

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
February 20, 2003

(Note audio tape (#1) dated February 20, 2003
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 Co-Chair Steve Clayton at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Diane Edgin, Steve Clayton, Marilyn Johnston, Mark Drain, Theresa Kirkpatrick. Bill Dewey was excused. Bob Sund was excused.

Staff Present: Bob Fink, Grace Miller, Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0025) Steve Clayton: Tonight we're reviewing a Shoreline Management Permit for Taylor Resources. Grace?

(#0030) Grace Miller: Grace Miller, Mason County Planning Department. I've just handed out to you copies of the Biological Assessment and the Hydraulic Project Approval for the project. They weren't in your previous packet. The representative for Taylor Resources, Diane Cooper, is unable to attend tonight because her airplane was delayed. She might come in late but I don't think so. This request by Taylor Resources is for the expansion of an existing floating upwell system or "FLUPSY" for the purpose of providing a nursery for developing shellfish. A shoreline permit for Substantial Development/Conditional Use is required by the Mason County Shoreline Master Program for floating aquaculture and it is reviewed under the Aquaculture Chapter 7.16.020. The staff recommendation is for conditional approval. To date, no comments have been received from the public. *(Grace continues to read staff report attached hereto).*

(#0435) Theresa Kirkpatrick: As far as the treatment of the wood materials, is that copper arsenic?

(#0438) Grace Miller: They're saying that they will either use untreated or concrete in the application and there are several conditions in the HPA that F&W has put on it as BMP's for what they end up doing. I could go through those with you.

(#0505) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Are there any concerns with the use of aluminum in a saltwater environment as far as degradation and the leeching of aluminum through salt?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

(#0514) Grace Miller: I don't know but Margie is the expert from F&W and I can find out for you. I don't see anything addressing that in her conditions. There are several conditions about the wood.

(#0572) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Is there a hazard to indigenous species by introducing non-native species?

(#0580) Grace Miller: I've heard in the past that no, they don't have any concerns.

(#0586) Theresa Kirkpatrick: The paddlewheel that will be used to irrigate the seed, is that noise generating?

(#0588) Grace Miller: I've gone out there and I don't hear it. You hear sort of a light hum but nothing more than that.

(#0594) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Not enough to impact nearby residents?

(#0596) Grace Miller: There aren't really any nearby residents. Even when you walk down to the dock you don't really hear anything.

(#0612) Theresa Kirkpatrick: They're saying four more workers; is that a pretty reasonable estimate as far as extra traffic off Highway 3 to the site?

(#0620) Grace Miller: That's a pretty reasonable estimate. When I drive by there there is only ever three or four people out there at a time.

(#0628) Steve Clayton: On page 2 of your staff report under #2 it says 'excludes'. Should that be 'includes'?

(#0638) Grace Miller: Yes, that should be 'includes'. I can correct that in the staff report.

(#0650) Steve Clayton: Do you know the structural differences on why they do the treated pilings versus concrete. Concrete seems that it would affect less. Is it a cost issue?

(#0658) Grace Miller: I've heard in the past it's a cost issue.

(#0680) Steve Clayton: On page 2 of the HPA under #19 it talks about being able to burn on the beach some material. I believe that's in the UGA? Is there a burn ban in the UGA?

(#0692) Bob Fink: I don't know if it's in the UGA but yes, there is a burn ban in the UGA. The UGA ends there pretty quickly. We can look at a map.

(#0735) Miscellaneous discussion about location of project. Bob Fink gets map to show to PAC. It was determined that the project is not in the UGA.

(#0850) Theresa Kirkpatrick: I was concerned about the seed coming in from Hawaii that might be bringing non-native organisms but now going through this is says that they will be chlorinated and cleaned.

(#0865) PAC continues to review new materials presented at tonight's meeting.

(#0885) Marilyn Johnston: Grace, in the past, with what their operation is, have they ever encountered any ecological problems or anything that necessitated they had to do something to correct that error?

(#0890) Grace Miller: Nothing has come up to my knowledge. They feel like they're actually improving the water quality.

(#0995) Steve Clayton: I had a concern about the depths and grounding out and the maps that they sent out and gave us here showed that the previous pilings had a 20-foot depth between where the FLUPSY was attached and the sea floor. The new one is going to be 11-foot and that's based on low tide. So if you take a minus tide from that 11-foot it's pretty much the max, it drops to 8-foot. If you take a 4-foot bin that drops it to 4-foot so we're starting to get close to the gravel real quick. I was just concerned with the grounding out

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

possibility.

(#1025) Grace Miller: It's my understanding that they never ground, even the closest bins.

(#1034) Mark Drain: I've been sitting here real quiet and I recognize the government agencies that they've gone through to get this permitted and you see the responses and the guidelines they've been given and it's just difficult for me to question what the WDF&W standards are so we just have to have faith in them. It's pretty comprehensive with the standards they will be held to.

(#1055) Steve Clayton: It says that they're 100 feet offshore but the numbers on the map don't reflect that.

(#1065) Grace Miller: The new bins would be 80 feet offshore. I think because this doesn't show OHWM so it's not showing what you're asking to see and that is the OHWM and the distance out.

(#1080) Steve Clayton: This shows the MHHW.

(#1082) Grace Miller: That's up on the bank so I figured that this is about 30 feet out where it begins and this is about 110 feet at the maximum distance out.

(#1088) Steve Clayton: So is the distance from shore ... are they looking for the maximum distance from shore or the minimum?

(#1096) Grace Miller: My understanding is that they're talking about the maximum. There was a discrepancy that it said in one place 100 feet and in the other place it said 110 feet. I was hoping she would be here to clarify that for you because it was confusing the way it was written.

(#1120) Steve Clayton: I was thinking you needed 100 foot from shore so that you had a migration corridor for salmon and what we're talking about here is that it doesn't extend past 100 feet probably for vessel traffic. They don't have a migration ...

(#1142) Grace Miller: They do because that's why they're being limited between March and June. The salmon do migrate past there but I guess it's not been a problem. It is pretty close to shore.

(#1160) Steve Clayton: The Bangor Subbase had to move their piers offshore further in order to leave a corridor so the 100 foot is something different.

(#1170) Grace Miller: I don't think that's really answered in the BA. It doesn't specifically talk about that.

(#1200) Diane Edgin: I actually think it creates additional shelter because you're only talking about tiny little fish at that point.

(#1202) Steve Clayton: The Navy spent millions to move further offshore so I don't know what the deal is.

(#1204) Grace Miller: How far did they have to move it out?

(#1206) Steve Clayton: I'm not sure; that's actually second hand.

(#1330) Grace Miller: I can ask F&W but I guess what they're saying is that as long as they're not in there working during those months that they won't be interfering with the migration.

(#1355) Steve Clayton: If you could just ask them because the wording, to me, infers that it's got a 100-foot buffer. Any other questions?

(#1430) Diane Edgin: I move that we accept it with the clarification of this 100-foot setback.

(#1445) Steve Clayton: This will go to the BOCC next so do we even need to put that clarification on it and then Grace can research it and if it's a problem she can bring it to the BOCC.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

(#1450) Diane Edgin: We can do it that way.

(#1456) Grace Miller: I can correct the wording regarding the 100-foot.

(#1574) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Then the other change to that wording would be to change 'exclude' to 'include'.

(#1482) Grace Miller: Okay.

(#1484) Diane Edgin: So my motion is to accept it with the corrections.

(#1486) Marilyn Johnston: I second the motion.

(#1488) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Motion passed.

(#1498) Theresa Kirkpatrick: I have a couple of questions that I'd like to raise with this body. I was absent due to illness the evening that signage was discussed here as part of our revision of the RO review that we were doing. My question to this body is was the final wording in the signage that was signed off on by the BOCC was that discussed publicly at all? The 10% of the square foot of the building face? I attended a briefing in these chambers on February 3rd when a formula was put forth and was later accepted by the BOCC and then on February 11th the BOCC approved that. My concern with this particular issue is that those particular proposals were brought forth by one individual and there was no opportunity for public comment. It's my feeling that signage can be something that can impact the rural character of an area in which we live and my concern is that there was not adequate public review on that particular issue. I just wanted to verify with you that that was not discussed. Also, 25-foot tall free standing signs; was that the recommendation of this body at any time?

(#1560) PAC: No.

(#1568) Steve Clayton: There was a letter than came in the mail today thanking us for our work on the GMA and also saying that given the time constraints it sounded like an apology for pushing it through and in the future we'll do it when we have a little more time to plan.

(#1588) Theresa Kirkpatrick: The other issue that I'd like to raise on the record here is that we spent a tremendous amount of time discussing the open space corridor issue that was remanded to us by the GMHB. It was my understanding the this body recommended the 600 foot on each side of the utility easements as a study corridor. Is that correct? It was a study corridor?

(#1624) Marilyn Johnston: Yes, it was.

(#1626) Theresa Kirkpatrick: One reason I'm bring this up is that that never appeared; the study part of that never appeared in any of the written materials I saw and when it was presented to the BOCC it was presented as a recommendation of a 'corridor' as opposed to a recommendation of a 'study corridor'. I just want to clarify if anyone on this commission saw the maps that we were told were coming? Did it show the corridors?

(#1656) Bob Fink: Yes, they showed the corridors.

(#1660) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Were those the maps that you presented on February 11th after public testimony was taken? Were those the same maps that were brought before this body?

(#1664) Bob Fink: No, the maps that were brought before February 11th were produced later but the maps that were presented to the PAC did show the corridors.

(#1670) Steve Clayton: I believe we did 'x-nay' the study. It was between John and Bob and Bob said he could live without the 'study'.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

(#1685) Diane Edgin: I remember that there were some comments about whether it was actually designated or if it was a study. He wanted it designated and it seems to be we did away with the study part.

(#1690) Bob Fink: It's largely a matter of semantics but it was critical to meet the compliance issue that the corridor be designated.

(#1700) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Not as a study but that is actually be designated?

(#1702) Steve Clayton: Yes, and that's where we got rid of the word 'study'.

(#1705) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Thank you for refreshing my memory on that.

(#1710) Marilyn Johnston: Isn't it a fact, though, that it's going to have to be studied? Our discussion about designation; we were acting with the knowledge that we had at that point in time. My understanding was that one of the reasons why we went with the 600 feet was because we weren't sure, until somebody studied the area, whether you might run into some wetland or some other environmental aspect of the terrain that we wanted to be sure. Then later, after a study, if it was judged that it should be lessened or increased then that was to be a decision.

(#1750) Theresa Kirkpatrick: I'd like to propose a motion that we respectfully request that the BOCC have the PAC revisit both signage and the open space corridors between Shelton and Allyn and Allyn and Belfair so that both of those have the opportunity for adequate citizen review and comment.

(#1788) Marilyn Johnston: I'll second the motion.

(#1795) Constance Ibsen: I would like to speak to the motion. I came here about the issue of the open space corridor study and the reason why I didn't really know how to approach this but information has come to me that the county is going to start trying to develop a policy and then to sell off land that they own. Before this fire sale happens I was going to suggest somehow that the county look at where that land is and if any of it fit in together in an open space type of corridor I would like it also to include Shelton to the Cushman or Hoodspout area, also. About a year and a half ago I paid \$13.00 for the Assessor's Office to do a computer run on all county owned properties so that that would be a place to start. Then we have a problem of the map. I went looking for records and I have a neighbor next door who was involved in early stuff and he had in his basement the Mason County Parks, Recreation, Open Space Comprehensive Plan dated 1991 and it has Planning Staff Grace Miller in here and Bob Sund was the only one on the PC and it's wonderful. It talks about new strategies for the preservation of open space and goals for preserving open space. It was all done and it says that the county should design a separate open space plan that includes the provisions for green belts and open space and residential developments along with preserving natural open space areas throughout the undeveloped lands of Mason County. I would urge that the PAC would really look at what county lands we have now before we sell them off and see if any of it fits together and see if we could identify more. I would urge you to amend that motion and put in something that this time we're going to do more than designate it and now we really are going to implement it besides just designate and study.

(#1965) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Do you know specifically of any parcels that the county owns that they're thinking of selling?

(#1968) Constance Ibsen: I know the Blair property for certain because I've spoken before the Hearings Officer on that but when I asked for that computer run on the parcels, Dixie thought it was very interesting and so she had one run and then she showed it to the BOCC and this when Commissioner Holter was here and they were surprised about all the property that the county owns. It's my understanding that there will be a policy developed and then they will start selling off some of the properties.

(#2006) Theresa Kirkpatrick: I would like to rephrase my motion then with that information and I would like to respectfully request that the BOCC put the open space issue back before this body with the idea of studying and implementing open space policy in Mason County with adequate citizen participation and review.

(#2025) Steve Clayton: So what we're looking to do is update the 1991 Open Space Plan that Constance

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

made us aware of?

(#2032) Theresa Kirkpatrick: And implementing it.

(#2034) Mark Drain: So we're not speaking about the corridor?

(#2036) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Yes, we are. We were under the time constraint in spite of the fact that the petitioners repeatedly said that they would extend the deadline. From what Mr. Fink just said that's why there was no time for those of us on this commission to review the maps that were presented after public testimony was closed on February 11th. So I would like to rephrase my motion the way I just put it that includes identify, study and implement an open space policy.

(#2060) Steve Clayton: We had approved a 600 foot buffer and the BOCC knocked that down to a 100 foot.

(#2066) Theresa Kirkpatrick: And then it went back up to a 200 foot buffer. The maps were dated February 3rd and they were presented and the revisions were being discussed and I did not see those maps that day. I did see them briefly after public testimony was closed on February 11th and I have not had a chance to get back in and look at them. When the hearing was adjourned, immediately upon adjournment, I approached the bench and asked the BOCC if there would be an opportunity for the public to review the maps and Mr. Baze said that it was a done deal. So I'm respectfully requesting that this issue be brought back in front of this commission so that citizens can have an opportunity to review it. Part of my motivation for this is that I attended the Belfair Subarea planning workshop and consistently on all the maps the citizens came up with potential open space. I do strongly feel that open space is a commodity or a treasure that this county has right now and as a planning commission I feel a personal responsibility to look forward in the future to setting that aside, designating it and implementing it.

(#2188) Mark Drain: I would like to have Bob Fink explain to us if we're missing something. If we didn't get a chance to review the maps that the BOCC the public had a chance to comment on it.

(#2210) Theresa Kirkpatrick: What happens was there was a briefing session on February 3rd at which the BOCC were briefed; there was a morning and afternoon session. The BOCC was briefed by the County Administrator and the planning staff as to our recommendations and staff's recommendations. Then the BOCC weigh and decide what will happen. Those maps were not presented February 3rd and because of the volume of material that they were reviewing the BOCC continued it to February 11th. That was the last opportunity for the public or any individuals to review this material. I testified at that meeting and one other citizen. After that public testimony was closed is when those maps were presented publically the first time to my knowledge.

(#2252) Bob Fink: Let me clarify that. That material was prepared, as was announced at the public hearing, that the final draft was to be available by the next day. So it was available all that week prior to the continuation of the hearing for anyone to review.

(#2268) Theresa Kirkpatrick: When was that announced?

(#2270) Bob Fink: I announced it in the hearing when I was speaking on the 4th.

(#2278) Theresa Kirkpatrick: I wasn't in attendance at the hearing on the 4th. There's only so many meetings I can attend.

(#2280) Bob Fink: I understand that but I'm just saying that it was announced that the final drafts along with any changes that had not been vetted through the public process to that date would all be finalized and made available to the public by the next day so they would have a week to review it in time before the close of the hearing on the 11th. We made that information available at that time.

(#2306) Theresa Kirkpatrick: So other than your announcement that it was available, was it announced anywhere else? I happen to have missed the hearing on the 4th.

(#2314) Bob Fink: We didn't release a public notice on it. It would have been impossible given the timing.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

(#2322) Theresa Kirkpatrick: So other than your announcement on the 4th at the public hearing that those materials were available there was no other way that a citizen would have known. My opinion is that it was not subject to adequate citizen review and that's why I'm respectfully requesting that the BOCC bring this particular issue in front of us and advertise it so that if people have strong feelings one way or the other they can voice them. Today in the paper there was a comment from Mr. Overton, for example, about these corridors and I haven't had a chance to study his words yet. My point is that this is an issue that I feel the public has not had an opportunity to review and comment.

(#2386) Diane Edgin: We sent on a letter to the BOCC saying that they needed to address that. I think this has to be addressed.

(#2410) Steve Clayton: We made dozens of adjustments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Regulations in our recommendations and now it appears that we're singling out the open space issue.

(#2418) Theresa Kirkpatrick: That and the signs.

(#2420) Steve Clayton: It could be addressed for any one of the dozens of issues that we hit on. The public process involves what we did and that was public process. We left the meetings open for months on end.

(#2430) Bob Fink: I might point out that if someone wasn't here to hear your own recommendations when you made them they might not know what they were. They were available the day after you finalized them for the public to review them. If people aren't participating in the process then they're not necessarily going to be aware of things that are being considered for decision.

(#2456) Theresa Kirkpatrick: I feel like as a citizen I could not be more involved in this process and even I did not know, because I missed a meeting on the 4th, that those materials were available for review.

(#2486) Diane Edgin: We spend a lot of time that night at that meeting listening to Mr. Overton and his ideas about the open space and the process involved because this is the first step. We sent the letter on to the BOCC asking them to address it and I have the letter sent back to me basically saying that it wasn't our concern. Somebody has to be concerned about it.

(#2515) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Who said it wasn't their concern?

(#2520) Diane Edgin: One of the BOCC. It was sent from the BOCC to me as Chair that it wasn't in our bailiwick.

(#2528) Steve Clayton: This was not in regards to the GMA compliance; this was in regards to the Allyn Subarea between Allyn and Belfair.

(#2542) Bob Fink: I don't have any objections to your motion as I understand it. You do understand the limitations that we're operating under and to revisit at a greater length when there is more time available ... it will be revisited at a later date anyway because it is simply the groundwork for something more.

(#2564) Theresa Kirkpatrick: The sign ordinance, as well?

(#2568) Bob Fink: Sign ordinances are very sensitive and I would have imagined that it will be revisited at some time.

(#2576) Theresa Kirkpatrick: That's one reason I'm making the motion so we don't just imagine that it will be revisited. I'm respectfully requesting that it is revisited. I feel the way the sign ordinance that passed on the 11th that the way it was presented was from one individual and those particulars were not available for public comment. My motion is for the BOCC to ask us to revisit it. The reason I'm singling out those two is to preserve rural character I think those are two of the most important and visible ways to preserve and protect rural character. Also, the information Ms. Ibsen brought forth today that the county owns a lot more property than certainly I knew about before and perhaps those could be incorporated into an open space plan.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

(#2636) Bob Fink: I don't know the particulars of all the land the county owns but I've come across many parcels that the county owns and a lot of them are street right-of-ways and street right-of-ways are typically small, isolated parcels that people simply defaulted on their taxes. That doesn't say that there isn't some larger parcels in county ownership that aren't intended for some particular use but the fact that there's a big stack is not necessarily indicative that there's really a treasure trove of property there.

(#2672) Theresa Kirkpatrick: My point is that if we can identify parcels that we can sell and put some money in the county coffers all the better but if we can incorporate them into an open space plan all the better but somebody should go look at it.

(#2686) Constance Ibsen: What I'm asking for is guidance on how we are ever going to implement open space corridors in this county and if this body isn't going to do it then the county needs to tell the citizens how and what body is going to do it. If this body is uncomfortable in asking for what properties owns that it might sell and looking at a map to do it then I need to spend the \$13.00 and get some kind of map and look at where we're going. I'm asking you to do something really politically scary and that is to follow the law and implement this open space corridors. I really feel that that is what the GMHB wants us to do also and not to have just another scheme.

(#2776) Theresa Kirkpatrick: I think it's very coincidental that you brought this forward this evening because I had no idea that you were here to talk about this.

(#2790) Diane Edgin: I'm willing to second your motion. If anything all we're doing is bringing it to their attention and if it comes back across our desk again I'll recommend that we send it back to them again. For the record, Constance, there's an RCW that states that no county shall give up any waterfront property, either saltwater or fresh water.

(#2862) Steve Clayton: Bob, how would this affect our compliance issues? That's being submitted now for compliance issues. Is this a landmine waiting for us to try to change it while it's in the process to the GMHB?

(#2882) Bob Fink: I don't know that you've come to the conclusion you're going to change it yet. I thought your recommendation was to simply revisit it at a later date. That doesn't mean you're going to act on it next week or that you've acted on it now. The decision on compliance will probably be out around August. If you were to spend the time to study this and act legitimately and thoroughly and take it another step or two forward it's going to take at least that long if not longer. I don't see that just because you open up this issue again means that you're going to act. Even if you did make a recommendation it wouldn't necessarily interfere with the compliance process.

(#2950) Mark Drain: My feeling is that it's been through this committee and we've passed things on to the BOCC and they may have made decisions that some of us aren't happy with but ultimately they're the ones that make the decision. It gets back to the fact that I haven't seen a mission statement for this committee and I'm not exactly sure what our responsibilities are but I don't know how much you want to push the BOCC in returning something that we've already passed out of this committee.

(#2978) Diane Edgin: One thing you have to remember is under GMA once it's all done you're going to revisit it once a year anyway and basically we're just asking for something to be put on that agenda.

(#2992) Theresa Kirkpatrick: My raising these issues has nothing to do with whether or not I agree with the BOCC's decisions because they are the BOCC and I'm a citizen making recommendations. The reason I'm bring these up have more to do with my concerns with inadequate citizen review to these particular issues. I realize that I'm not the BOCC and I don't have final say so whether I like it or not has no bearing on why I'm raising these issues.

(#3025) Mark Drain: If it's a point of process then perhaps we just need to send a letter to the BOCC voicing our concerns and they can either provide the process or ignore us and go on but at least we can voice our concern that we have questions about the process.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

(#3054) Bob Fink: I don't know that you want to say that or not but it is your decision on how you phrase that. I don't know that it's necessary to even say that if you simply want or think it's appropriate to have those items put on the agenda for the review that's coming up this year for the annual review. That's really all you need to do if you want to revisit the issues.

(#3082) Theresa Kirkpatrick: There's been a motion and a second.

(#3084) Steve Clayton: Do you want to restate it?

(#3095) Theresa Kirkpatrick: I propose a motion that we respectfully request the BOCC to have the PAC revisit two specific items; those being the study and implementation of an open space policy, including the open space corridors and also to review and revisit the issue of sign ordinances in the rural areas in Mason County. The reason I'm bringing this forward is I feel that there was not adequate citizen participation and review on those two items in particular.

(#3138) Marilyn Johnston: I second the motion.

(#3144) Steve Clayton: Any further discussion? All in favor? Motion passed with one member opposing.

(#3165) Marilyn Johnston: Going back to the maps, were there any e-mails or phone calls made to the PAC members to advise us that the maps that are dated February 3rd were available for our review?

(#3186) Bob Fink: We didn't call you but we sent you a copy of the draft. All the maps did was illustrate the width on the corridors that were already shown. You could have taken a ruler and marked out that width by hand ...

(#3212) Marilyn Johnston: But I think the opportunity should have been provided since it was going to be brought forth on the 11th and I don't think any of us saw those maps before the presentation was made. It's sort of a courtesy issue.

(#3234) Theresa Kirkpatrick: Also, the drafts that I received previous to that most of the sign ordinances still said "Reserved". I never saw the drafts that addressed the 10% of the buildings face formula that was adopted by the BOCC.

(#3270) Steve Clayton: If I remember correctly, we made the recommendations based on Mr. Diehl's comments and it was recommended to include Mr. Diehl's comments and it was a square foot number that we put on each of the rural zones and yes, you're right, the 10% that Mr. Henrickson brought up wasn't available for public comment.

(#3292) Bob Fink: Until later.

(#3294) Theresa Kirkpatrick: My point is that it wasn't in the drafts that I received.

(#3296) Bob Fink: Well, it should have been. When we sent you the final draft it should have included the language on the signs and it wasn't a complete reworking of all the parts; it was the changes that differed in the staff recommendation from what your recommendation was and it was all included.

(#3333) Steve Clayton: As Mark said, we made recommendations and the BOCC took some and the BOCC didn't take some and we did the best we could and we need to carry forward. Bob, what did the BOCC end up doing about the LAMIRDS?

(#3368) Bob Fink: They adopted your recommendations which were the reduction of three of the hamlets with one parcel included that hadn't been included prior to that in Bayshore.

(#3390) Steve Clayton: What about the conforming and nonconforming?

(#3410) Bob Fink: If you kept the zoning that was imposed most of the businesses are conforming. Since you didn't change the zoning then that was interpreted as being your recommendation.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 20, 2003

(#3434) Steve Clayton: Anything else tonight?

(#3436) Bob Fink: I'll send you an e-mail with the exact date, I think it's March 15, and the Peninsula Chapter of the American Planning Association is going to have a one day conference in Port Orchard and among other things they'll have a short course on planning that the state puts on and they'll have other interesting information for you. I will get that out to you.

Meeting adjourned.