

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

October 17, 2011

(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 Dennis Pickard.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bill Dewey, Dennis Pickard, Jim Sims, Cathi Bright, Randy Neatherlin and Ken Vanbuskirk.

Staff Present: Barbara Adkins, Allan Borden, and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

Barbara Adkins opened the hearing on the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Last month we had a brief discussion regarding some wordsmithing and correctional errors that would be brought out at this hearing. We received comments from the three members that were in attendance. We made those revisions and sent out another document.

Barbara Adkins explained that Growth Management provides that Capital Facilities is a required element of the Comp Plan and because this particular element contains an inventory of capital facilities. The Department of Community Development has put this document forward, although we don't have any projects included in this document. Each of those projects is required to maintain a budget. It contains a 6-year budget, so every year we are mandated to update them so they remain current. The budgets and timelines for the projects are not something that the PAC necessarily has control over. Those budgets have been scheduled out by the various departments. The PAC can look at the descriptions and ask questions and get clarification on the projects that are in here.

Jack Johnson inquired if this has anything to do with the sewer general plans. Barbara Adkins explained there are portions of the sewer project in here, but the sewer plan is not a portion of this plan. Jack stated there is a sewer general plan required by RCW 36.94.30. Barbara explained that sewer plan has already

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 17, 2011

been adopted. It's not subject to this public hearing. Jack noted in the sewer general plan it has requirements to tie into the Comp Plan. In the sewer general plan it has RCW's required for the sewer general plan. Dennis Pickard stated this conversation is outside the bounds of this particular hearing. The plan is not adopted into this document and the requirements are independent of what we have before us tonight. Emmett Dobe explained that was adopted into the Comp Plan in 2005.

Dennis Pickard opened the public comment period of the public hearing. Bob Harris of Belfair submitted a comment letter from which he read stating his concerns. They include the sewer assessments, side sewer costs, and monthly sewer fees that are being forced upon all residential and commercial Belfair UGA property owners. He noted many current and future sewer customers are now realizing how prohibitive it is to hook onto the Belfair Sewer. He compared sewer costs from surrounding communities that are not based on ERU's. He believes Mason County should establish a Citizen's Advisory Board to work with the county throughout the entire construction of Phase 2 and also review spending in Phase 1. Phase 2 should be postponed.

Bob Harris of Belfair continued to express his concerns about the cost of the project. It stated that if it is not economically feasible and creates an unreasonable burden on Phase II property owners, Phase II should be postponed. The Belfair sewer should encourage concentrated growth in the Belfair UGA instead of forcing growth outside the UGA or into another county or city creating more transparency in Mason County government by efficient communication with Belfair property owners is essential to the long term success of this project. He is hoping for a citizen's advisory group to review this project. Mr. Harris compared these rates to those of the City of Shelton rates. Mr. Harris noted his concern just how many people will be hooking up in Phase I. He would like to see Phase I evaluated when it is up and running and see where we are before we move into Phase II.

Jack Johnson stated he would like to support what Bob has said. The UGA needs sewer and urban services, however, there could be other alternatives that could be looked at that could include a lot less spending. He stated he is also in favor of a citizen's advisory group to look at the options other than what the consultants recommended. He believes things are moving too fast to sewer Phase II and there's not the ERU's there.

Dennis Pickard closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

Barbara Adkins stated she wants to make sure that we stay on the focus of the Capital Facilities Plan. This is not a public hearing about the Belfair sewer. The information that has been provided here has been through a public process and has been to the BOCC. The ERU's have been established and it has been through it's process. It's not the agenda for this group tonight to re-evaluate ERU's or rates or phases.

Ken VanBuskirk stated he has to disagree with those statements. The information that we worked with last year on the CFP has been changed at the last meeting with this group. We were given information that totally changed the timing of the phasing. Last year I distinctly remember asking that those folks in Phase II be informed and involved.

Barbara Adkins stated it's not the PAC role tonight at CFP to discuss what's going on with the phasing of the sewer or the ERU rates. That has it's own process. It's not the agenda of this group tonight to re-evaluate ERU's or re-evaluate rates or re-evaluate the phasing. We need to stay focused on the material that is inside this CFP only. That is between the Utilities Department and the BOCC. That process is already going on.

Randy Neatherlin inquired what the role of the PAC is in this discussion. So do we really have no say on structure, funding, timing, or anything? Are we really here to just check on the spelling of things. If that is our role, what do you base it on?

Barbara Adkins stated she had researched the topic extensively, especially through Municipal Research on what is the function of the PAC when it comes to this particular element of the Capital Facilities Plan. These projects have been through a process already. There's a TIPCAP group that put the roads plan together. The sewer has been through years of public planning and environmental impact statements. You can't

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 17, 2011

change numbers, the budget, the timing, unless you see something fundamentally wrong with it. You can make recommendations on policy, and different aspects.

Cathi Bright stated it probably has to come to us because it is a change to the Comprehensive Plan. We could change something, but in terms of the Belfair Sewer project can we recommend changes? This body hasn't been intimately involved in this project. It's not our role to make the decisions on what is going to happen with the Belfair Sewer project.

Randy Neatherlin there were several items that came up in questions last year about the Belfair Sewer project.

Dennis Pickard stated our role is more on the planning policies that preface all the detailed projects.

Emmett Dobe stated four years ago you adopted a plan that talked about building out Belfair in four phases. Phase 1 being the area along SR 3, phase 2 being Old Belfair Highway, phase 3 being Newkirk area, the 4th area being the southern connections. Very clearly, you adopted this, along with the BOCC, as a plan of action to sewer the Belfair UGA. It came after two or three different discussions that occurred when GMHB obligated Mason County to sewer that particular area. What we're doing now is trying to implement that by Phase 1. We have suggested in this particular plan that we're going to modify the way we address the 2nd phase of this by speeding that phase up. That's one change. We also suggested that an ULID could be involved. We're not suggesting that as a means to do that any longer.

Cathi Bright stated this document is showing a worse case scenario. That's why it appears to be a lot more expensive than it will actually pan out to be. Also, we're into a time table that we're trying to accelerate that time table to actually save money. It will cost more the longer it's delayed. Things dealing with budgets and construction, when you're putting a plan into place, it's means to be guidelines; it can't be set in stone because there's so many other factors involved. These are estimates and projects in terms of the numbers.

Dennis Pickard noted the numbers are completely irrelevant to what we're looking at. As a planning manner it doesn't make sense. For example, we have Belfair Sewer project, we're not going to change the numbers; we may or may not wish to make a recommendation as to the timing of those things, but it should be a very limited discussion on our part.

Bill Dewey stated as we've gone through the CFP process in the past, we not just rubber stamping, and not just correcting grammar. If there's deficiencies in facilities that we see as citizens we need to be calling those out.

Barbara Adkins stated that there are no clear guidelines as to what your role is in this particular document. Your bylaws aren't specific and neither are the RCW, other than the PAC reviews updates to the Comp Plan.

It doesn't pick apart what exactly you're supposed to be doing. The opinion we got from Municipal Research was mixed as to what the PAC's role is in this particular document. It is not your regular update or amendment to the Comp Plan. This document only requires one public hearing, but that has not been the regular policy of Mason County. What your role has never been clearly defined.

Randy Neatherlin stated we should have a say in any part of this document. I don't mean anything disrespectful because I know how hard you work.

Barbara Adkins stated we're not trying to remove your ability to make comments on it as we've done this for several years now.

Dennis Pickard added that it has been a gray area.

Ken VanBuskirk stated the last paragraph on page 1 should also include 'water districts'.

Bill Dewey had concerns about the verbiage in CF-502. Dennis Pickard explained that when there's an

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 17, 2011

Ecology Facility Plan in place, under the existing Belfair UGA regulations we've already precluded the construction of new development. Emmett Dobey explained a moratorium is not required at the state level so we could have the option to make other regulations. This does discourage it.

Ken VanBuskirk added a change to CF-503. 'Allow existing single-family homes with septic systems to continue using those septic systems until they have failed or are deemed deficient. Replace failed or deficient septic systems in a timely fashion and require their conversion when public sewers are available'.

Randy Neatherlin stated that is a major policy change. Jim Sims inquired if there is a difference between a failed septic system and a deficient septic system. Emmett Dobey stated DOH says a failed septic system is sewage on the ground. A deficient septic system is one that does not treat nitrogen to a high enough level.

Barbara Adkins noted that change would make it in conflict with the development regulations. She will discuss with the BOCC.

Jim Sims made a motion, and Randy Neatherlin seconded Ken VanBuskirk's motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Bill Dewey stated under CF-603 it should be more pro-active. Randy Neatherlin made a motion to add 'Plan for and create'. Dennis Pickard noted there is no need for a motion after each item. Ken's earlier motion was a more substantial change.

Bill Dewey noted a change under Water and Wastewater Utilities. Second paragraph should read 'Rustlewood facility...'. Next sentence should read 'approximately 3000 total customers'. Bill Dewey discussed the North Bay Case Inlet Sewer System Fund 403. He had concerns regarding the recent failures there and inquired about if the funding outlined will address those failures. Emmet Dobey responded there was a line that broke; it wasn't a plant design problem. We will be spending \$300,000.00 this month to upgrade pumps at the Allyn pump station.

Ken VanBuskirk noted there is a significant change in the Belfair Sewer Development phase 2 numbers since last time. Emmett Dobey explained the difference is shifting the \$8,000 to 2012 to start the facility planning for Phase 2. The construction costs are estimates. Once the facility plan gets approved next year, then you will have accurate numbers.

Randy Neatherlin inquired about the capacity of the Belfair and Shelton transfer facilities. Emmett Dobey explained we have enough capacity, but not enough people to run the facility. Budget cuts contributed to that. All the waste that we collect is transferred; it's the ability to actually operate that is the issue. The 'privatization' of the solid waste operations is being discussed. PAC asked staff to add 'due to personnel limitations'.

PAC discussed several of the Park pages were missing. They need to be added back into the document. They also need to review Estimated Project Costs.

Bill Dewey noted the Sheriff's office shows the need for more storage but there's nothing that speaks to how that is to be resolved. That's what a Capital Facility Plan is all about. A strong message needs to be sent to the sheriff's office on how they plan to facilitate more storage.

John Keates did note there is a storage problem and in conversations with the sheriff's department they are looking for some options for rectifying that. Nothing is concrete, but it's not accurate to say they are doing nothing. They are looking at options.

There was also a discussion on the actual content of the criminal justice facilities section and that information regarding criminal activity statistics does not apply to this chapter.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 17, 2011

Ken VanBuskirk noted it stated the county should require connection to the system when available. Emmett Dobey stated the requirement to connect came from an ordinance that was passed earlier. Ken VanBuskirk made a request to the BOCC that a citizen advisory committee should be incorporated into this process. I would like to recommend to the BOCC that a citizen advisory committee be established to work with this sewer project.

Dennis Pickard questioned whether it was appropriate to have a committee specifically for the capital facilities plan element of that recommendation.

Cathi Bright stated there is already an ordinance in place that requires the citizen input, there's public meeting requirements; they've been through this whole process. This isn't about that process; it's about capital facilities. We can send the BOCC a recommendation outside the CFP.

Ken VanBuskirk talked about the sewer connection zones. He pointed out the Old Belfair Connection and noted the NewKirk Road area. Those people who live up there in the small lots do not consider themselves a part of the Old Belfair Highway; they consider themselves a part of Newkirk. When they get hit with the next phase of the sewer where they're involved, they will come unglued. He noted other issues of concern regarding the next connection zone.

Emmett Dobey stated that is what facility planning is all about. This map was drawn almost five years ago and it was never meant to be established in stone. We've said this all along. If changes need to be made, we will do that.

Ken VanBuskirk reiterated that those people in the Newkirk location need to be notified that the next phase is coming so they know about it.

Discussion of engineering of next phase will be reviewed and brought back to the PAC. Ken VanBuskirk had asked that last year. Emmett Dobey stated that if there have been any changes on the ground, they will be picked up. That might involve changing the size of the growth boundary lines. The estimates have all been based on that particular boundary.

Bill Dewey noted Ken has valid concerns and how do we assure him it's not falling on deaf ears and that those terms are going to be considered? Emmett Dobey responded there will be a public involvement process when this happens. There certainly was a public involvement process for Phase I and we have every intention to continue that.

Jim Sims stated the concerns are also that corrections need to be made from an engineering standpoint. Dennis Pickard added if there are changes to be made, that the existing sewer plan allows sufficient flexibility for engineering recommendations as far as specific phase boundaries. Emmett Dobey stated these are not hard fast lines.

Cathi Bright inquired if the title of phase to be implemented and the specific lines when they are implemented, is this the appropriate venue for that or should these comments be directed to someone, and if so, should the committee facilitate that? Emmett Dobey responded by stating how the facilitating process works. There's a scoping, which is deciding how big is big, and during that scoping phase is when you should be involved. That will be a public process. Cathi Bright responded by asking in order for Ken to express these concerns, then he needs to go to those meetings. Emmett Dobey stated that is the case. The next step in this process is that we will do a solicitation for a consultant to do the planning. The last time we selected a consultant, there was a representative from the Belfair community that participated in that selection process. I assume we will do that again. Once the consultant is selected, the scope of work is prepared. The scope of work is then reviewed and the BOCC approves it. That's the time to be involved.

Dennis Pickard inquired if the county would include additional public participation than is outlined in the policies. Emmett Dobey stated he takes real exception with people that have complained that we have not

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 17, 2011

involved people in this public process.

Emmett Dobey stated there was a general consideration, when we started this project, that most could not afford a total connection to this project. We heard that and we created a 'get connected program' which actually connected more people to this system. Beyond that we now have a financing program that people can borrow money from the county. It pays half of their connection fee plus pays all of the connection charges and they pay us back over a 20-year period of time at 4% simple interest. We found a way to help people finance.

Randy Neatherlin suggested sending a direct mailer to the affected people.

Bill Dewey made a motion to recommend to the BOCC the provisions to the Mason County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 6, Capital Facilities, as amended by the Planning Advisory Commission. Jim Sims seconded the motion and it was approved. It was so recommended that the Sheriff's department come forward next year with a more complete update. Ken VanBuskirk voted nay.

Allan Borden opened the public hearing on the rezone request by Wallace & Vivian Peterson, and Steve Clayton to amend the outer boundary of the Belfair Urban Growth Area around three parcels, currently designated as Residential 4 zone (R4), the three parcels designated Rural Area, and each rezoned as Rural Residential 5 zone (RR5). Dennis Pickard inquired of the PAC members whether anyone would like to recuse themselves. Ken VanBuskirk stated he would like to recuse himself as he is an adjoining property owner. Dennis also inquired if any members of the PAC have had any ex-parte communications on this matter. Allan Borden stated this property is located on Davis Farm Road and is within the Belfair Urban Growth Area. The Rezone Criteria was analyzed and staff has found the request is consistent with the review criteria. Under the current zone Residential 4, the critical areas would have to be set aside as not available for development. You can't have a variance on a subdivision proposal. That limits potential development. That's one of the driving forces to make it a consistent designation of Rural Residential 5.

Criteria #5 talks about how the requested rezone is a less intensive land use, and as noted in Criteria #4, the demand for urban level of services would be reduced. Bill Dewey inquired about the disagreement with Mr. Dobey. Allan Borden explained that Mr. Dobey is concerned about the fact that if there's a sequence of rezone requests in the UGA over a period of years, you're starting to chip away the predicted amount of service connections for the sewer in the UGA. I don't think he has formally stated he is against this request, but just alerting staff and the PAC of his concerns.

The public comment portion of the hearing was opened.

Steve Clayton stated they are part of the Phase II project of the sewer. It won't make a difference for Mr. Dobey's current calculations for the current phase of the sewer. Steve Clayton talked about the easement for the property, which is part dirt, part concrete, and part asphalt. Bill Dewey stated the easement exists so you wouldn't have to get permission to develop it. It also involves crossing a creek. Steve Clayton also showed the wetland where the stream comes from. Steve Clayton talked about the location and vicinity of these properties and surrounding properties and how they are accessed.

The public comment portion of the hearing was closed.

Cathi Bright inquired about how these properties could get connected to the sewer. Emmett Dobey explained the 'get connected program' is helping people acquire easements that are necessary to make connections. Emmett Dobey stated he is not particularly opposed to the application; he is interested in the findings that will be made to approve this so they don't set a precedent for more future opting out of the UGA.

Cathi Bright stated the problem is that if you have a real access issue in terms of having to get easements, that maybe this is bringing up another issue. Cathi Bright noted the ones that you have to run the lines further to access a small number of residences seems like it would cost more per connection. Emmett Dobey stated that is true. She inquired of Emmett how thoroughly he looked at that. Emmett stated there have been instances in Phase I where this exact same issue has occurred. This area is particularly difficult.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 17, 2011

She inquired how the UGA was put together. Emmett explained the establishment of the UGA was done by a committee several years ago. Cathi inquired if it was done with this particular project in mind. Emmett stated that it was.

Randy Neatherlin stated this area is more of a farm community than it is anything else. Randy stated we've made decisions because of the surrounding areas. We've made decisions because we've seen that other ones around it were 5 acres; this is the same situation in reverse. On both sides of this are properties not in the UGA. This property should have been pulled out in the original decision.

Dennis Pickard stated the primary reason to do the rezone is so that these properties are not part of the Belfair sewer system. They can certainly continue with their current uses in the existing zoning. Dennis inquired of Emmett if the design and engineering suggests that the cost of connecting a particular parcel within the general phase of the sewer plan are such that it becomes impracticable. Emmett explained there may be some properties that are going to be difficult to serve. Whether these particular parcels are some of those... It certainly looks like it. Our plan is to serve the entire UGA. That's why part of the system is gravity and part of it pressurized.

Jim Sims inquired if this is the only request you've received to opt out, or are you aware of others in the mill?

Emmett explained there have been no other applications. There was been some discussions about modifying the size of the growth boundary. Barbara Adkins explained that we were cautioned that when we were going to evaluate rezones, that we evaluate them based on the criteria as listed in our regulations and that you cannot make a decision to exclude this or deny this based solely on the utilities. That's very dangerous and could lead down a path we don't want to go to and expose the county to a liability.

Randy Neatherlin stated that what their plan is not our decision and we don't base our decision on their plan.

Dennis Pickard explained that most of the time a rezone request is made because there is a use that is being proposed that wouldn't be permitted under the existing zoning classification, and that's not the case here. We have recommended a rezone request not be approved because there wasn't adequate justification in terms of the specific request being made.

Randy Neatherlin stated this is one of those situations where this is just a farming community. Once you go down the Davis Farm Road it's a different place. Definitely not UGA property.

Miscellaneous discussion regarding a request by the county for a Comp Plan Amendment, which has been discussed possibly altering the UGA boundaries to incorporate additional parcels that might benefit from the sewer connection. The PAC agreed that this would appear to be a relatively unique group of parcels. That will need to be explained in the Findings of Fact.

Randy Neatherlin made a motion and Jim Sims seconded the motion for recommendation of approval of the rezone request based on the Findings that the removal of the current zoning and changed to RR5 as it more accurately reflects the characteristics of the area and recognize that the provision of urban level services to this specific site would be unusually problematic. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously with Ken VanBuskirk recusing himself.

Barbara Adkins opened the Public Hearing to consider revisions to the Comp Plan policies in Chapter III (Planning Policies), Section 4 (Resource Lands) with respect to Long Term Commercial forest and InHolding Lands. We received this application from Green Diamond Resource Company, and it is not quasi-judicial; it is a legislative action. Mr. Shallon is here tonight from Green Diamond and can answer any questions you may have. This is two new policies in the Comp Plan. The first section is a new policy and reads: 'Long Term Commercial Forest lands may be redesignated to non-resource land provided that the BOCC also designates as Long Term Commercial Forest an equivalent or greater number of acres that meets the criteria in subsections A-E, so that the overall acreage and quality of Long Term Commercial Forest land in the county is not diminished. The idea is a zero net loss of Long Term Commercial Forest. The second new policy is for InHolding Lands. It reads 'Once designated, InHolding lands shall remain InHolding lands even if they no longer meet the criteria in subsection A due to the redesignation of adjoining Long Term Commercial Forest lands.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 17, 2011

In the discussion section is the GMA where it discusses how you go about making changes to the Comp Plan. We don't do this very often outside of the CFP. On the next page it demonstrates that it meets those criteria. There is also a discussion of the GMA and the 13 goals. In particular Goal #5, Economic Development. This goal encourages growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth all within the capacities of the state's rural natural resources. Goal #8 discussed natural resource industry and the encouragement of conservation of productive forest lands. Page 4 outlines the county vision statement which also highlights resource based industries and planning objectives and support resource based economies. That is the goal that Green Diamond is looking to amend these policies for. There were no SEPA comments received. Page 5 states the staff's recommendation.

Randy Neatherlin inquired about the properties that are owned by people outside the company. Barbara Adkins stated this does not apply only to Green Diamond property. This is a policy that would apply to any property owned by any person that meets the qualifications.

Eric Shallon of Green Diamond stated this is really about flexibility. Long Term Commercial Forest is pretty inflexible. There are places where that designation exists that doesn't make sense. The Long Term Commercial Forest designation was delayed reaction and there were some issues with county getting compliant in a hurry and so everything west of the highway was long term commercial forest and everything east is something else. We have property scattered around that have that commercial forest designation that just do not represent commercial forest. Also we have property that is zoned RR20, RR10, or RR5 that is 85% slope with 35 year old timber on it. There is topography and things that come into play that just don't jive with zoning designations.

Dennis Pickard inquired if there is a lack of a current policy that would permit this designation. Eric Shallon stated there isn't really one that exists. If you have Long Term Commercial Forest now you can't pull it out. This also puts the controls in the county instead of falling back on GMA standards. This gives the BOCC a chance to keep the local interests alive.

Cathi Bright noted the result is that there might be more forest lands, but there won't be less. Eric Shallon stated there might be more, there won't be less, and the way this is written is what we put in will be better than what we take out. It's a meet or exceed. We will look at the site and what we're taking out and what we propose to exchange will have the same or better timber site.

Bill Dewey inquired if there is a common problem in other counties. Pat Schneider, legal council for Green Diamond, stated we didn't model this in any specific legislation. We feel it's peculiar to the issues here in Mason County. We did take a look at all growth board cases dealing with people putting things in and taking things out of resource land categories. We are confident it complies with all of the GMA requirements.

LaJane Schofer stated that when you look at Long Term Commercial Forest and you're looking at some residential land somewhere else, how do you look at the area around it? Eric Shallon stated it is never our intent to move Long Term Commercial Forest next to people. A big part of this is doing the opposite. We find it's a lot easier to manage the timber with out the neighbor issues. From a commercial standpoint, a perfect tree farm is a big contiguous block with about a 2 mile buffer all the way around with no residences. LaJane Schofer stated she was looking at some of the properties. LaJane is working on the update of the Shoreline Master Program. She stated she has 66,000 acres in the SMP. Eric Shallon stated they want to block the Long Term Commercial Forest west of the highway away from people.

Dennis Pickard stated there is a provision for InHolding Lands once designated, but inquired if a proposed redesignation to Long Term Commercial Forest ends up creating a new area that would ultimately meet the criteria for InHolding Lands. Barbara Adkins stated it does not automatically change to InHolding. You have to apply for that.

Public comment portion of the hearing was closed. Bill Dewey made a motion to make a recommendation to the BOCC to approve of the proposed amendments. Randy Neatherlin seconded the motion and the vote

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 17, 2011

was unanimous.

Allan Borden opened the continued public hearing on the request that one parcel within the Inholding Lands be redesignated as Rural Area and then zoned as Rural Tourist Campground zone by CGR Enterprises. Dennis Pickard noted we did complete the public testimony and the PAC had requested some additional information before they make their recommendation. Allan Borden stated that information was supplied to the PAC via mail. The PAC had requested information stating that the owner had given the applicant permission to pursue the rezone. Barbara Adkins explained that the owner does not have to be the applicant. It becomes the burden of the owner of fight it.

Allan Borden stated he did send emails to the Sheriff, Fire District #2, and Public Works department and they all responded that this current request would not impact their level of service. They will likely be commenting on any future development proposal if the rezone is approved. Ken VanBuskirk stated the letter from Public Works notes they do not have any objections to the rezoning but it appears they have some concerns regarding the easements with DNR. Allan Borden responded they have some concerns that need to be addressed if they want to use those road easements for their purpose and would have to bring them up to code. Further discussion revealed that resolving the easement is not a requirement preliminary to the rezone request.

Ken VanBuskirk noted the Public Works letter stated there may be a requirement for a traffic study, however, the traffic counts are low. Ken noted that was interesting as we had a rezone before us last year at the intersection of Sand Hill and Highway 300 and there was a concern regarding the site distance at that intersection, and inquired at what point the traffic study is warranted. Dennis Pickard stated when an application for use would impact the traffic. Ken VanBuskirk reiterated his concern for the traffic issue.

Allan Borden stated the beginning of the Public Works letter says it should be noted for future reference if the rezone is approved, and the proposed project moves forward, then the two comments regarding DNR access and traffic study will need to be addressed.

Jim Sims made a motion to send a recommendation of approval to the BOCC. Bill Dewey seconded the motion. The motion passed with Ken VanBuskirk casting the one nay vote.

Meeting adjourned.