

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes**  
**March 24, 2008**

(Note audio tape (#2) dated March 24, 2008  
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 at 6:00 pm by Vice-Chair Dennis Pickard. Chair Bill Dewey joined the meeting shortly after the beginning of the Public Hearing on the LID Ordinance.

## **2. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** Bill Dewey, Tim Wing, Dennis Pickard, Wendy Ervin, Jim Reece, Diane Edgin and Debbie Jacobs. Debbie Jacobs was officially welcomed to the Planning Advisory Commission.

**Staff Present:** Barbara Robinson, Barbara Adkins, Bob Fink, and Susie Ellingson.

## **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the January 28, 2008 meeting were approved as presented.

## **4. NEW BUSINESS**

(#0040) Vice-Chair Dennis Pickard opened the Planning Advisory Commission meeting and introduced the first item on the agenda, the Low Impact Development Ordinance.

(#0050) Barbara Robinson, Director of the Department of Community Development, opened the hearing. You have had a chance to review this document over the last few months. We have received some comments from Bob Hagar of the Lower Hood Canal Coordinating Council. Wayne Carlson, our consultant from AHBL, who wrote the ordinance, has responded to Mr. Hagar's comments, and the PAC has been provided with a

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, March 24, 2008

copy of those responses, and they are addressed in the latest revision that you received. The Low Impact Development Regulations were developed back in 2006, and were brought to us in a final draft form in April of 2007. Wayne Carlson, from AHBL, is here tonight and has worked in conjunction with the Puget Sound Action Team, which is now Puget Sound Partnership. Duane Fagergren is here from Puget Sound Partnership to help with the technical part of this whole process. As you know, LID regulations are one of the components of both the Allyn and Belfair Stormwater Management Plans, and is part of our requirement for compliance with the GMA. Once we developed the two Stormwater Management Plans for Belfair and Allyn, we also needed to include the LID regulations. That is what is being brought to you tonight. Wayne Carlson is recommending that we adopt, by reference, the Maintenance of Low Impact Development Facilities, and the Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound. PAC members have also received a copy of the maintenance document for reference. The LID Technical Guidance Manual is on file at the Department of Community Development.

(#0120) Duane Fagergren of Puget Sound Partnership explained that stormwater management in all of Puget Sound has to be one of the major priorities for our work, and one component of that is LID. We're strongly in support of this and we've helped with some of the funding to assist jurisdictions to pursue LID projects and to build that not only into new developments, but looking into retrofits and getting at some areas that are high in impervious surface. My purpose working with the Partnership will be the Regional Liaison for South Puget Sound and Hood Canal. We all know development is going to happen so we need to do it smartly. I applaud the county for moving ahead with this as it is a very important component as a way to address GMA so we can get to some of the funding sources that are available. I thank you for your consideration in this matter.

(#0225) Wayne Carlson, Principal Planner for AHBL Consulting Firm from Tacoma, explained that for three years they have been working with the Puget Sound Partnership on this project. In 2006, Mason County joined other jurisdictions that participated in this. Wayne stated he appreciates what the Planning Advisory Commissioner do and he explained he is also a Planning Commissioner and understands all the hours that are put into it. The origin behind this ordinance is two fold. In 2005 we had communities that indicated they wanted to identify what an LID project would look like. They understood the 65% native vegetation and 10% impervious, but in a UGA, you can't meet the urban densities you are trying to achieve. So what would an LID project look like with urban densities? Then once you have designed the design criteria, would there be an incentive or would it be prescriptively required? When we worked with the staff here, initially the purpose was to come up with an LID Ordinance similar to the one we did for other jurisdictions, and now there are 32 jurisdictions in that effort. With staff here, we wanted to devote our efforts on the criteria as to what would constitute an LID project, and that it was incentive based. So some of the changes you see from the original draft is now a prescriptive requirement that these standards be required in Belfair and Allyn, and not attaching any kind of bonus density or other types of incentives. We have a new section entitled 'Applicability', which applies to all new development in all zones within the Allyn and Belfair UGA's. The exception is the construction of a single-family unit on a legal lot of record. It would not apply to that. If you have an existing lot and you want to build a single-family home, then these standards in meeting these design objectives would not be required. This is from feedback that we received from your staff.

There was public comment regarding maintenance of the LID Best Management Practices. What we noted back to staff is that there are some really good maintenance provisions that Washington State University and our staff put together. We emailed those to staff and recommended that for maintenance provisions, they can be adopted administratively by engineering staff as guidance for the maintenance of these facilities.

Regarding the mechanics of the ordinance, we clearly knew that in the UGA's achieving a 65% native vegetative and only 10% impervious just doesn't work in UGA's. We strove to have a standard that is much different than a planned residential district or a PUD or some type of standard where an applicant and county staff might not be sure whether they met it. We wanted everybody to know whether the standard was being achieved. For LID, the concept is to manage surface water as closely to where it falls as possible. So you really want to have stormwater facilities, such as rain gardens or other types of BMP's scattered throughout the site, rather than one large storm pond. The idea is to infiltrate the stormwater as closely to where it falls as possible. So if you have a site with well-drained soils, would it be an LID project if you used catch basin and pipe and directed your stormwater to an infiltration pond that drained to the subsurface without any downstream impacts? It was uniformly decided that would not be an LID project. Even though there are no downstream impacts, the concept was to have some percentage of the site native vegetation, reducing

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, March 24, 2008

impervious surfaces, and managing stormwater in smaller facilities. Through those three elements we came up with the design criteria that drives this ordinance. The table on page 3 specifies what an LID project is. Wayne illustrated an example by describing what would happen if staff received a subdivision proposal at 4 dwelling units per acre. Under the table, less than 6.1 DU's per acre, the project would need to have 35% of the site in native vegetation, and if the native vegetation isn't there, it would be re-established. Depending on the underlying infiltration rates of the soils, a conventional pond size would need to be reduced by a certain percentage. So if the site soils have an infiltration rate of .5 inches per hour, the pond would have to be reduced by 60%. When we looked at the modeling exercises we did, reducing the pond by 100% would be so onerous that no one would ever consider doing it.

(#0650) Tim Wing inquired about reducing the ponds. You're talking about reducing the pond and the pond hasn't even been built yet.

(#0675) Wayne Carlson explained the engineer would provide the calculations. So the very minimum reduction that would need to occur to demonstrate that you've complied with the intent of the ordinance, are these numbers. If the engineer can demonstrate through the infiltration rates of the underlying soils and their own modeling, and this specifies that you need to use the continuous model, and if through their design they find they don't need to build a pond, then they don't have to build a pond. In 2005, this implied the engineer had to do two models. They had to design a conventional plat, figure out how big the pond needed to be, and then re-design it and reduce the pond. The baseline you're reducing the pond from is established in the table on page 4. So you're not required to do two different designs.

In the rest of the document there's additional information about what native vegetation means. It also describes soil amendment, and items regarding stockpiling during construction.

(#0800) Wendy Ervin inquired if when requiring a site assessment, if there's been some general site assessments of the area, can those details be cut and pasted into the plan, as these assessments can be expensive.

(#0860) Wayne Carlson responded it says a survey will need to be prepared and that depending on how steep the site is, the contour interval needs to correspond. If you have a flat site, you would want much more smaller contour intervals so you could see the subtleties of the terrain. If you have a steep site, a five-foot contour interval would be sufficient. Most of this information is going to be required at the preliminary stage of the project. It's not wasted work, but work that occurs up front rather than later on in the process.

(#0900) Tim Wing inquired how it works with other counties, and how does it compare to Kitsap or Thurston County.

(#0920) Wayne Carlson stated that Thurston County was going to adopt an ordinance similar to this and make it prescriptive in the shellfish areas, which were extremely sensitive, then make it incentive based in other parts of North Thurston, where the soils are not as good. Then in South Thurston where the soils infiltrate quite rapidly, they would allow it as an option but not attach any incentive. Just as we were finishing this project with them, their Comp Plan got appealed. They are about in the same phase as Mason County at this time. Art Castle, with the Kitsap County Homebuilders, has been working with the various communities there in terms of putting together standards. They are trying to put together something similar, but based it on the old 1992 Manual because they are not ready to adopt the new DOE Manual. The communities in Western Washington have not wanted to adopt the new Manual because the old Manual was based on a single event modeling. You model a certain storm event. The new Manual is a continuous model so it models stormwater continuously.

(#1125) Bill Dewey inquired about the maintenance aspect of LID.

(#1150) Wayne Carlson explained the connection to maintenance isn't described in this ordinance, but we can add it in. The connection was based on the 2005 Technical Guidance Manual, which is referenced in here. The BMP's are described in the 2005 Manual, and it also says you have to do maintenance in that Manual. So you would want to adopt not only the LID Ordinance, but also the 2005 Technical Guidance Manual and the Maintenance Provisions. That is referenced on page 3 under (8) ©).

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, March 24, 2008

(#1220) Bill Dewey suggested the language needs to be more clear with the discussion of maintenance.

(#1250) Wayne Carlson noted he could make this language more clear.

(#1275) Bill Dewey inquired about the language for the exemption for a single-family unit on a legal lot of record, and where the LID ordinance is going to apply in the UGA, and what percentage would that affect?

(#1300) Barbara Robinson explained there is also the small parcel drainage plans that are required for the smaller parcels. That is separate from this document. This is for the larger projects for over 1 acre. A year and a half ago we adopted the small parcel plan drainage requirements. That requires a small drainage plan for every single-family dwelling or duplex that's proposed within the county that is 1 acre or less in size. Barbara Robinson noted that too requires everything be retained onsite. It's based on total impervious surface. This requirement is now in place.

(#1350) Diane Edgin inquired about the public education on these requirements.

(#1425) Barbara Robinson stated there has been quite a bit of education. We've met with the Master Builders and Developers regarding this. When we originally developed the small parcel drainage requirements, there was a task force that met which included Developers, Realtors, EDC, Master Builders, and developed the regulations through public workshops and then it was adopted by the BOCC.

(#1465) Diane Edgin noted there are a lot of lots out there that are developed and people don't have this information. They're doing landscaping projects, and they're just as much the problem as anybody else.

(#1475) Barbara Robinson explained if it's an existing development, we can't require it. If it's over 2000 sf of new impervious surface that's created, it falls under that requirement. We have the information on the website, and at the Permit Assistance Center.

(#1500) Wendy Ervin mentioned it would be helpful if the Master Gardeners could be informed to help others in these projects.

(#1525) Emmett Dobey added the Washington State Extension Service has CD's on things you can do for low impact development.

(#1550) Wendy Ervin noted a reference in the Ordinance for use of non-native vegetation.

(#1665) Wayne Carlson stated it is talked about on page 5 under (2) (B).

(#1685) Bill Dewey inquired what the term 'passive recreation' referred to.

(#1695) Wayne Carlson explained it's typically meant as open space that people aren't walking heavily through or moving heavily through on a regular basis. We can add a definition for that.

(#1775) Tim Wing commented about the problems with the old systems with the ponds. If you have a 20-home subdivision with a big pond, you have one thing to watch to make sure it is maintained. He noted his concern is maintaining all the rain gardens, etc., and then the house sells, and by neglect and re-landscaping, what are these techniques going to be like in 15 years? When you have a single storm pond, the county can come out and say it needs to be fixed. Are there any other places around that have been doing this for 20 years?

(#1850) Wayne Carlson explained in Maryland the results have been pretty good. We don't have a 2-year track record here in the northwest. There are substantially longer period back east and in Florida. It's very critical that they be designed and built properly and the home buyer be educated about them.

(#1950) Tim Wing continued on noting his concern about the county being able to monitor the maintenance on LID projects. There's really nobody in this county that I know of on staff to go out and monitor the ponds.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, March 24, 2008

(#2000) Diane Edgin wondered outside of having it on the deed, what other mechanisms are there?

(#2050) Jim Reece noted when you install a new system, the building department states you do an annual inspection and submit it to the county.

(#2075) Barbara Robinson explained it is an Operations and Maintenance Agreement required by Environmental Health.

(#2100) Bill Dewey commented Mason County has good software programs for tracking the septic O & M requirements. He inquired if there was comparable software for LID tracking. We don't want to set ourselves up for failure.

(#2145) Miscellaneous discussion regarding maintenance.

(#2250) Bill Dewey inquired once you've created these LID projects is there a place they're recorded, and when a property transacts, is there a record of it.

(#2260) Miscellaneous discussion regarding maintenance.

(#2655) Tim Wing inquired if the Mason County Homebuilders Association has reviewed these documents.

(#2675) Barbara Robinson explained they have been given drafts of this at the Master Builders meetings. We've also had several workshops, starting back when Steve Goins first worked on it.

(#2700) Bill Dewey inquired if they have reviewed it since the changes from an incentive program to mandatory prescriptive in the UGA's.

(#2720) Barbara Robinson explained they have not. We have made the changes because of our Compliance Order with GMA. We had to include LID in the Allyn and Belfair UGA's in order to comply with our Order. It's all part of adopting the 2005 DOE Manual for the Allyn and Belfair UGA's, as well as the LID regulations for the two UGA's, in conjunction with our Stormwater Management Plans for each UGA.

(#2745) Dennis Pickard inquired how specific are the Board's requirements. Dennis noted his concerns are the potential costs in implementing this on a relatively small scale development, and in particular, the infill developments we expect in the Allyn UGA. This seems to be designed for the larger subdivisions.

(#2780) Barbara Robinson explained this document excludes single-family development as well as duplexes. If it involves more than an acre of land, it would kick in the requirements for LID. It will be required for short plats, large lot subdivisions, and subdivisions. The idea of the LID is to include everything other than single-family residential.

(#2850) Bill Dewey inquired about the notation regarding Community Outreach Meeting on page 9.

(#2900) Wayne Carlson noted that should be removed from the Ordinance.

(#2940) Tim Wing inquired about the inspection of the projects while they are being installed and is there staff trained to do this. Has there been any discussions with the Building Department or any staff as to how to implement this?

(#2975) Barbara Robinson explained there have been discussions with Public Works and Utilities regarding these regulations. We would be working in conjunction with them. The building inspectors will not have the expertise, and they would then fall back on the Public Works crews to review and monitor it. We have one person who is a certified building inspector and plans examiner who has just recently received his certifications in erosion and sedimentation control. We will continue to pursue all the training that might be necessary for him so he can take on these projects in conjunction with Public Works while they are being constructed. We will then have someone who has the technical expertise specifically on these projects that

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, March 24, 2008

can monitor them as they're being constructed and then make sure that at the end they are being installed per the regulations.

(#3150) Bill Dewey agreed with Tim Wing's concerns. He is pleased with the county's efforts regarding the stormwater issues, and in fact, there have been great improvements in Allyn regarding the shellfish industry. We need to make sure we have adequate expertise to ensure things are being put in correctly and even more importantly, that they are maintained in the future. We have identified some shortcomings that need to be addressed as this moves forward.

(#3225) Wendy Ervin inquired about the voluntary program that was originally presented versus now it is mandatory.

(#3275) Emmett Dobe explained he worked in the stormwater field in another jurisdiction. That jurisdiction started out with voluntary compliance and found out that didn't always work. They went to a code enforcement person which requires deed restrictions that get put in and requires an annual inspection by this code enforcement person. There's also an agreement that you sign that says you're going to take care of it. The other way to handle this is through a utility of some sort with dedicated funds that gets paid. We are exploring that option right now of a Stormwater Utility that would collect revenue and likely one of those programs would be some sort of education and enforcement program. Charlie Butros and I are talking about sharing that responsibility. I would do the program, and Charlie would do the implementation work. It would be the Utility's responsibility to do the inspections and code enforcement work, along with the educational facilities. All of this will get built into a Stormwater Enabling Ordinance which would have programs features and capital facilities features that Public Works will take care of. We would support it for the first three years through grants and then in the future with a proposed stormwater utility that the BOCC would have to pass.

(#3425) Charlie Butros addressed the staffing issues that have been talked about. As far as our current abilities with the level of work that's coming at us, we are under equipped. The way we've dealt with that is to invite interested applicants that can handle having the work outsourced to do that. That will get them through the process a lot faster. As far as handling the implementation of the LID Ordinance, that is an added task that obviously needs some additional attention and additional staffing time to deal with. At this point, the way the stormwater program is managed in the county, it's spread over multiple organizations and with Emmett's involvement to try to get us transitioned to a stormwater utility, that will help centralize and coordinate the functions under an organization that will have the resources to staff some of these functions. We were fortunate enough to have been granted funding through DOE that is rather significant that will allow us to get through the initial phases of implementation and transition to a self-sustaining function. We hope to be able to add the resources and get the in-house people trained to be able to do the additional work that is coming our way.

(#3565) Tim Wing inquired about the rates of the utility fee that may be imposed.

(#3588) Charlie Butros responded they have been gathering information from other counties and it appears to be in the neighborhood of \$2 - \$5 a month.

(#0140) Bill Dewey opened the public comment portion of the hearing. No public was presented who wanted to testify so Bill closed the public comment portion of the hearing. Bill opened up the discussion for the PAC. Bill inquired of staff what they would like to see for a recommendation.

(#0300) Barbara Robinson stated staff would like PAC to recommend the LID Ordinance and Maintenance Requirements be sent on to the BOCC with their proposed changes.

(#0350) Bill Dewey stated his points were making clear maintenance is a requirement throughout the document. Adding a definition for 'passive recreation' on page 5. Deleting 17.70.180 (3) on page 9 referencing 'The Community Outreach Meeting'. Based on the discussion tonight, as this is passed on to the BOCC, pass along expressing our very sincere concerns about the lack of adequate staffing to ensure that this is implemented, and that there's adequate training and oversight for maintenance of these LID requirements if they're going to be adopted.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, March 24, 2008

(#0425) Jim Reece stated he feels we're premature sending this to the BOCC and make the BOCC wrestle with the questions that we have like how you implement it. He also stated he's concerned on what happens down the road. Do you wait until the LID project runs over onto other people's property? How do you know when it's time that rain garden or pond needs to be replaced? Is it the homeowner's responsibility?

(#0485) Barbara Robinson responded we have discussed that and there is language in here regarding protecting and maintaining those facilities that have been installed. Especially in subdivisions there are requirements for continued operation and maintenance of those facilities.

(#0500) Emmett Dobe added the BOCC will be having that discussion later this year about the formation of a utility or some other way to pay for this. So you're going to see that discussion anyway. That is the proper place to have that discussion.

(#0575) Dennis Pickard inquired if there is a deadline to approve this ordinance.

(#0585) Barbara Robinson responded there is a GMHB requirement that we have to have this adopted by June 19th. Getting through this portion with the PAC, and then it goes on to the BOCC for a second public hearing to discuss it and consider the adoption of it.

(#0600) Dennis Pickard stated that he feels we are one version away from a draft of this that he would be comfortable with sending on. There are enough issues we've discussed, and some technical points I would like to bring up.

(#0650) Barbara Robinson explained it has been through a full review with DOE, Puget Sound Partnership, CTED, as well as the Tribes. This is the final document from those reviews. This is not only something that has to be done for the compliance order, but we have water quality issues. This is a necessity in the urban areas.

(#0700) Miscellaneous discussion regarding possible review of the requested changes before being sent on to the BOCC, with another meeting or otherwise.

(#0750) Tim Wing stated he is personally comfortable with the way it is with the proposed revisions.

(#0775) Bill Dewey stated he is also comfortable with the proposed revisions.

(#0800) Dennis Pickard explained some of his proposed changes. He noted we already have Chapter 17.70.

(#0825) Barbara Robinson explained we did note that and will change it to 17.80.

(#0830) Dennis Pickard stated he has other issues of note with the Ordinance.

(#0840) Bill Dewey stated it would be better to just review them all tonight rather than come back for an additional meeting, which would delay it a month.

(#0875) Dennis Pickard commented Section 120 on page 7 talks about modifying minimum lot size, lot width, and building setback, and inquired what that means.

(#0900) Wayne Carlson explained if you're going to require an applicant to have so much of their site in native vegetation, what we're saying is if there's a minimum lot area, the applicant would be allowed to reduce the lot area so that they can achieve the 35% native vegetation. It provides more flexibility.

(#0965) Dennis Pickard stated he would like to see that language clarified. Dennis suggested using the word 'reduced' instead of 'modified'. Dennis commented on the tables on pages 3 and 4. He suggested moving the first column in the table on page 4, which talks about modeling assumptions, and making it the fourth column in the table on page 3. That way we're only talking about modeling assumptions in the table on page 4.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, March 24, 2008

(#1050) Wayne Carlson stated that could be done to help alleviate confusion.

(#1080) Dennis Pickard inquired if 070, Site Assessment, and 170, Site Assessment, could be combined since there's some later references to Section 070 that talks about detailed information that would be found in 170. That reference is made on page 10 under 190 (2), where it might read 170 instead of 070.

(#1150) Wayne Carlson noted that could be done.

(#1200) Dennis Pickard inquired what the meaning of 'ownership tracts' is on page 10 under (17)(B).

(#1245) Wayne Carlson explained there should be a comma between 'ownership' and 'tracts' regarding the information that would need to be provided by the applicant.

(#1285) Wendy Ervin commented there should also be a comma added on page 5, at the bottom of the page, after the word 'grading'.

(#1325) Dennis Pickard stated he is more comfortable with what we've discussed with these additional items.

(#1345) Bill Dewey stated if people have any other specific recommendations for changes, they can provide those to staff.

(#1375) Tim Wing made a motion to recommend to the BOCC adoption of the LID Ordinance and regulations as altered and changed by the PAC's discussion tonight. Wendy Ervin seconded the motion.

(#1400) Bill Dewey requested there be a friendly amendment to the motion to include the PAC expressing their concern regarding adequate staffing and oversight for implementation of the Ordinance in regards to maintenance and monitoring. Tim Wing made the friendly amendment to his motion, and Wendy Ervin seconded that as well. A vote was taken and the motion was passed.

(#1500) Barbara Adkins, Program Manager, Long Range Planning, Department of Community Development, stated staff has developed a list of work projects to be completed in 2008, and is presenting its recommendations to the PAC. We have a list of projects carried over from 2007, and none of these projects had a mandate so we had the flexibility to move the ones we did not accomplish in 2007. The new ones were added by either staff or PAC recommendations. We do have one project for 2009. The table goes into more detail about what the items are and gives you initials for the person who will be taking the lead on the project, and the target dates of when we proposed to have either the draft done or when it needs to be adopted or both. Tonight is your opportunity to ask questions about these items or propose additions or deletions.

(#1600) Wendy Ervin stated she had asked the decision making process for rezones to be reviewed. She noted there are differences in analyzing the criteria for rezoning property in the UGA's and for other rural areas of the county.

(#1650) Miscellaneous discussion regarding re-evaluating the rezone criteria.

(#1800) Barbara Adkins responded staff will review the rezone criteria for urban areas.

(#1850) Dennis Pickard stated he would like to see the Boundary Line Adjustment regulations come forward in 2008.

(#1900) Barbara Adkins went over the table with the PAC and they discussed which work items will be coming before the PAC in 2008. The following items will be presented to the PAC during the remainder of 2008: Short Subdivision Alteration Process; Special Provisions for Park Models; Oakland Bay Development Regulations; GIS based zoning map; Work on the Allyn UGA to include Landscape Ordinance, Urban Road Standards, Update of Right-of-way Map, Draft Parking Ordinance, Revisit Zoning Code; Develop Sign Ordinance; Adopt permanent language for the allowance of temporary sales offices; Coordinate with Public Works and Utilities to develop and adopt Hoodspout and Countywide Stormwater Plans; Review of the Danger Tree Code; Draft a

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, March 24, 2008

School Impact Fee Ordinance; Draft Interim Regulations and Prepare Zoning Map, as well as revisions to the Shelton UGA Plan; Process annual zoning requests; Annual Update of the Capital Facilities Element; Annual Update of the Transportation Element; Update of the Economic Development Element; Establish Stakeholder Committee and review of DCD permitting process and fee policies; and Work with Criminal Justice Working Team to develop a Strategic Plan. You have suggested adding two more. We will have to review those items to see what kind of review process they need and how much time they would take.

(#2500) Wendy Ervin inquired how many rezones there will be this year to process.

(#2550) Susie Ellingson stated the deadline is the end of June so there is still time to see how many will be submitted.

(#2600) Bill Dewey inquired about onsite sewage. He noted we adopted a plan this year and Commissioner Ring Erickson asked that a task force be put together on continuing to refine that. During the public hearing that adopted that, she made a recommendation acknowledging that it was still far from perfect but we needed to get into place. There was a commitment made to continue on that.

(#2700) Barbara Robinson responded to date we have not discussed that with the BOCC.

(#2750) Tim Wing talked about the meeting that was held in Belfair regarding the transportation issues, and explained it has led to CTED actually drafting a request to openly fund this county \$40,000, which will be matched with a little bit of money from the county, to develop a road plan for Belfair. Belfair is so different than Allyn and so they really need to come up with something for Belfair. So I feel like we're making some real progress.

(#2800) The PAC made a motion, a second, and took a vote to pass the recommended 2008 Work Plan, with the two additions, onto the BOCC for their approval.

Meeting adjourned.