

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
June 6, 2005

(Note audio tape (#1) dated June 6, 2005
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

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

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Steve Clayton at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

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

Staff Present: Bob Fink, Allan Borden, Emmett Dobey, Stephanie Pawlawski and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0022) Steve Clayton: We have two hearings on rezone requests. The first one is scheduled for the Enger request followed by the Douglas request. The Richard-Peacock request has been formally withdrawn.

(#0035) Stephanie Pawlawski: My name is Stephanie Pawlawski and I'm with the Department of Community Development doing some long-range planning. I have done some work on these staff reports and I will be presenting the Enger request and Allan will do the Douglas request. So what we're looking at is off of Highway 3, it's just north of Pickering Road. The property owners are Arthur and Mildred Enger. The property is currently zoned Rural Residential 5, which allows one dwelling unit per five acres. They would like to have that amended to Rural Tourist Campground. It's 29.75 acres and it is just on the northwest side of Highway 3 and it's about 3/4 of a mile from the Spencer Lake Hamlet. So that doesn't affect any commercial zoning and there's no problem with locating it that distance from the hamlet. On the east side of the property there are residential uses and then on the north there are some residential parcels and then there's also the auto wrecking yard. On the south and west there are some large tracts of land that are primarily timber uses. What the current zoning of RR5 allows is single family residential, hobby farms, (which include small scale agriculture, aquaculture and wood lots), churches, local community and recreation centers, group homes, cell towers, fire stations, fish hatcheries, and public utilities. If a special use permit is granted they can get public facilities, schools, commercial day care centers, cemeteries and home occupations and cottage industries. If

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

the rezone to Rural Tourist Campground is granted it can allow for lodging facilities (including RV parks and campgrounds), golf courses, retreat centers, and outdoor recreation. With special use permits they can have employee housing, motels, bed and breakfasts, marinas, (sales, service and storage), retail, gas, self-storage, and restaurants. Those uses would only be allowed as they relate to the RV campground uses. There was a SEPA determination issued on May 9th and it was a determination of nonsignificance. If there are environmental impacts on the site they would primarily be minor. There are no critical areas on this site and that would be looked at more in depth at the time of permit review. The applicant is requesting this rezone because they feel it is a prime location to support the recreational activities in the county. It's close to Spencer Lake and it's got views of the mountains and the county can find no evidence at this time that would not support this request. There is no access at this point in time but we don't have any reason to believe that they wouldn't get granted access. So after reviewing the rezone criteria as we've outlined in the staff report we find the criteria have all been met. We find no issue with supporting this request. Any questions?

(#0170) Wendy Ervin: They said they're wanting to have individual RV hookups. Is there any information on how many hookups they're proposing?

(#0175) Stephanie Pawlawski: At this time they don't have to specify how many they want. There is a well that's on the site but until they propose an actual development with densities at that time they obtain their water rights for however many they're intending.

(#0185) Steve Clayton: For the audience's benefit, we generally ask staff for input and then we'll open it up after staff is done for public comment on the issue and at that time you'll be given an opportunity to interact with staff on any questions.

(#0205) Diane Edgin: I know it's not in our jurisdiction here but I have concerns regarding the access to the highway. Because of it's locale between Pickering and Anthony ... the traffic just continues to build on Pickering. I live out in that area so I know. I can see at some point in time that we're going to have to have off and on ramps. I just want it in the record so that this is looked at because I don't think it's that many years away.

(#0225) Wendy Ervin: Do you think a light would do it?

(#0230) Diane Edgin: A caution light would help but I think that ...

(#0232) Wendy Ervin: They do have a turn lane there now.

(#0235) Diane Edgin: But when you start bringing in RV's ... I have sat there at Pickering as much as twenty minutes on a Sunday trying to make a left hand turn. I'm also thinking of the site distance because that's going to be right at the rise of the hill where they're going to be turning.

(#0248) Steve Clayton: The north bound traffic will have trouble but that's the Department of Transportation's issue. Going north bound it is pretty blind there.

(#0270) Beverly Godwin: My name is Beverly Godwin and I live on Queens Way which is in the Wonderland development. My concern is what's the difference of an RV campground and a mobile home park? I have concerns ... a truck with a camper or a little camper trailer is real cheap low income housing and I don't care to have a bunch of scum bags living in back of me with a bunch of perverts. What guarantees, as a property owner, do I have that it's not going to be permanent residents?

(#0298) Steve Clayton: In the definition under Rural Tourist Campground there's a particular section in our development code and it says that RV parks shall comply with the following standards: no recreational vehicles shall remain in the park for more than 120 days, and 180 days in a 360 day period. So they can't move in, move out, move in. So they're limited in that way.

(#0315) Beverly Godwin: So that's classified as a campground ... they can live there for four months straight?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

(#0318) Steve Clayton: Right.

(#0322) Beverly Godwin: That's where I have a concern. I know one place up in the Skokomish Valley that is pervert corner; a bunch of perverts live in that corner. It's scary with small children.

(#0335) Mel Enger: My name is Mel Enger and we're petitioning for this change. It is our intent to have this more of a public gathering place and not for people to stay for any long length of time. People go down to Arizona and they spend months down there on end and this is just mostly for the tourists coming and going through. Highway 3 is a very busy spot and it just seems like it would enhance Mason County to have a private campground like that and gathering place for the locals to get together for picnics or weddings. My wife and I were married in a park like this and it was just beautiful. We rented it out for the day and the kids could play and run at will. It's not our intent to set up manufactured homes or modular homes and have people stay there. We're not looking to do that.

(#0375) Beverly Godwin: But if it's rezoned then can there be something stipulated in there for a shorter term; not four months? Once something is done, you can't undo it. There are so many undesirables running around nowadays and they just live in these little pickups with little campers on them; they're everywhere and that's my concern that they don't move in and start living there. Once you get one, then you get two, then you get three ...

(#0400) Mel Enger: I guess I would tell you to look at Spencer Lake Resort. I don't know how you feel about that but their RV camping seems pretty upscale to me. I don't know if they have problems there. Ours would be similar to that and it would have a common gathering place for the local people to come. I can't guarantee you you'll have good neighbors but I can tell you what we're looking at doing.

(#0422) Beverly Godwin: You see my point, don't you?

(#0425) Mel Enger: Yes, I do. However, being on the other side of Highway 3 I also feel that I don't know if it would affect you. Anybody that would try to cross Highway 3 there ...it's something of a liability. We're trying to do this within the limits that are out there for us to use and we do want to keep it upscale. However, we don't have deep pockets and it's going to be a family owned business that will be done in phases.

(#0445) Wendy Ervin: Could I ask you how many hookup sites you have penciled in in your mind?

(#0450) Mel Enger: We would like to start with about 30 RV sites. We'd get the trail system and get the public gathering areas done first and see how that pans out. We don't have all the water rights worked out so it will be determined by the hydrologists and the county as to what we would be allowed to have.

(#0480) Allan Borden: I'm Allan Borden from the Department of Community Development. I just wanted to clarify that this hearing is for the proposal to change the zoning of the property from RR5 to Rural Tourist Campground. Any land use that's proposed, especially if it's an RV park, will require the property owner to apply for an RV park permit. So the questions about who stays, and how long they stay is not appropriate for this hearing. It will be appropriate for any future hearing for an RV park permit.

(#0500) Tim Wing: What that means is that the concerns that have been raised here can be raised at the time the permit is applied for.

(#0505) Allan Borden: That is correct. You can take into consideration your concerns tonight on your

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

review and evaluation of the proposed rezone.

(#0510) Steve Clayton: It also means that their current intent is to build an RV park but they could, at some time in the future, not build an RV park and do something else that is permitted in that zoning.

(#0518) Allan Borden: That is correct.

(#0525) Steve Clayton: Any other public testimony on this? Hearing none, we'll close the public testimony on this hearing. Any discussion?

(#0535) Tim Wing: I move that we accept the proposed rezone change and refer the matter to the BOCC.

(#0542) Diane Edgin: I second the motion.

(#0545) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? I just wanted to ask the Engers if they were aware that last month we did a rezone request to change the zoning for an RV park at the Bayshore Golf Course?

(#0550) Mel Enger: No, I wasn't aware of that.

(#0552) Steve Clayton: They're also looking at doing an upscale RV park next to the golf course. We approved to pass it on to the BOCC. The BOCC hasn't heard it yet. Okay, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#0575) Bob Fink: You'll also need a motion to approve the Findings of Fact based on the staff report for signature by the Chair.

(#0577) Tim Wing: I'll make that motion.

(#0580) Wendy Ervin: I'll second that motion.

(#0590) Steve Clayton: We have a motion and a second on the Findings of Fact. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#0650) Allan Borden: I'm going to hand out to you a comment letter we just received from the Squaxin Tribe regarding the Douglas rezone request. They have concerns about water availability at the upper end of Johns Creek watershed and that the creek is actually closed to new appropriations of water for domestic use. So they have concerns about dividing the property to serve four times as many people as currently exists.

Break in meeting to read letter. Bill Dewey has joined the meeting and will resume his role as Chair.

(#0740) Bill Dewey: We'll call the meeting back to order. Allan, go ahead.

(#0745) Allan Borden: I'm Allan Borden with the Department of Community Development. We have a request from Claudia Douglas to rezone three parcels totaling 123.28 acres from Rural Residential 20 to Rural Residential 5. This afternoon I received a call from Claudia Douglas' council informing me that we would like to request that this hearing be continued. There are people here tonight that came possibly to express comments on this proposal. I can summarize my staff report.

(#0777) Bill Dewey: Was there a particular reason he asked for a continuance?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

(#0782) Allan Borden: He asked for it to be continued because he wants to prepare additional information. Sid Bechtolt is a surveyor who helped Claudia Douglas prepare the application and responses to the rezone criteria and he also wanted additional time to provide pertinent information. John Bonin is the attorney and he can step up here now if he wants or after my presentation.

(#0805) Bill Dewey: Why don't you go ahead with your presentation, Allan.

(#0810) Allan Borden: This is the county map of development densities (*Allan shows map*) and we go up from the Shelton UGA about a mile and 3/4 to where Brockdale goes from north / south to east / west and the property is down here. I have this map showing the parcels in the vicinity. These are the three subject parcels here. So we have RR5 at the intersection of Brockdale and McReavy and we have RR5 near the intersection of 101 and Brockdale. We have a large extent of RR10 to the west and RR20 to the south and east side with RR5 on the north side of Brockdale. I also have a photo from 1996 where you can see the lines that show the parcels. I'll bring your attention to the upper end of Johns Creek; it comes across the properties here and it's a Class I wetland, in reference to the letter from the Tribe.

(#0888) Diane Edgin: So that flows to the south?

(#0890) Allan Borden: That's correct. It comes down south and actually curves around again, crosses Brockdale, and goes south and parallels Johns Prairie Road. The uses allowed under RR5 and RR20 are basically the same. Allowed are: single family residential, hobby farms, churches, local community and recreation centers, group homes, cell towers, fire stations, fish hatcheries, and public utilities. But the approval of this rezone from RR20 to RR5 would allow a much greater intensity of development. SEPA determination was conducted on May 9, 2005. A determination of nonsignificance was issued. Moderate impacts are anticipated if the rezone is approved but such impacts will be addressed at the actual time of the development review. The applicant's reason for the request, she has stated that the current zoning of these parcels is inconsistent with the zoning of the surrounding parcels. She's alluding to the small lots that are actually divided and developed north of Brockdale. The current zoning is a hardship for the property owner and she would like to give the resulting parcels to her heirs. An additional fact to consider is that in September of 2001, Parcel B (43.67) was divided into two parcels. The current 40 acre parcel and the 43.67 acre parcel. A large lot subdivision exemption application was submitted on Parcel B in September of 2004 and was approved and recorded in April of 2005. This large lot resulted in the division of one lot into two lots and it shows up on your map. There's a 10-acre+ lot in the southeast corner and a larger lot that 31.85 acres that remains. Lot 2 was created and deeded to the applicants daughter. Upon review of the rezone criteria, staff finds several of the criteria are not met. The increase in development density due to the change in zoning would impact available water appropriations in the Johns Creek area. Due to the wetland and steep slope critical areas present on these parcels, the existing RR20 zone is the most appropriate zone for these parcels. Increasing the development density would affect the services available, especially for traffic and safe access to county roads. Increasing the development densities in the rural area affects the allocation of population in these areas and causes a loss of rural character in the vicinity and interferes with allowing large parcels to remain available for the future expansion of nearby UGA's. Staff would support a recommendation to deny the applicant's request to rezone these three parcels from RR20 to RR5.

(#1070) Bill Dewey: Any questions for Allan?

(#1128) Tim Wing: Allan, were you talking about this area here versus this area here with the high ground? (*Tim point out on map*).

(#1135) Allan Borden: That's correct.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

(#1137) Tim Wing: So this flows down through here to Purdy Creek and this flows down through here to Johns Creek? *(Tim shows on map).*

(#1140) Allan Borden: That's right.

(#1142) Bill Dewey: So if there's no additional questions for Allan I'll go ahead and open the public hearing and start with any testimony.

(#1150) John Bonin: Thank you. My name is John Bonin. Claudia Douglas came to see me about a month ago about this issue and I am requesting a continuance. Perhaps Allan didn't remember but about a week ago when Mr. Borden provided me with this statement I did make contact with him and indicated that I was surprised by it. The reason I was surprised by this was because Claudia is not someone who is skilled in the ways of real property or zoning or whatnot and she was under the impression that it was actually not Sid Bechtolt who helped her fill out her application but the county and I had no way of knowing so I was surprised to see a response that was basically diametrically opposed to the comments that it turns out Sid Bechtolt had written. I found out from Mr. Borden at that time that it was actually Mr. Bechtolt who had filled out the application. I did mention at that time that I would probably need a continuance because the information that had been provided to us was so significantly different. By way of history, I want to point something out to you. If you will examine the file you have received you'll see that Ms. Douglas requested this rezone application more than a year ago. The reason I'm involved in this at all is because about two months ago she came to me and said that she had applied about a year ago and that nothing has happened. So I wrote a letter asking for a copy of the file and here we are today. I still haven't received a lot of the information that I do need. I do note that what was provided to me by the county I have provided to Ms. Douglas to look at and she, not a real property sophisticated person, looked at the history of her parcel as conveyed in that report and does not understand. She says maybe when this person was helping me do this or that maybe that when something happened... so there's a lot of things in that history that we need to examine to get clarification on because I think it kind of portrays Claudia in a false light. So those are some of the reasons. Now, for the real reason, which is something that was in the back of my mind the minute I saw even the mere mention of wetlands in the county's reports, and that is, if you'll examine the report that has been provided, all it says is there's a designated wetland, everybody agrees there's a wetland, the buffers are being represented to be maintained. To me that is pretty nonsignificant to say there's a designated wetland and we're going to maintain the buffers. In other words, they're going to comply with the requirements. Now, at the last minute, we're getting correspondence and documents with depictions indicating that maybe there's a need for me to employ a wetlands expert. Somebody to go out and take a look at whether these two are connected. It appears to me that I'm probably going to have to tell Ms. Douglas that she needs to invest \$2,000 or \$2,500 to have somebody go out there and take a look. I understand the county, in making designations and determinations, the financial conditions of the people that are being impacted, are less of a concern than what it's going to do to the county. I want to make sure that you're a little bit aware of who Claudia Douglas is. Claudia Douglas owns the acreage you see and the clothes on her back. We're not talking about somebody who is going to be taking 5 acre parcels and dividing them up into 1 1/4 acres. We're talking about somebody who wants to divide 20 acre parcels into 5 acre parcels and give them to her children. We're talking about somebody who has inherited this property from her father, who by the way was, somebody who was given a large portion of this because he was a Supreme Court Justice's groundskeeper and that Justice was fond of him. That's the history that you probably ought to know about her. The things that we're talking about right now as I review this documentation, I didn't even know that Mr. Bechtolt had the experience he did until I talked to him about this particular documentation. He said it looks like they're talking about two different parcels. We're looking at this and he has come up with his determinations for the eight factors, he's given me information and input. He said he personally conducted a traffic study on Brockdale Road; those are the things we need to take a look at. I want to pull Ms. Douglas' entire file with respect to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

these acreages. So those are the reasons I need a continuance. I was surprised when I came up here today to find that there were so many people who are here in support of Claudia because they know her and they know what she's planning on doing. They know she's not somebody who's out here to rape and pillage the property. So if those people are here they should have an opportunity to provide their input. I would just like to be able to come back with Mr. Bechtolt at another time. I would want to confer with him regarding the Squaxin Indian Tribe information and determine whether or not she can afford it, and also, the timeliness for getting somebody out there to take a look at these wetlands. So those are the reasons why I would like a continuance. If you want me to charge forward, I will but this is my first attempt at one of these.

(#1398) Bill Dewey: If you have additional information to provide us tonight that we could be considering beyond what you've said, that would be fine. You should do that.

(#1405) John Bonin: I want to tell you that what her plans are is that she has children, not just one. The one division that you're talking about actually went to her daughter, Claudine. She has three other children. She has a real need to get herself out of this situation of basically being the richest, land-poor person I've ever met. If you look at where Brockdale is and you look at what's adjoining it, some of the representations that they've made with regard to the impact of additional traffic; the things I'm going to be looking at is I'm going to actually call the Fire Marshall. We're talking about RR20 to RR5 with the same abilities of use. You're talking about 1 house per 5 acres. It does not seem like a significant number for Brockdale Road but I'm going to let Mr. Bechtolt talk about that because he's the person that knows. Other than that, I do need to take some time to do some research into this because I just received this on June 1st. The application has been here for a year so I need to take a look at it.

(#1466) Bill Dewey: So I would encourage you, if you're looking at hiring somebody on the wetlands, the other issue that stands out in the Squaxin letter to me, is the Johns Creek basin is closed to new appropriation of water for domestic consumption so it's a water quantity issue, not just concern about impacts to wetlands.

(#1480) John Bonin: I can do that. Thank you for your time.

(#1485) Bill Dewey: Okay, we'll go ahead and open it up for any testimony for the audience.

(#1490) Audience: Is there any certain time of the year that they go out to test the wetland?

(#1495) Allan Borden: As far as I know, the Tribe does water quality testing at least four times a year.

(#1500) Audience: In that area?

(#1502) Allan Borden: In the whole watershed.

(#1505) Audience: I was curious because there's a lot more water there in November than there is in August.

(#1515) Bill Dewey: Would anybody like to come up to the podium and testify?

(#1520) Jeff Carey: My name is Jeff Carey from Allyn. The reason I'm testifying tonight is about what I call consistency in the county. Personally, looking at this, I would ask both this commission and the BOCC to oppose changing this designation for a couple of different reasons. One is, we went through a lot of work to create an intent and a Comp Plan in concert with and in spirit with GMA. Through a lot of public testimony through 2000 and 2001, we came up with all these designations. I believe when we start looking at this one here in particular, I look at it ... for example, this land is

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

classified as designated forest lands. Bottom line on that is, it pays zip as far as property taxes for infrastructure. I really ask that this commission reconsider when you take lands that have been designated as forest lands that they would really seriously look at that before they change those lands. For openers, they don't contribute hardly anything. It's basically anywhere from \$1.00 to \$2.00 per acre per year in property taxes. That doesn't do much for the infrastructure. The other thing is fundamentally we have this thing called designated forest lands and either we're going to be fair about that rule or not be fair about that rule and be consistent. It seems like if you start taking forest lands and readjusting them all to RR5 we're just going against what we laid out in the Comp Plan. I'm not saying I agree with everything in the Comp Plan; I'm not saying that it's right or wrong but it's just the principle here to have a little bit of consistency and it needs to be applied to all property owners. I feel as a property owner that if somebody is only paying \$2.00 or less per acre for property taxes and I have 10 acres and I'm paying something like \$700 per acre, and we're not talking view or waterfront, I don't think it's fair and I'd like this commission to use that as far as judgment in changing the rezone. Thank you.

(#1635) Tim Wing: Are you aware that if you take property out of forest designation that they have to pay back taxes ...

(#1640) Jeff Carey: They have to go 9 years back and things of this nature but the problem is, at least the way it's been used in this county, the current owner doesn't have to notify ... it becomes the responsibility of the new owner.

(#1660) Tim Wing: I'm a real estate agent and when they're working with me, they're told about that.

(#1664) Jeff Carey: I understand that but like the case of the piece of property up in the south end of Allyn, that's still designated as long term commercial forest lands. It's a half a million dollar piece of property and they pay a grand total of \$60 dollars a year on property taxes.

(#1680) Tim Wing: You talked about consistency. If you want to be consistent with this piece of property, you would need to say that if they want to take it out of forestry they should have the same right to do that as someone else in the county; that would be consistent.

(#1688) Jeff Carey: I'd agree with that but the county isn't, in my judgment in reviewing things, looking at the big picture here. All I'm saying is that that property owner ... I'm not saying she would do this but I'm giving a situation in concept here saying as a property owner of 10 acres they have an unfair advantage over me and I'm saying that's not right on taxation. That's my issue. The other is infrastructure and the taxes not paid for or contributed to.

(#1715) Diane Edgin: I think a lot of their taxes are paid into the infrastructure, call it a pool, when they harvest trees.

(#1730) Bill Dewey: Would anyone else like to testify tonight? Seeing no hands, we'll close the public comment portion of the hearing and open it up for discussion.

(#1745) Wendy Ervin: I would like to know if the 62.5 people ...

(#1750) Bill Dewey: Excuse me, Wendy. I should clarify that we're closing the public comment for this evening but we'll leave the public hearing open on this item.

(#1758) Wendy Ervin: The 62.5 people, is that taking into account the amount of this property that has wetlands and therefore cannot be developed? Is that subtracted out? It seems to me that you can't actually put 62.5 people on this piece of property.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

(#1772) Steve Clayton: You don't put anybody where the problem areas are but you increase the density in the other areas. So the net affect is 62.5.

(#1780) Wendy Ervin: Okay.

(#1788) Steve Clayton: If you break this up into 5 acre parcels and there are a number of parcels that will never be buildable given the setbacks, will they then be able to apply for a variance based on the reasonable use exception?

(#1800) Allan Borden: We wouldn't let it happen. We wouldn't let them create a lot that couldn't be built on.

(#1810) Terri Jeffreys: So the variance is for already created lots?

(#1814) Allan Borden: That's correct.

(#1817) Terri Jeffreys: And you can't increase the densities on the RR5 anyway if you were to try to cluster. The cluster ordinance is only available to an RR10?

(#1825) Bob Fink: It's for RR20 or RR10. The cluster provision can be provided to a RR5 but you can't get a bonus in density. There are other benefits to clustering. Reduced development costs.

(#1850) Wendy Ervin: Mr. Bonin said that Claudia Douglas has three heirs; three additional children. She's already given a piece of property to the one daughter. She wants to give to the other three. It seems to me with a total of 123.38 acres that each child could get a reasonable amount and put one house on each of those parcels and the RR20 does not affect whether or not they can put a house on each one of their parcels.

(#1888) Tim Wing: I had some of those same questions in my mind but I also dismissed it thinking to myself this is not an issue for this group to talk about. It just happens to be their family situation. We need to apply the rules and laws of the zoning and not consider other issues that have to do with heirs and incomes. I don't think that's where we ought to be.

(#1905) Bill Dewey: That's not the criteria that we're supposed to be considering.

(#1912) Diane Edgin: This will come back before us and one thing I would like to see is a colored map outlining the Johns Creek Basin because if you're saying it's closed to the appropriation of water for domestic consumption ... are we talking surface water or are we talking underground? I would like to see all that.

(#1935) Tim Wing: I have a related question about this business of it being closed for domestic water. What does that mean? Can you not put wells there to serve homes?

(#1942) Bob Fink: That's a good question.

(#1945) Bill Dewey: Keep in mind that's not from staff; that's from the Squaxin Tribe.

(#1948) Bob Fink: When they say that the basin is closed, they mean for surface use of the water. That doesn't necessarily mean that use of groundwater is prohibited or won't be permitted. The issue is that there's a limitation on use of groundwaters as it affects the surface water and the connectivity between the surface and groundwaters. I haven't read this particular Squaxin letter so I can't tell you how much they addressed that or how much they explain in their letter but that is what the concern is with groundwater.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, June 6, 2005

(#1980) Tim Wing: I'm going to need to know whether we should take that into consideration given that probably there isn't a clear answer to the question.

(#1990) Terri Jeffreys: I think that's something that's still being developed through the watershed planning because there is a flow set for Johns Creek, is that correct?

(#1995) Bob Fink: Yes, there would have to be for it to be a closed basin.

(#2000) Diane Edgin: One of our biggest problems is the runoff and we're not getting our groundwater recharged. It starts with little things like this.

(#2010) Bill Dewey: If we could get clarification ... I think we're all in agreement we'll continue the hearing on this. If we could get clarification on the issue that's raised in the Squaxin letter as far as what's available for water there.

(#2025) Steve Clayton: In continuing a hearing, my understanding is once it's been advertised, as in tonight, they do not need to readvertise it.

(#2030) Bob Fink: If you continue it to a date certain it doesn't have to be readvertised.

(#2034) Steve Clayton: But we don't have a date certain ...

(#2036) Bob Fink: We can pick one. I don't know how much time they'll want.

(#2050) John Bonin: I really don't know how long it will take to get someone out there and do some research. I was going to suggest the 20th before I knew about the letter and before I knew about this particular issue was significant. I think I'm going to need to make contact with somebody and find out their availability and I'm thinking at least 30 days.

(#2085) Steve Clayton: Obviously we've had some public interest in this and if it's continued date uncertain then there's no notification to people who might be interested in.

(#2100) Bob Fink: You could continue it to July 18th, which would be our normal meeting date in July.

(#2106) Wendy Ervin: Does that fit with what we've got scheduled to do on that date?

(#2110) Bob Fink: We really haven't gotten anything specifically scheduled for you on that date but there will probably be other things going on.

(#2120) Bill Dewey: It sounds like we could probably extend it to the July 18th date and save having to readvertise it.

(#2128) Terri Jeffreys: I move that we continue this hearing until July 18th.

(#2132) Wendy Ervin: I second the motion.

(#2134) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second to continue the Claudia Douglas rezone request until July 18th. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes to continue the hearing until July 18th. Meeting adjourned.