

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes
July 10, 2006**

(Note audio tape (#2) dated July 10, 2006
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

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

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Dewey at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

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

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the June 5, 2006 meeting were approved as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0075) Allan Borden opened the meeting by stating that tonight there was to be a public hearing on a request by Simpson Timber Company to rezone a 13-acre piece of property from RR5 to Rural Natural Resources. On the 3rd of July, Simpson sent letters to the homeowners in the area nearby, Storybrook Homeowners, to say that they were notifying property owners that Simpson is withdrawing their rezone request at this time. Concerns had arisen after the announcement of the rezone request and they feel they want to be good neighbors, so they have withdrawn their application. Because they have withdrawn their application, the proposal will no longer be reviewed. So the public hearing is cancelled.

(#0165) Barbara Adkins opened the workshop on the Public Benefit Rating System Ordinance. She stated that RCW 84.34 provides for a current use program. Right now the county has a current use / open space program which is basically a program where a landowner can enroll their property in to get a reduced tax assessment. What this new PBRs will do is allow the county to use a new method with new criteria for evaluating open space. The tax assessment will be evaluated as to what is on the property and what public

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

benefit that will be and a point system will be used in the evaluation. This is all up for negotiation right now, this is a workshop we're doing and we welcome any and all comments. We will probably have to have a couple of workshops before we get to something we can bring to you for a public hearing. Terry Bow is here from the Assessor's Office to answer any questions you may have and help us understand what Mason County does at the present when it comes to open space.

(#0235) Terry Bow stated that currently the open space program, which was initiated in the early 70's, there was really no guidelines and it was basically on a criteria that the county defined as justification. The Assessor handles this program for the BOCC. We go out after we get the application from the taxpayer and look at the concerns the taxpayer has regarding what he has listed as for justification and then report back to the BOCC what we have observed. They then either approve it or deny it. The problem with our system right now is there is really no format or direct correlation to the public benefit that the public gets out of the property to the assessment. You can have a marginally benefitted property get just as much of a reward as a highly benefitted property. That's why the state legislature enacted, in the early '80's, the PBRs program, which this county is looking at trying to adopt. That means that now there will be more guidelines and requirements of that property, and that's something we can correlate. Every time you give an exemption, there is a tax shift to everybody. We do have applications of properties on file that got into the program with the justification that they just didn't want to pay regular property taxes until they were ready to build, and they were accepted into the program. There are properties out there that really have a lot of benefit to the public and they get a reduced tax rate. Currently the way it's set up is it's done on a per acre basis. The acreage is set at \$265.00 per acre. For example, if you have property that's on the waterfront and you have listed it to be a natural habitat for osprey nesting, etc., and you have three acres, your tax base is on the three acre rate of \$265.00 per acre, regardless of the market value, which could be \$300,000.00. Or maybe you have a forty acre tract up on the hill, and it has the same amenities as the waterfront one, their tax rate is forty acres at \$265.00 per acre, which the market value could be \$120,000.00. So we'd like to adopt a method to directly correlate the direct benefit to the public of having that reduced tax rate, to a percentage of the assessed value. Based on a point system, if you have a highly desired you would get up to 90% reduction on the land value.

(#0365) Jay Hupp inquired about the statement Terry Bow made regarding if someone gets a tax reduction, that reduction is picked up by everybody else.

(#0375) Terry Bow explained that everybody is on a market value in the State of Washington. Any time you have a reduction, an allowance off the market value, that is a lowering of the assessment base for the taxing district. The base creates a higher rate for that taxing district. That's one of the criteria in the open space current use program in making a decision by the legislative authority, they have to look at the ramifications of the tax shift. That's one of the first criteria in evaluating a property for the open space program.

(#0420) Steve Clayton inquired about the RCW 84 and if the Assessor follow that.

(#0425) Terry Bow replied that the RCW is set up to be governed by the legislative authority and they act on behalf of the BOCC. In Kitsap, Thurston, King and Pierce counties the current use timber and current use open space, open space, the application and the actual handling of the property being in that program is normally handled through the Community Development Department, but in Mason County, the Assessor's Office has taken on that responsibility. This is going to change the format in this program. There will be quite a bit of input from DCD because this will be going through a committee for approval in the application process.

(#0460) Steve Clayton inquired if the committee was a necessary step in the process.

(#0465) Terry Bow responded that the committee is set up by law to set land rates by farmers for the open space and farmland ag. We used to have a farm and ag committee here in Mason County but I don't know when the last time was when they sat for the BOCC. The land rates were set, and we have adjusted those rates every year by the Department of Revenue on a cap rate basis. The Department of Revenue gives us a cap rate to come to a value. For example, if you have a market rate of \$40.00 per acre per year on a property and capitalize that on out, that's going to give you a market value indicated for that acre, and that's what we do at the Assessor's Office. We adjust those land rates every year that have been established from the '70's. Those land rates are based on commercially active farm land that's being used. They do a survey of all of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

the farmers that have leased land for farm and ag purposes. The law in the WAC and RCW is based that that committee would also oversee the other programs, like the timberland and open space. Open space, as written right now, may have historical significance to the community, and have that benefit rated and be overseen by that committee. The expertise in that committee may not have that for the BOCC, but the BOCC does select that committee. In charter counties, they do have an active committee that oversees that part. Originally, the committee had expertise in farm and ag. We would have to form a committee to do that.

(#0550) Terri Jeffreys inquired as to why only ag was represented in this committee.

(#0555) Barbara Adkins responded that's the way it's written in the RCW and WAC.

(#0560) Terri Jeffreys added that it doesn't necessarily reflect all the different types of public benefit we would be evaluating.

(#0565) Terry Bow added that the BOCC may want to change that criteria in selecting that committee, or you could recommend that.

(#0575) Steve Clayton inquired as to how many applications are processed in a year.

(#0580) Terry Bow responded that they get more applications on the open space / open space than farm and ag, or for the timberlands. Right now they only require a justification, and we would like now to see, within that justification, an outline of that property that they show on their property where that sensitive area is and how they're going to maintain it. We have to see that the ag and farm is being commercially used as a farm. If an appraiser goes out there and determines that it's not being used as a farm, we can look into it and they can actually be removed from the program, and assessments and penalties can be assessed to that taxpayer. Same with timberlands. On open space, we have approximately 200 to 300 properties in that program. Right now we have fifteen applications. It takes two years to get into the program. There's an application year, and then the tax year is the following year. Then there's a minimum of ten years to be in the program, or there are interest and penalties assessed if it's removed prior to the ten years. The property owners that are in the program right now, have the benefit of getting out of that program and not having to pay the back taxes on the difference if we opt into the PBRS, and the BOCC is changing the program on them.

(#0690) Wendy Ervin inquired about the classifications and if they maintain those classifications and then the open space is layered.

(#0700) Terri Bow explained that there are different facets within this program and you may qualify for different applications based on your points. You can get up to 90% of the value reduced, or a minimum of 50%. This PBRS would say that on the weight of how much benefit to the community to maintain your property, you get a direct correlation in reduction of value, or a reduction in taxes.

(#0750) Wendy Ervin inquired about open space as required by a development and if that is what you're referring to as open space / open space.

(#0760) Terry Bow responded that these are properties that are strips of land or buffering in a development. A PUD would have a core area of where all the housing is going to be and then you'd have an area around it that would be common. In the Assessor's Office that value of that area is actually incorporated in the dedication of the plat to the community. We normally don't levy a value to that property around that. It's dedicated ground as a public benefit, like a park, if it's platted that way as dedicated common area, there is no market value to that property.

(#0800) Wendy Ervin stated that the open space program, and the open space in the development, one of them needs to have their name changed. This is going to create an enormous amount of confusion.

(#0850) Terry Bow responded that the open space areas are areas that they don't want to see any development on.

(#0865) Jay Hupp inquired if there has been any discussion of automatically triggering a critical area so it

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

would automatically become an area of preservation for public benefit.

(#0870) Terry Bow responded that the county has targeted those areas and they are developing a plan for open space at this time. But that doesn't automatically give them a tax reduction. Even if it's a swamp area that has very little market value but most of the time we would have to determine the highest and best use and if there's a building site on that property, that's where the value is incorporated. If you have waterfront down in Allyn that's a swamp that's good for the ecosystem and they apply for the open space exemption and there's a value of \$60,000 for 200 feet of swampy waterfront they could get up to 90% reduction of the \$60,000 value that we carry on it.

(#0940) Tim Wing inquired if somebody paid \$60,000 for that wet Allyn waterfront, isn't that it's market value, and is it then possible to get that tax reduction.

(#0950) Terry Bow replied that it is possible.

(#0960) Tim Wing continued on by saying that he's worried about getting too much of these exemptions because the taxes have to be paid and if they're not paid by that piece then they're going to be higher on somebody else's piece.

(#0975) Terri Bow responded that's where the direct benefit of programs like this is where you gauge the direct benefit to the public of that property being at a reduced tax rate.

(#1020) Tim Wing inquired who wrote this document and where did it come from.

(#1040) Barbara Adkins responded that it's from a couple of other counties and taken from the code.

(#1050) Tim Wing inquired as to whether this method has been tried out or any numbers run on it.

(#1055) Terry Bow responded that he has not tried this method out.

(#1065) Tim Wing inquired if this was a well established program in the counties that you borrowed this from.

(#1070) Terry Bow responded that he has worked in Kitsap County and it is a good program. He further explained that he was working in Kitsap County when they adopted the program. They went from the regular system to the PBRs and it did add more workload to the planning staff who had to review them. We did have some problems in the beginning when talking to taxpayers and there's a property owner who is in the program and the property owner next door who is not in the program and they are upset because their neighbor's assessed value is lower than their's I have to explain to them about the program. They explain they have just as much value as their neighbor and I explain they just have to apply for the program. The Assessor's Office, up to five years ago, the application fee was \$30.00. The BOCC just raised it up to \$250.00 for processing of the application. Other counties charge up to \$1,000.00 because of the process.

(#1100) Tim Wing inquired if the properties in the program now will be re-evaluated using the new system.

(#1110) Terry Bow replied they would have to phase it in because of the workload and staff time. It would take a tremendous amount of time and energy to go through that process. We would require that the homeowner reapply based on this new point system and criteria. Then they would get their rating and it would have to be phased in by revaluation, which we're on a four year cycle.

(#1135) Tim Wing inquired if the homeowners that are in the system now are in the program appropriately.

(#1140) Terry Bow responded that the very first justification he looked at was a 2 ½ acre tract off of the old Belfair Highway and it had part of the Union River on it and they didn't want to pay taxes until they built. We've just given them an application and they are either approved or disapproved by the BOCC. I don't believe there has ever been one that has not been approved.

(#1175) Wendy Ervin inquired about exempting property in the urban area. She stated that that seems to be

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

an oxymoron to be setting aside open space in the urban area. She stated that she thinks urban areas should not be open to this kind of a classification.

(#1200) Terry Bow responded that would be a decision you would have to make. Motivations between any taxpayer trying to get a reduction in assessment for whatever purpose may have that option. Every time one of these property sells, they have to sign a continuance. If the new owner does not sign the continuance, then it gets pulled out of the program and compensating taxes and penalties, if warranted, have to be paid.

(#1250) Wendy Ervin brought up the fact that months ago there was a discussion brought up about an open space area that was between Belfair and Allyn that broke up the various urban areas and a chunk of that was owned by the Overtons. She stated that they were very concerned that their property had been designated open space and that people would then view it as recreational. This designation implies that considerable amount of what you are allowing to be rated as open space would be recreational or open to the public. She further stated that she sees a serious conflict in the nomenclature; that the GMA is insisting a certain amount of area be named open space and then this tax rating system is named open space so she is concerned about the conflict.

(#1300) Terry Bow stated that within the document that's being proposed it is designated to be recreational or a benefit to the community. I do understand your concerns, and there are limitations to that being open to the public. A lot of them had them listed by appointment so you couldn't come onto the property except during certain times. There isn't free access onto the property. The label within the law states that it is open space / current use. That's a taxation label.

(#1400) Wendy Ervin inquired if the owner could refuse access.

(#1450) Terry Bow replied that they can, or they can limit access.

(#1500) Jay Hupp inquired if the public benefit necessitates having public access.

(#1525) Terry Bow replied that is true, but you may get less of a point system if you don't allow it.

(#1550) Jay Hupp inquired if someone has a 20-acre parcel and half if it has been designated as a critical area, and they want to take that half that's been designated and put it into preservation would be looked at favorably.

(#1560) Terry Bow stated that it would and there would be a reduction on the market value.

(#1575) Terri Jeffreys stated that in the criteria and point system, you need to have an additional 50 feet than what was already there.

(#1580) Barbara Adkins responded that it's because critical areas area already protected.

(#1600) Terri Jeffreys continued on inquiring if that mandatory buffer area is eligible for exemption.

(#1625) Terry Bow responded that it would be eligible. Terry gave an example of a piece of property on Bainbridge Island. There was a 40-acre farm that sold to a nature conservancy for \$200,000. They put in a conservancy easement on that property for no development and sold it the next month for \$300,000.00. The people who bought it wanted that protection of not being able to develop it. It actually enhanced the value on that property.

(#1650) Tim Wing stated that he is concerned about having that many properties with greatly reduced tax rates, then everybody else has to pay extra.

(#1675) Terry Bow stated that he can provide to the PAC how many properties are in the program. Most of the properties in the open space program are in the Grapeview area, more so than in other areas.

(#1685) Tim Wing inquired why there are open spaces in Grapeview.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

(#1700) Terry Bow responded that people apply for these because their values are going up and they want to preserve the property and they don't want to preserve it for timber cutting, and they don't have an active farm on it, so this is another program that they can apply for to get a reduction in their taxes.

(#1715) Wendy Ervin inquired if someone has a 10-acre piece and five acres of it is in a buffered area required by law, half of that cannot be built on because it is in that buffer, are those people paying the same taxes for the buildable five acres as for the buffered five acres.

(#1725) Terry Bow replied that they are. The five acres that is not buildable can be put in this program to reduce the taxes to compensate the people for having their property use dictated. Terry explained that he only can look at things as to how they're market driven. He further explained that at one time there was a difference between a gravel access road and an asphalt access road. When a high demand of properties are out there, you may see that discount go away because there's not a shortage of land. When we did Allyn four years, sewers had just gone in. It was just too early to see what the impact would be from that. Four years later, we've seen it. That has been accelerated because of a high demand for lots to be buildable.

(#1800) Allan Borden stated that currently the RO provides for people to have a conservation easement placed as critical area buffers. And that should also affect their taxes.

(#1850) Tim Wing stated that he would like to see some form of a plan for re-evaluating all the properties that are on this program now. Maybe under a three or four year plan. Everybody should be on the same program.

(#1875) Terry Bow stated that maybe we could phase it in over a four year period of time.

(#1925) Steve Clayton inquired if the process that is currently being used regarding the rezone requests, where it comes to the PAC, will be the process utilized for this program.

(#1950) Terri Bow responded that something similar to that process would be used. We would administer and oversee and control the exemptions because of our evaluations of the property every four years to see if they were in compliance. Terry also stated that there should be some sort of a flagging system on those properties so there is better inter-departmental communication.

(#2050) Terri Jeffreys inquired about how the point system was derived.

(#2100) Barbara Adkins responded that is was from the model they adopted. Those can be reviewed and revised as they may not meet our county's values and visions and priorities. It's just a place to start.

(#2150) Terri Jeffreys inquired what is meant by the statement 'An application that is in an area subject to a comprehensive plan'.

(#2175) Barbara Adkins responded by saying that because a comprehensive plan can only be updated once a year, that if this area affects one of the maps of the comprehensive plan, that it may need to go through the same process as updating the comprehensive plan. For example, when the Overtons took their property out of open space and changed the boundaries of the open space that was on that map, that was a comprehensive plan change. Anything that's going to affect an area that's reflected specifically in the comprehensive plan has to go through that comprehensive plan process.

(#2225) Terri Jeffreys stated that we may want to include something in there explaining about the possibility of a map amendment.

(#2275) Terry Bow stated this was just a template and we may want to amend some of the language to better reflect Mason County and it's critical areas.

(#2320) Allan Borden inquired if the applications were docketed together and reviewed on an annual basis.

(#2350) Terry Bow stated they're all reviewed at one meeting, typically in June.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

(#2400) Steve Clayton inquired if the PAC would be interested in directing the process to go to DCD instead of the Assessor, and handled in a similar manner as our rezone requested are handled.

(#2450) Terry Jeffreys stated there would be an element missing in that. In the document it says 'The Assessor shall evaluate whether the preservation of the current use of land, when balanced against the revenue loss or tax shift may result from the application, will protect and conserve open space lands in conformance with this ordinance'. If we take the Assessor's Office out of the process, then we lose that piece of it.

(#2500) Steve Clayton stated unless it's done in a similar way to a rezone request and that's one of the questions the applicant answers and one of the questions DCD goes to the Assessor and incorporates it into the staff report.

(#2550) Terri Jeffreys inquires of Steve Clayton if philosophically he's saying to bypass the Assessor, bypass the quasi-judicial committee, and the application go straight to DCD, their recommendation goes to the PAC, the PAC's recommendation goes to the BOCC.

(#2575) Steve Clayton then inquired if it's something that should go to the Hearing Examiner.

(#2585) Allan Borden interjected that currently it is framed to go to the BOCC because there's a tax affect involved.

(#2600) Terry Bow stated that the RCW states that it goes before the BOCC because of the tax shift affect. They're not paying the full weight, and that's the reason why you have to consider what will be the tax shift. The greater the benefit to the community, it's worth more to the tax shift.

(#2650) Tim Wing stated that he is concerned about borrowing all this language from King County, and is recommended by DOE, and we're in Mason County. Everyone is over burdened already.

(#2680) Barbara Adkins stated that the only thing that came from King County was the criteria. The whole first part of it is from Lewis County.

(#2700) Tim Wing stated that he just wants a fair system, but wonders how we can accomplish this as we are all over burdened as it is.

(#2750) Steve Clayton stated that the committee should be varied and not just from the farm or ag or special interests. That's what the BOCC has appointed this body for.

(#2800) T.J. Martin stated that is would need to go to the BOCC, much like a rezone, with a recommendation coming from a panel of some type, with the Assessor giving their recommendation. We'd really need to figure out how to keep it as simple as possible and not layer bureaucracy on top of bureaucracy.

(#2550) Allan Borden added that it might be possible for the PAC to have a member on that panel or committee.

(#2875) Terry Jeffreys inquired about the Board of Equalization and their possible role in the process.

(#2900) Terry Bow stated that they do have authority for hearing some exemptions or denials or approvals.

(#2950) Tim Wing stated that he would like to see it go from the application, to the Assessor, to the Hearing Examiner. Tim further stated that these things can bog down these committees to a point where you can't get people to serve on them, or it takes all your time. He indicted that he would not be happy coming to meeting three or four times a month to deal with an individual who just has a tax question that should be handled by professionals that are used to doing that.

(#2980) Jay Hupp interjected that you would be laying a judgment on whether or not this property should

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

come into the program or not on the hands of people that are out of touch with the taxpayers. That's the other side of the argument.

(#2995) Bill Dewey stated that with the additional criteria that is being brought forward he would be more comfortable with that.

(#3005) Jay Hupp inquired of Tim Wing if he would not want a committee interface with this process.

(#3010) Tim Wing stated that he just doesn't want two or three committees.

(#3025) Jay Hupp stated that he thinks there should be some committee interface somewhere in the decision making process.

(#3035) Barbara Adkins stated that the code asked that a committee be pointed.

(#3050) Steve Goins stated that the RCW allows some latitude for conforming with appointing a specific committee. It states that it shall be the Planning Advisory Commission or another body that you create. We will come back with different alternatives or methods of getting through this process.

(#3100) T.J. Martin suggested diagramming it from different counties and figure out which is the most simplistic model.

(#3150) Jay Hupp reiterated that he would like to see a map of what currently exists in this program.

(#3200) Steve Clayton stated that he would like to see limits on the amount of property that goes into this program in a UGA. Not to eliminate it because there are good applications for smaller recreational uses there.

(#3230) Steve Goins responded by saying that we could handle that through the point criteria by weighting properties in a UGA differently.

(#3265) Bill Dewey stated that one of the issues they're sensitive to as an industry is public access to the tidelands and shorelands. Taylor tries to be sensitive to this as far as posting the tidelands. We post them saying you are welcome to use them but please do not disturb the equipment or crops. We try to encourage that public use in our tidelands. It's an access that we would like to encourage more of because Washington is fairly unique in the fact that they sold off their tidelands to private ownership. I would like to figure out a way to incorporate that to encourage people to have that type of access.

(#3350) Barbara Adkins responded by saying she will work up a few alternatives for review and it will probably take a couple more workshops to work through these issues.

(#3400) Steve Clayton stated the equation will have to be determined regarding if not all of the property is designated exempt, what percentage would be assigned to that. He also stated that there is no language regarding the deferred taxes and penalties for early withdrawals.

(#3450) Terri Jeffreys inquired of T.J. Martin if the a buffer is required through the development code, could that mean an automatic inclusion. Also, in this draft it states you have to add 50 more feet to the buffer to get inclusion in. She further inquired if that is some sort of legal reason for the mandate to protect the critical areas. To be eligible for the program, you would have to add another 50 feet to what's already regulated.

(#3485) T.J. Martin responded they would still have to make application. He stated that he would have to review that under the code to see if there are any legal reasons for that. If it's just for taxation issues and not for development it might be different.

(#3550) Barbara Adkins thanked the PAC for their discussion and input. She stated she will try to clear up these issues and have another workshop. In the meantime, let me know if you have additional comments.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

(#3700) Steve Goins handed out the packets to the PAC for the upcoming hearing on July 17th. He discussed the upcoming PAC meetings. He stated one of the items in the packet for the hearing is going to be the review of the Master Development Plan regulations that have been through a series of workshops and we are bringing that forward as a public hearing for your consideration.

(#3775) Allan Borden stated that he will be bringing forward a table or summary of the rezone applications that have been submitted to give you a level of what is being applied for. This is the kind of request that has been made of us in the past to give a general idea of where the upcoming rezone requests are located. Allan stated that there are seven rezone applications, and they're located all over the county.

(#0130) Bill Dewey asked if there were other items on the agenda besides the public hearing for the Master Development Plan regulations.

(#0135) Steve Goins stated that was the only item on the agenda. He further stated that it is hard to predict just how much public dialog there will be on the MDP regulations. It has had a lot of opportunity for public comment and review, but it is hard to predict how much public we will have. On August 7th, Bob Fink wants to bring forward the Skokomish Valley plan for review. We do anticipate that to be an item that will take some discussion so we might not schedule another item for that meeting. That could be a lengthy discussion.

(#0150) Steve Clayton inquired if we have the revised consultant's report on that yet.

(#0160) Steve Goins responded that we have just about all the information together to finalize it. Steve Goins inquired if the PAC had had to review the revised transportation letter that was included in their packets.

(#0180) Wendy Ervin commented she would like to see the wording on page 3 under 1)b) say 'adopt' instead of 'develop'.

(#0200) Tim Wing stated he had some concerns about the letter and the contents if its discussion. Tim feels that the letter should be more clear to the BOCC as to how the PAC feels about the urgency to do this. On the past page, under 1) it states 'Direct the Public Works and Community Development Department staff to establish a strategy by the end of 2006 that would accomplish the following, and to complete work on these four areas by the end of 2007' ... Tim stated that he remains concerned that we have been having discussions now on this issue for almost eight months and so far there hasn't been a single thing on paper, no timeline, and he would like to see us recommend that there be a deadline. The BOCC can decide on how to handle staff and decide how to do that. Also, on the last page, Tim stated he would like to see the second to the last paragraph say 'The PAC, however, urges the BOCC to require DCD and Public Works to set, as a high priority, the task of planning and developing a functional road system within the county UGA's'.

(#0300) Jay Hupp agreed with Tim's comments and stated the PAC needs to be forceful with this issue or it will just continue to drift.

(#0310) Steve Clayton stated that the format we were given is that this is supposed to summarize our meeting with the TIPCAP, not to give the PAC's views on where the county should go on the roads. The initial paragraph stated 'The following summarizes the topics discussed during the meeting'. Steve continued on saying he does not like the thought that this comes across as what the PAC thinks.

(#0330) Tim Wing stated that the review of the meeting are in the first six points and then the last page are the recommendations.

(#0345) Bill Dewey stated he doesn't have a problem with Tim Wing's recommendations. Bill did comment that he had wanted the word 'prioritize' added in the first recommendation point.

(#0365) Wendy Ervin inquired about the word 'alternative' in the third recommendation.

(#0375) Steve Goins responded that he worded it that way because there is more than one way to go about doing this and if your directions was for us to pick one and go, we could do that, but his thought was to review what alternative there might be.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 10, 2006

(#0400) Tim Wing inquired if he could give Steve Goins his written comments for use in his revising of the letter.

(#0410) Steve Goins stated he could incorporate those into a final draft that Bill Dewey could sign at next weeks meeting.

(#0420) PAC was in agreement with the recommended changes.

Meeting adjourned.