

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes  
February 12, 2007

(Note audio tape (#2) dated February 12, 2007  
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 Tim Wing at 6:15 p.m.

## 2. ROLL CALL

**Members Present:** Tim Wing, Terri Jeffreys, Jay Hupp, and Diane Edgin. Bill Dewey, Dennis Pickard and Wendy Ervin were excused.

**Staff Present:** Allan Borden, Susie Ellingson and David Baker.

## 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

## 4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0020) Tim Wing opened the meeting for tonight's agenda. The first item we have is a rezone request for Gary Gribble.

(#0025) Terri Jeffreys recused herself from this particular hearing as she has direct interest in the preparation of the application that is being considered.

(#0050) Allan Borden of the Department of Community Development opened the hearing on the Gary Gribble rezone request. This is a 6.82 acre parcel that is under request for changing zone from Rural Residential 5 to Rural Tourist Campground zone. The anticipated use of the property is a

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

recreational vehicle park. If the rezone is approved, the applicant will have to apply for an RV park permit and he anticipated having an area for open storage for trailers, motor homes, boats and provide support services at the RV park. The property is located along US Highway 101 in Potlatch, south of the Tacoma Public Utilities hydroelectric station. It's west of the Tacoma Public Utilities fishing ramp and waterfront access facility on the northeast side of the highway. Potlatch State Park is .25 mile to the south and the Potlatch Hamlet is just to the north. There is long term commercial forest land managed by Green Diamond to the west of the subject property. This property is entirely within the Skokomish Reservation borders. That border is less than .25 mile to the north of the subject property. In the recent past, within the last five years, both the county and the Skokomish Tribe have coordinated land uses in this area, and it's gone back and forth between the county and the Tribe.

Currently, according to the letter we just received from the Tribe today, they have concerns about the processing of this request as they question whether the county zoning applies in this area. There's nothing official to that extent so unless the Tribe wishes to proceed any further, we will just proceed with what has always happened in the past. Looking at the county's Zoning and Development Areas map, this area is within the rural area, not on Tribal lands, but apparently that is an error that will have to be fixed later this year to correct that zoning. Under the proposed zone of RTC, the zone allows for lodging facilities, as well as RV parks and campgrounds, and any self storage is considered an accessory use. The zone is intended to be for properties that are typically greater than 5 acres in size. Under the development standards for RTC, development has to adhere to what's called a floor area ratio, and that's the sum of all the building floor areas divided by the size of the property. That ratio is 5% for 1:20. So it's 1,000 sf of building for every 20,000 sf of lot area. That will keep the scope for any potential development down so that the maximum building size is 5,000 sf. A larger building could be approved but only through the special use permit process or park permit. The park permit is heard by the county Hearings Examiner, so there's another level of public review. If the PAC makes a recommendation to approve the request, that just changes the allowed uses on the property. It doesn't give approval to any proposed specific development. Based upon the information that was submitted by the applicant, especially with a site plan included in the staff report, staff would recommend approval as it is an appropriate zone to provide such facilities in the county and it is located in an area that has a lot of recreational development in existence. Public health and safety standards would have to meet regulations from both state highway department for traffic, public health for both septic and water, and public works review of stormwater management.

(#0425) Jay Hupp inquired about the error on the map Allan discussed.

(#0430) Allan Borden responded early on in the Comp Plan review process in the mid 90's, the county relied on the Metsker maps that showed city lands, county lands, forest lands, and the Indian Tribal boundaries. Indian Tribal boundaries for the Skokomish Reservation actually went to the north side of Section 26, and this property is in that section. When the maps were drawn, they did not include Section 26; they ended at the section to the south. It should include Section 26.

(#0475) Jay Hupp inquired if this was fee simple land in the reservation.

(#0480) Allan Borden responded that it is.

(#0490) Jay Hupp inquired if it was the county maps that had the wrong line for the reservation.

(#0500) Allan Borden responded that was correct.

(#0510) Jay Hupp stated that wherever the line is drawn doesn't make any difference. Jay inquired if the county had zoning jurisdiction over fee simple land in the reservation.

(#0520) Allan Borden stated that in the past we have off and on sometimes the county takes the authority and coordinates with the Tribe and sometimes the Tribe takes the authority and

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

coordinates with the county.

(#0530) Jay Hupp stated we asked that specific question when this issue came before us a couple of months ago, and we asked that the legal staff answer that question before we heard this issue again. Jay inquired if he was hearing a legal answer.

(#0540) Allan Borden responded you're not hearing a legal answer, and I don't remember that instruction.

(#0550) Tim Wing noted he is asking that same question. Tim inquired if this property is inside the Tribal Lands.

(#0560) Allan Borden responded that it is.

(#0570) Tim Wing inquired what was in the letter from the Tribe.

(#0600) Allan Borden read from the letter from the Tribe. 'The Tribe does not support this rezone request, nor does it acknowledge Mason County zoning in this area'. My understanding from this letter the Tribe is not saying do not consider this application; they're just saying they're not acknowledging the county's authority. In the next sentence, it says 'The Tribe and county are proactively working together on other issues'.

(#0620) Tim Wing inquired if it would be advisable for this group to make a recommendation prior to the county and the Tribe resolving the issue of where the boundary is.

(#0630) Allan Borden responded he doesn't see any harm of it because if the Tribe says 'we have the authority', then the county no longer has the authority, but if the Tribe says 'we will coordinate with you and whatever recommendation there is we want to have input on it'. The Tribe has certain capabilities and one of those capabilities that they do not have is the ability to do building inspections. They ask the county to do inspections for construction. They do have the ability, through the Indian Health Service, to do water and septic or sewer review.

(#0650) Tim Wing opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#0685) Clifford Brecht testified first. He stated he owns the property directly across from the proposed project. Most of us are concerned about the health of the Canal. I've had my property for over 35 years. I wanted to buy that property at one time and was looking at it and I was told there were wetlands on it. The lower half was so deep we couldn't walk on it. I gave up the idea because it was going to cost a lot of money and effort just to put in one septic tank that works. If this is approved, the applicant is going to have to prove that drainage is proper to take care of 36 RV parking spots and his laundry and showering facility. I don't see the sense in rezoning it at all until the wastewater management programs that are proposed now for that area are in place. I would like to see this zone change request denied.

(#0800) Doug Palmer testified next. I am one of the owners to the east of the subject property. I am also speaking in opposition to the rezone. The staff report recommending the rezone claims that all of the rezone criteria are met. However, the report itself does not support that finding, in my opinion. There are several rezone criteria that are not met in this application, but I will focus on one of them that I think clearly is not met. That's Criteria #2, which has several different aspects. One of the parts of that criteria is that the proposed designation matches the characteristics of the parcel better than any other zone designation. Secondly, it says that the proposed rezone is consistent with the Mason County Comp Plan. Neither of those requirements are met. To apply that criteria you have to look at the parcel's characteristics and determine that a RTC zone

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

designation is a better fit for that parcel than any other designation. Not just an okay fit, but a better fit. The facts do not support that finding. The staff report notes that on three of the four sides of this parcel the current zoning is RR5, which is the current zoning of the parcel in question. Only to the south of this parcel is the only deviation from this zoning, and even there it's less than half of the southern border that is currently zoned RC1. The immediately surrounding land is overwhelmingly RR 5 with single family residences. Since that's the case, it seems to me it should be obvious that the best zoning fit for this parcel is the current zoning of RR 5. The staff report points to uses that are up to a quarter of a mile away. It says in the staff report 'The general location of the subject property along US Highway 101 is in an area where tourist and recreational activities are dominant. Restaurants, fishing, and waterfront access and other RV parks are within a quarter of a mile from the subject parcel'. With all due respect, that is a mis-characterization of the nature of this location. The fact that there are RV parks a quarter of a mile away, and totally ignoring the character of the immediate surrounding land does not satisfy the rezone requirement that the proposed usage would be a better zoning fit than the current one. When you add the site specific characteristics of this parcel, some of which are acknowledged in the staff report, it's even more obvious that the current zoning is a better fit. The staff report states that the line of site at this location is adequate to provide safe ingress and egress at the parcel. You have to be very careful because there is a curve in the road right there. You have to be careful of the speeding cars on Highway 101. It would be an even more inadequate line of site for RV's. From my point of view, the land is within the reservation, and the Tribe has expressed real concerns about the rezone from the standpoint of water quality, etc. Also, the proposed rezone is not consistent with the Comp Plan. I would submit the proposed use as an RV park does not protect the rural character of this parcel. I think the SEPA addendum actually acknowledges that. It actually recognizes the same thing for a retreat center, or a paint ball or water feature park with the same statement that these would change the rural character. This is not a contract rezone so this site plan means nothing. In conclusion, the burden should be on the applicant to show that all the rezone criteria have been met. The staff report does not come close to demonstrating that Criteria #2 has been met and for those reasons I would ask that the rezone not be recommended or approved.

(#1150) Marilyn Duran testified next. She stated she lives directly to the south of the proposed site. She stated the criteria has not been met at all. I'm a Master Gardner and I can tell you there are listed species on the site. If you put in a 36 unit RV park there, with dump sites, etc., you will definitely be putting a stress on the animals and the wildlife there. It's a very delicate and fragile piece of property with old growth and he has admitted to us all that he's got a long road ahead of him trying to get all of the permits in line and a lot of money put into it. I say it shouldn't be done in the first place. It should not be rezoned as RTC. Once it's there you can't go back. If you accept this for him now he may change his mind and someone else could move onto it. I honestly believe it should be stopped here.

(#1265) Faith Nobel testified that she lives across the street from it. Two things you need to think about are the hazards of the highway. I cannot tell you how many times I've been hit and how many accidents have happened out there. There is way too much traffic in the summer there already. Also, your questions about the Tribe. You people actually directed me at Mason County that I had to deal with the Skokomish Indian Tribe when I had a land use issue a few years ago. I think if you do that for one person in that tribal land area then it needs to be done for everybody because they are concerned about the nature of that parcel. That area needs to be preserved.

(#1300) Tim Wing closed the public comment portion of the hearing. It was decided to continue the hearing on this matter until March 19<sup>th</sup> when there was a full quorum of the PAC. We will then have our discussion on March 19<sup>th</sup> and made our recommendation at that time.

(#1350) Jay Hupp commented that it very may well have been that when we tabled this issue the last time that the request I made to T.J. Martin to resolve the legal issue before we heard this again

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

many have been after we were closing up the meeting and it may not have got into the minutes. It was certainly an eyeball to eyeball question between T.J. and myself and we both understood it. I would like to make sure that we don't address this issue again until legal staff has addressed the issue of governments authority over this piece of property with the Tribe.

(#1435) Tim Wing noted that is a view held by numerous members of the PAC. The next item on the agenda is a rezone request for John and Mary Lou Borgert.

(#1500) Allan Borden presented the staff report for the rezone request. This is a request from John and Mary Lou Borgert that three parcels totaling 69.94 acres be rezoned from Rural Residential 10 zone to Rural Residential 5 zone. If approved, the applicants would then be able to subdivide the property for rural residential development at that approved density. The properties are located at the end of Scarlet Road, which is east of Agate Road. The existing residential development occurs to the west and south of the subject properties and timber management exists to the northeast and east of the subject property. Pioneer School is located to the north and northwest of the property. The parcels surrounding the properties, as well as the subject parcel, are all zoned RR 10, but there's a 38-acre parcel directly to the north that is bisected by Spencer Lake Rd. that is RR 5. If the rezone is approved, the subject properties could be subdivided into 12 to 13 parcels instead of the 6 parcels that are under the current zone of RR 10. The applicant also owns two small parcels, 1.5 and 1.7, adjacent to the subject parcels. The properties in the vicinity are utilized for residential and timberland uses. Based upon the submitted information, staff recommends approval of the rezone to RR 5. There is an alternative. If the PAC does not feel that the criteria are met and would recommend denial, the property under RR 10 could be divided by performance subdivision with open space conservation areas and could essentially double the density. The public health issues can be addressed by securing adequate water supply to the proposed number of lots created. The number of water rights they can receive is going to control the number of lots they can create. Traffic is expected to increase to levels to some degree, but it depends on the number of lots created. The proposed rezone to RR 5 is consistent with the Comp Plan policies because it is compatible with the existing predominate pattern of smaller lot sizes both on the west and southwest. The road and utility infrastructure is available already, and critical areas are only on the east end of the eastern most part of the subject property. Sprawling low density would not result from the approval of the new zone, especially as a separation is provided adjacent to the timberlands on the east and northeast side during the subdivision review process. The rezone to RR 5 would not affect providing service to an urban area, nor would an urban level of services be needed. Existing development standards would provide for vegetation buffer and setback from the Type 3 stream of Malaney Creek. There are no slopes exceeding 10%. There should be no pressure to change zone designations in the surrounding lands if this rezone request were approved. Staff recommends approval of the rezone request as proposed.

(#1950) Tim Wing inquired about the performance subdivision and what the requirement was for the amount of land that has to be designated as open space.

(#1965) Allan Borden responded it's 50%. If you have the lots clustered, you can have open space in between or along the creek or next to the school.

(#1980) Tim Wing inquired what is the likely buffer requirement between 5 acre parcels and the timberlands.

(#1995) Allan Borden stated the timberland is not long term commercial forest. Typically 50 to 100 feet is adequate to create a physical separation.

(#2010) Tim Wing open the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#2030) Gordon Brown testified first. I live on the west end of Scarlet Road. I've been there 57 years.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

Since then Pioneer School has come in and they've been expanding through the years. In the last 10 years, I've had problems with my well going partially dry in the summer. I have trouble with groundwater now that I never used to have. Pioneer School has opened up a lot of ground up there and we're getting a lot more runoff. Now John Borgert wants to put in his development and that's going to open up some more ground and what's that going to do to people at the low end? We will have more influx of traffic on Scarlet Road, which isn't designed for excessive traffic.

(#2100) Jay Hupp inquired of Mr. Brown how deep his well is.

(#2110) Gordon Brown testified his well is 90 feet deep.

(#2125) Mary Lou Borgert testified she and her husband have owned this property for 35 or 40 years and we've always paid our taxes on RR 10's. We've never gone timberland, and do raise Christmas trees. We've raised Christmas trees on that property for 35 or 40 years. All the surrounding neighbors, except for Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Oberg are all in timber and there's no timber on their property; they're all in agriculture and there's no agriculture on their property and I don't understand this. The last time I came before this commission we were doing another project and it was turned down because of the road, but this time we've been paying our taxes and I'm getting a little tired of paying full taxes and no one else around me is paying the full taxes. The Pioneer School was our property and we sold it to the school district. I feel that it's right for us to be able to develop this now and it's time to do something else with the property other than Christmas trees, which is not a big deal any more. It's been very hard for us to develop this property on Christmas trees. I feel we've worked very closely with Allan and met all the criteria. I'd like to be considered this time. The school district did ask us if we would try to put houses there because they need more development to support that school. We're trying our best.

(#2240) Terri Jeffreys inquired of Mrs. Borgert if they had considered keeping the RR 10 zone and going with a performance subdivision.

(#2245) Mary Lou Borgert stated she has talked to Allan about it but we haven't decided anything yet.

(#2275) Tim Wing closed the public comment portion of the hearing and called for discussion by the PAC.

(#2300) Diane Edgin inquired if it went under a performance subdivision and it's open space forever more is that spread amongst the other properties or does it remain in the ownership.

(#2325) Allan Borden stated the open space is written up as a conservation easement. It could be shared by the group of properties or it could be just be one of the created properties.

(#2365) Diane Edgin stated she likes the open space concept instead of just 5 acre parcels all in a row. The 2.5 acre lots with a conservation easement would make property close to a school more affordable for families.

(#2395) Allan Borden stated you could create a range of lots along with the conservation easement. Smaller ones near the school or road and then larger ones farther away. You just can't go below 2 acres.

(#2400) Jay Hupp inquired if you could put a conservation easement on less than a 5 acre piece.

(#2420) Allan Borden responded that you can.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

(#2430) Jay Hupp stated he thought you have to have a minimum 5 acre lots for a conservation easement.

(#2435) Allan Borden stated you could put one on a stream and buffer in a conservation easement.

(#2440) Jay Hupp inquired if that is recent.

(#2445) Allan Borden responded it's written in the RO as a way to do that. We'll look into that.

(#2450) Tim Wing stated that people appreciate the conservation easement concept as long as there are buffers between the lots and that also can guard against everything just being cut down over time. I think, however, the 5 acre piece gives people a little more flexibility on what they can do with the land. If you have a conservation easement you can't do anything with 50% of the total land. If you've got wetlands or streams those are the areas you will want to identify.

(#2500) Terri Jeffreys stated Mr. Brown said he was having trouble with his well, and while I appreciate the fact that's a problem for him, we have no way of knowing what is actually impacting his ability to get water. We also don't have any hydrological information about the drainage issue, so I would caution this board into taking that into consideration as part of the decision.

(#2540) Tim Wing inquired if the possible traffic impacts have been taken into consideration by the county road department in terms of the intersection and would there be an assessment made of the road to determine if the traffic would be suitable for that.

(#2570) Allan Borden responded that part of the subdivision review would be to guarantee there being access provided to all properties created so if there's a tiny road already involved they will look at the potential impacts of number of lots created and increased traffic that results from that.

(#2590) Tim Wing continued on by saying that people that are using that road should have the assurance that the county is going to examine that question before they approve the subdivision.

(#2600) Allan Borden stated that was correct.

(#2610) Jay Hupp made a motion that the PAC recommend approval of the rezone request as it is stated.

(#2620) Terri Jeffreys seconded the motion.

(#2625) Tim Wing stated we have a motion and a second to recommend approval of the rezone request. Tim called for further discussion. There was none so the question was called for. Motion passes.

(#2650) Break in meeting.

(#2900) Tim Wing called the meeting back to order and introduced the next item on the agenda. It is a public hearing on the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) which provides a guide for solid waste collection, transfer and disposal activities in Mason County.

(#2920) David Baker, Solid Waste Manager for Utilities and Solid Waste Management, introduced the topic. It is designed to be a long term and short term look at the future of garbage and recycling for Mason County and its residents. In my line of work I see garbage everyday and I know most people don't think about it very often but as Americans we make more garbage than anyone in the history of our species and it is something we do need to think about. A few years

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

before I was born, the national average of waste generation was around 2 pounds per person per day. In the year 2000, it was about 4.5 pounds per person per day and in 2005 it was 7 pounds per person per day, including recycling. This trend is quite alarming as we have both more people and more trash and if you consider all the things that go into the production of our waste, before we even get it, and then what we do with it afterwards as waste. That's a lot of material. It's pretty important, in my opinion, that as a county we would want to be aware of the fact that we have a lot of waste that we have to deal with and we should develop some strategies for dealing with that on a daily basis both on the short term and the long term. As a result, we do have a requirement to develop a plan like this that does speak to those kinds of concerns and considerations for given communities and this plan represents quite a bit of effort on the county, the City of Shelton, and also a consultant that was hired to finalize the document. Overall this document is very solid. It meets the requirements of the regulations, RCW 70.95, and lays out the ground work for where we'd like to see the county go in the next few years with regard to facilities, with programs, and various different strategies to address waste in its many different phases. I would also share with you that the version of the plan that you reviewed is a draft and the appendix is incomplete compared to what the final version looks like. I have additional information for you from the City of Shelton, which is a concurrence letter, along with a Determination of Nonsignificance for our SEPA from the Planning Department. There are two comment letters from the public that basically say they would like to see more recycling.

(#3130) Terri Jeffreys inquired about Table 1.1, Status of Recommendations from the Previous Plan (1998).

(#3160) David Baker explained every time there is a plan that's put forward, once it's adopted it is in force until it's replaced. So a recommendation from the previous plan is essentially still in place until this plan replaces it. Once this plan replaces it, as it says in the first item under Waste Reduction 'Public education should be a high priority' and the status is 'Ongoing'. There's nothing in the new document that would change that status.

(#3200) Terri Jeffreys requested there be an addition of a date to Table 1.2.

(#3235) David Baker noted the requested change.

(#3240) Terri Jeffreys noted on page 11 of chapter 2 it makes reference to a table that is not shown.

(#3265) David Baker noted the table is not in the plan and will add that in.

(#3295) Terri Jeffreys also noted under chapter 3 on page 28, #8, it says 'Divert organics for composting at county owned solid waste facilities'. It's unclear if you're recommending that the county do the composting itself. If you also go to chapter 4 recommendations, you talk about the same topic but in a different language. It says 'Develop separate organic waste and construction and demolition waste tipping areas at the Shelton Transfer Station Facility where materials collected could either be processed onsite or transferred to an existing private composting operation in Mason County.'

(#3350) David Baker explained where we identified in chapter 4 we would have some sort of diversion options ... let's say you're going to the Shelton facility and you have nothing but yard debris. Right now you're going to pay the garbage rate and we will transport that to the regional landfill in Eastern Washington. What that recommendation is saying is if you have an alternative option available at the facilities you could come in and say you have yard waste and you would be sent to a different area and then we could conceivable box that up and send it to a location within Mason County where it could be composted as organic material. That would be consistent with the recommendation #8 on page 28. You wouldn't want to get into competition with private



## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

enterprise that's already established.

(#3470) Terri Jeffreys stated she would recommend taking out the word 'for composting' in #8.

(#3485) David Baker stated that as he saw the recommendation it says 'divert organic material at solid waste facilities'. That's the part I'm paying attention to. Composting would be considered the best use of the material as opposed to some alternative. We could take all the wood and grind it up and use it for mulch and that would be fine, but it's not necessarily as good as composting. This recommendation simply identifies composting as a best management practice.

(#3550) Terri Jeffreys inquired about the growth projections and capacities in chapter 4 and that it appears the only facility that will not be able to handle the growth is the major facility. Then you go on to say that we clearly have a problem that we're not going to be able to handle it without expansion.

(#3600) David Baker explained that numbers are useful for understanding big issues but they don't always tell the whole story. An example would be if you were in a restaurant where it seemed like it was kind of slow and they were getting ready to close and then a bus load of people showed up. If you were to read through the register tape maybe they only served 75 customers that evening, but if you were working in the kitchen you knew that 42 of them came in at 5 minutes to closing. Those numbers don't tell you what happened to you that day. So with that general understanding, these numbers are useful for planning purposes but our business is really not the same every day. Our peaks and valley are fairly disparate and we have some significant challenges meeting the high numbers that we get during the peak season, which is about 9 months of the year. We have been having an increased amount of business for the last few years in a row. We've seen anywhere from as little as 1% growth in tonnage to as much as 13%. We've seen we have an increase and we need to do something about it. It's really our primary facility that's least capable of handling the significant growth.

(#3700) Diane Edgin noted the correct spelling of the island is Harstine. She further noted under the solid waste area, King County charges \$10.00 for a computer monitor, and right now people can bring them in and drop them off and it's just part of the general load. I don't believe we separate it out.

(#3750) David Baker stated that is correct. However, by 2007 to 2009 we have to have something in place because that's when the state law becomes mandatory. That's being phased in as we speak.

(#3800) Diane Edgin inquired about the drop station at Johns Prairie. That can be a disaster at time. It does get cleaned up but then it goes right back. She inquired if there was any thought to giving somebody free RV parking in exchange for having somebody there.

(#0130) David Baker responded he has never explored that particular strategy.

(#0135) Diane Edgin noted that brings up another issue with the absence of RV dump stations. There are some people that dump no matter what.

(#0150) Terri Jeffreys noted that under the financial plan, you didn't list tipping fees as an option for revenue generation, and inquired what the breaking point might be.

(#0175) David Baker explained that tipping aren't mentioned in here; however, they have been increased since this draft was put out. We did change our tip fee structure on January 1, 2007 and the rates have gone up and that is in part to address some of the needs we have with our facility.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

I'm not exactly sure what the breaking point is in terms of illegal dumping, and the reason I don't know that answer is because every county, that I'm aware of, has illegal dumping no matter what their tip fees are. Our garbage goes to the Roosevelt Regional Landfill in Eastern Washington in Klickitat County. If you're a resident of Klickitat County and you bring your own garbage to the facility, it's free. It's their tradeoff with the rest of the counties in Washington State. There are 32 counties using their landfill. They get free dumping; they have illegal dumping.

(#0220) Jay Hupp noted there's one place he has observed where illegal dumping does not occur and that's generally in the states of Montana and Idaho. What you find in both of those states, particularly in rural areas, are facilities that are convenient to people. You can't hardly travel more than about 10 miles in a rural area without running into a legal dump site that is free. You don't see garbage out in the brush or along side the roads. When they catch you they really nail you because there's no excuse for illegal dumping. In our case it's both inconvenient and expensive, so it winds up in my back yard.

(#0245) Diane Edgin noted there are a couple of days a year where there is free dumping and there is so many of us that want to take advantage of that but you can't handle us all at once.

(#0255) David Baker explained that they've gotten away from the free dump days as a model and gone to the voucher program so we hand out 500 vouchers that are good for a period of time so that we don't get all those people on one given day. The other strategy for funding disposal mechanisms is through general taxes. I've often heard people say where I used to come from I didn't have to pay for garbage but they just didn't pay a garbage bill. There are no free lunches in this particular equation. In Washington State where we have tip fees that are free all the way up to over \$100.00 a ton, all the counties that I'm aware of have problems with illegal dumping.

(#0300) Diane Edgin brought up the fact that in California they ran a recycling program for usable goods so if you wanted something you might pay very little for an item and it helped them financially. Also, it was mandatory that all loads had to be covered.

(#0325) David Baker responded that in Kitsap County if you show up with an uncovered load, they just automatically charge you for that. In Thurston County they have a similar program as well. It was something that was proposed for our new rate structure, and it's something that our committee is working on trying to get implemented for the future.

(#0340) Terri Jeffreys inquired about the pilot project that Mason County is doing for curbside recycling.

(#0350) David Baker explained that it has been going on approximately 2 years and there are plans to expand it. They are open to that idea. They're doing it around Lake Limerick, Lakeland Village and Oak Park. The other thing that's changing that right now is the City of Shelton is currently using the stacking bin system for their recycling program, which is what we have in the pilot areas. The City of Shelton is changing over their curbside recycling collection program and they're going to use something that's a little bit more modern. Once that's implemented and up and running, that service will be provided to the City of Shelton by Mason County Garbage and Recycling under contract. Once they're set up to provide service to that particular contract, then they can more realistically look at providing that more convenient service on a countywide basis.

(#0400) Diane Edgin noted that it's a great plan and obviously a lot of work went into it.

(#0425) Tim Wing stated that people are willing to do more because there's a huge waste of resources by not doing as much as terms of separating items and recycling. I want to encourage you to push ahead with that.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, February 12, 2007

(#0450) Jay Hupp made a motion to recommend approval of the draft and send it forward to the BOCC for their approval.

(#0460) Diane Edgin seconded the motion.

(#0470) Terri Jeffreys stated she would like the instruction to be to recognize her suggested changes to the BOCC.

(#0475) David Baker responded at a bare minimum there would be some kind of a typed version of this meeting that would have to be included in the appendix before we would even consider bringing it forward for final adoption.

(#0500) Tim Wing inquired of Jay Hupp if that would be an acceptable addition to the motion.

(#0520) Jay Hupp and Diane Edgin stated that would be an acceptable addition to their motion and second.

(#0525) Tim Wing called for the question and the motion was passed.

Meeting adjourned.