldn't have to talk about UGA's because the population projection would lead you to building roads where people need to live.

(#1750) Charlie Butros stated 'message received'.

(#1775) Bill Dewey echoed the fact that this has been an ongoing conversation for a while and he shares his frustration with the document. Bill also stated he does understand the funding issues, and from his prospective, that's not going to change by just sitting here and talking about it. I recognize your traditional sources of funding have driven this project list. We need to get serious about looking at a process of different ways to fund our roads.

(#1795) Charlie Butros stated we have searched for additional funding for roads in UGA's or roads in population areas, and we have been unsuccessful. I commend the North Mason Chamber group that has taken the initiative to get CTED into a discussion on the issues, and as a result, provided the funding for the planning. In talking to CTED and others, we have not been able to come up with the funding sources.

(#1830) Bill Dewey inquired if there was some kind of more formal process that we can initiate, or some body of experts within the county, innovative people who are out-of-the-box thinkers to form a task force that can collectively try to analyze this issue.

(#1840) Charlie Butros explained the PAC has been making this point over several years. I recommend you recommend to the BOCC that this type of committee be formed by staff within the county to explore additional sources of funding, additional approaches to prioritizing roads and other types of development in the UGA's. Roads is not the only aspect of development that you're looking for. There are many other aspects such as utilities, that go along with connectivity. My recommendation to you as a group is make that suggestion to the BOCC because I think the committee that you are recommending is a multi-organizational committee. I can talk to you about transportation, and what Public Works does. I can't talk about planning or utilities or other aspects.

(#1900) Diane Edgin inquired before we drew the lines around the UGA, where was Johns Prairie on any list for improvement. She stated there are things that get on this list and depending on what happens, such as storms, they move up and down the list. Anything that's been put on the list regarding Johns Prairie prior to the UGA lines being drawn, may have been dropped by the way side.

(#1950) Charlie Butros explained we do not prioritize our project based on whether the project is in a UGA or not. From the standpoint of boundaries, we look at the roads and we have many roads in the UGA's just like we have many roads in the rural areas, but our prioritizations are based on where we get funding. I could have a high priority project with no funding or support. The Johns Prairie / SR 3 intersection has stagnated because of that.

(#2000) Diane Edgin stated she appreciates the efforts Public Works goes through, and that your hands are tied in many areas, but we do need to start thinking outside the box.

(#2050) Charlie Butros stated we're not the only Public Works organization that approaches the work this way. We've compared with other organizations and when we had the CTED discussion, we invited them to check with other agencies. We thought maybe there were other funding out there that we were not aware of. From the feedback we got from Tim Gates, and others that we talked to, they were not aware of any other

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 18, 2008

funding either. Believe me, we don't treat roads in the UGA's any differently than roads outside the UGA's. If there was a road out there we didn't have any funding for, we wouldn't treat it any differently regardless of where it was.

(#2150) Dennis Pickard stated the idea is to plan. This is an element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan says these are the areas to emphasize growth, and why isn't this element ending up with results that conform to that Comprehensive Plan? We need to make changes to this element of the Plan so that we get the results we're looking for.

(#2185) Ken LeMaster inquired about the list of projects, and stated he assumes there is funding for all these projects.

(#2200) Charlie Butros replied 'some, yes' and 'some, no'

(#2210) Ken LeMaster inquired if Public Works was directed to prioritize some of the roads in the UGA's, would that impact the funding in such a way you would be able to move those projects up into a higher priority.

(#2225) Charlie Butros responded if we were given direction to move Wheelwright to the top of the list, could we do it? We would do that. However, realistically, if we were directed to build Wheelwright next year, could we do it? No. There's a lot of work that needs to be done up front, as I explained earlier. We can put it at the top of the list, but would it be completed any sooner than what would happen through normal process? Perhaps, a little bit sooner. Dramatically sooner, probably not. From a Comprehensive Plan standpoint, we feel we are complying with the goals that we have for freight, access, and transportation priorities. We may not be meeting the priorities as Tim described them for building roads in the UGA's first because we have a basic disagreement on that as a primary criteria. That is not the way we apply the priorities to do the work.

(#2350) Bill Dewey acknowledged that it's not just Tim who feels that way. I believe a number of the other PAC members feel the same way.

(#2375) Debbie Jacobs inquired about the \$25,000 grant. She inquired what department will be the lead on it, and how will the \$25,000 be used to effectively come up with a plan.

(#2390) Barbara Adkins explained that the Department of Community Development will be the lead on it. There is a scope in the contract that explains how we are to spend the money on. There's a \$10,000 match. A committee will be selected by the BOCC. We will hire a transportation consultant. We'll have a local advisory group. We will prepare a draft road network map in conjunction with stake holders from the Belfair area, and conduct at least one public workshop to review all draft roads map. This is to be used to create a future road map for Belfair.

(#2450) Jim Reece inquired about the connector between Highway 3 and Grapeview and also why we improved Grapeview Loop Road.

(#2475) Charlie Butros responded it goes quite a ways back in time, well before I was with the organization. The criteria that was used at the time was an analysis of the traffic and an analysis of how that road was being used, how the growth in that area was impacting the use of the road, what the safety factors were on the design of the road, and as a result of the analysis on that road and others, Grapeview Loop Road was put in a ranking for roads that needed to be realigned and improved. That isn't just Grapeview Loop Road. There are other roads that have had similar improvement. Regarding the connector between Highway 3 and Grapeview, the approach on the long term transportation plan was that we needed to identify areas that had very large looping roads, and reduce the effect of looping roads for access improvement and efficiency, and ease of access for emergency response. Many of the roads that you see, and good examples are those up in the Tahuya Peninsula, and down in the southwest part of the county, if you had a major incident that closed the road, where the detour route would be substantial, for safety purposes for the residents living in that area, access for 911 calls is a concern. That went into the consideration for how we reduce roads loop length, and improve the efficiency of the transportation network.

(#2650) Tim Wing inquired what the timeframe is for this project, and what is the plan on going past the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 18, 2008

workshop.

(#2675) Barbara Adkins responded it is a required annual update. This will have to be adopted by December. Depending on the recommendations, and the need for additional PAC meetings.

(#2700) Tim Wing stated he is not comfortable with the idea that we would make a recommendation for how the county ought to work together to come up with a different system. Our job is to let you know at a workshop setting where our views are on things, and then ask you to come back with a draft that would incorporate the issues we're bringing up. I feel it's inappropriate for us to write a description of how we think the two county agencies ought to work together to come up with a different priority system. I think we've said a lot about what we think about the plan and how it ought to change. It seems appropriate for you to come back to us with a draft of something that would lead to some of the issues we've discussed here.

(#2800) Charlie Butros stated he will have to discuss this with the BOCC, but at this point I don't feel we, as a department, are ready to make as dramatic a change as you're looking for. We're not ready to change our total priority system or redirect the funding that we get. Many of the things you see on the 6-year plan have been funded for some time, and to basically turn to the funding sources and tell them to take their money back is not something we think is a reasonable approach.

(#2850) Tim Wing noted he has never asked that to happen. There just needs to be a system of coming up with a priority list that includes the issues we're talking about. If those all go on the bottom of the list and they start working their way up, and I can see that these issues will be considered on a systematic basis, that's what I'm wanting to do. I'm still not comfortable with the fact that the North Mason group got the \$25,000 and not your department, that Lynda Ring Erickson forced some UGA roads on the list and not your department, and the writing in this is the same as two years ago even though we've discussed this. So I'm not comfortable with that at all, and I think you know my position on it.

(#2890) Charlie Butros acknowledged that he understands his position.

(#2900) Dennis Pickard stated as a group we have a general consensus is that what we're looking for is the structure of the transportation element of the plan to be modified so that future results of the priority list come closer to the rest of the plan. That there's a greater emphasis on those other roads, without neglecting the areas that need safety improvement, but an emphasis on these urban areas. The grant certainly will help that for the Belfair area, but we need to have a plan for arterials. Maybe we should get together with other counties at a higher level and start talking about how the state funds rural county transportation improvements. You talked about the developers paying for this. If we have a plan in place that identifies the major arterials, we can hopefully implement things like Wheelwright, where the county pays and we have latecomers fees, but we have the plan for those areas in place so the private funding, as is appropriate, can be paid.

(#3000) Diane Edgin commented that we should have a mission statement.

(#3050) Dennis Pickard added if we move toward planning as a focus of this I think we can get farther towards that goal than only looking at the emphasis of the short term funding issues. Maybe a certain portion of the funds don't directly go into building Wheelwright, but starts with the engineering as a beginning.

(#3150) Tim Wing stated the whole thing doesn't need to be rewritten, but you need go redo the priority system for what roads will be focused on. The priority system that dovetails with the county with its true planning. It's mentioned in here a few times that the transportation element will be based on the county's population projections, but the result of this list doesn't reflect that.

(#3500) Bill Dewey inquired of Charlie if he is willing to go back and work with staff to try to amend the transportation element to capture some of these issues.

(#3530) Charlie Butros stated he will need some time to think about that. As I mentioned, it's such a dramatic change from the way we do business today, that that is going to be seriously impacting how we deal with

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 18, 2008

things in the future. At this point, I've heard what you said. For the most part, I don't agree with a dramatic change in approach that you're recommending. However, I will talk to staff and the BOCC about your suggestions before we come back with an answer. I'll indicate I'm leaning to say 'thanks for your comments, but ...', and I don't want to do that. I think your points are valid and your positions are good ones, I'm just not sure how to integrate the changes that you're asking into the process that we use without scrambling everything.

(#3600) Bill Dewey mentioned the survey of trucking companies, and noted there are a lot of other business in the county that use trucks. There's the logging companies, shellfish companies, etc., and I wondered if they were incorporated into the survey?

(#3650) Charlie Butros noted he will check on those figures. He doesn't believe they were incorporated in the survey.

(#3675) Bill Dewey stated that in their company, Taylor Shellfish, they move 16 million pounds of shellfish through their processing plant every year.

(#3700) The PAC thanked Charlie for his time and effort into working on the transportation element.

(#3725) Charlie Butros stated he will have a discussion with Barbara Adkins to determine how we include planning in the transportation element.

(#3750) Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development, opened the workshop on the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

(#3775) Miscellaneous discussion regarding adding additional PAC meetings to meet deadlines for mandated items to be completed by the end of the year. There will be meetings on September 15th and 29th, October 20th, November 3rd and November 17th.

(#0200) Barbara Adkins noted there are four different versions of the Capital Facilities Element. She explained the history surrounding the four different versions, and now have a new original version to review.

(#0385) Bill Dewey commented the Sheriff's Chapter is confusing. It's not the same style, and it's not really a plan, but just a statement of their status. It talks about their lack of space needs, etc.

(#0400) Barbara Adkins responded it's difficult when you read this to try to figure out what is and what is not appropriate. The bottom line is that it's Capital Facilities; what do you have and what do you need? The sheriff does not have enough meeting space, but he doesn't really have a proposal to fix that. It may be that putting it here into the Comp Plan and adopting it is just one of the tools they may need to secure some kind of funding in the future. Sometimes all it takes it having it mentioned in the Plan.

(#0500) Bill Dewey noted the Storm Water Facilities Development description on page 83 of the 8/4/08 version should be amended regarding the Allyn and Belfair stormwater plans. Bill also noted on page 77, where it talks about the Sheriff's Strategic Plan, they need to state when a formal strategic plan will be completed.

(#0550) Miscellaneous discussion on Land Use Policies and integration of Policies on the Transportation Element.

(#0750) Miscellaneous discussion regarding envisioning a plan, and creating a focus group for that plan.

(#0850) Bill Dewey inquired why the North Bay Sewer Improvements were crossed out in the 8/18/08 version on pages 23, 24 and 27.

(#0875) Barbara Adkins explained the projects would expire in 2008. We can have someone here from Utilities when we meet next time to answer any of those questions you may have.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, August 18, 2008

(#0920) Diane Edgin inquired about the Harstine Water and Sewer District and whether they have reverted back to private ownership. Perhaps that question could be answered at that time as well.

(#1000) Jim Reece had questions on the square footages noted on pages 95 and 96. Currently we have 76,000 square feet allocated. The 2007 need is 158,000 square feet, so that means we're losing half in 2008.

(#1050) Barbara Adkins explained that in 2007 we had 76,000 but we need 158,000 square feet.

(#1100) Diane Edgin noted two spelling errors. One on page 64 'Boar' should be 'Boat'. On page 65, 'Harstene Island' should be 'Harstine Island'. On page 79, under project name, it should read 'Mason Lake Boat Launch Renovation'.

(#1150) Miscellaneous discussion regarding Table 10-1, County Owned and Operated Capital Facility Improvement & Finance Costs. Barbara will review that table with staff.

(#1400) Barbara Adkins inquired of the PAC how much more time they would like to review the Capital Facilities plan before it comes before them as a public hearing.

(#1450) Bill Dewey stated they are clearly not ready for a public hearing on the Transportation Element, but would be ready next month for the public hearing on the Capital Facilities Element on September 15th.

Meeting adjourned.