

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

October 18, 2010

(Note audio tape (#1) dated October 18, 2010
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 Chair Dennis Pickard.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dennis Pickard, Jim Reece, Ken VanBuskirk, Randy Neatherlin, Jim Sims, and Cathi Bailey. Bill Dewey was excused.

Staff Present: Barbara Adkins, and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ken VanBuskirk noted his concern regarding the time it took to have the November 23, 2009 minutes ready for approval. There was public testimony recently at the BOCC meeting. One of the public expressed that they had tried to get a copy of the minutes, and it took quite a while before they got them. I had to call Barbara for the final recommendation as I could not remember. He requested that in the future, we try to review the minutes in a more timely manner.

Dennis Pickard we had obviously had some extenuating circumstances with our main helper being missing in action for an extended period of time. That is the primary culprit in this particular instance.

Ken VanBuskirk stated that night there was a packed meeting, and we didn't get those public comments until the night of the meeting. Maybe, in the future, if we have a meeting that we know there will public comments, we could ask for those comments to be submitted so that we can get them in our package to review.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2010

Dennis Pickard noted generally, if there are written comments submitted prior to issuing our packets, we do receive those ahead of time. Obviously we've had a number of occasions where we've had a few comments submitted at the meeting, and we do take a recess to review them prior to continuing on with the meeting. Certainly last minute comments are relatively common, and cannot always be submitted ahead of time.

Dennis Pickard also stated in the event we do have any non unanimous votes, we will take more time and care to make sure that it's clear to Susie, at the time, who votes which way so we have a clear understanding of the vote. That comment is reflected in the correction listed on page 15.

The minutes from the November 23, 2009 meeting were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

On page 12, under (#0586)(fourth sentence), it should read: It's not a position that I'm particularly comfortable being in, in terms of having to rezone any parcel that wants to engage in a use, a rural permitted use, that is not residential'.

On page 13, under (#1125), it should read: 'You are' ...

On page 15, under (#2050), it should read: 'The vote was taken and the motion carries, with 3 voting for, and 1, Ken VanBuskirk, voting against'.

4. NEW BUSINESS

Dennis Pickard introduced the one item on the agenda which is the Public Hearing to consider the annual updates to the Capital Facilities element of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan.

Barbara Adkins of the Department of Community Development opened the public hearing on the update of the Capital Facilities Plan. She explained it is updated every year, and is the inventory of the capital facilities of the county, along with some policies and goals. Each one of the departments that have capital facilities in their budget contribute to this document. Planning does not do capital facility projects, but we are in charge of compiling this document and make sure it gets updated every year. The projects that are outlined in here from the various departments all contain 6-year financing plans, which have to include both expenditures and funding resources for these projects. All the department heads are here tonight with the exception of Mike Rutter of Facilities and Grounds. His contribution contains square footage of the departments. There are several edits in here, and the entire first section is devoted to policies. The budgets are given to me by the department heads by their financial department and are a part of their annual budget. Any questions you may have about the project or funding, they are here to answer them for you.

Cathi Bright stated on page two of the staff report under Summary, it says 'the amendments are being provided to the Planning Advisory Commissioner' ...

Barbara Adkins noted that change to 'Commissioners'.

Dennis Pickard noted the word 'Center' was missing from page 12 in the last paragraph.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2010

Cathi Bright inquired about the table on page 14, which shows construction costs, but no funding sources.

Emmett Dobe explained they could just be divided evenly by thirds for grants, loans & rates. The Belfair Facility is about 90% grant funded. Emmett noted the Belfair project is divided into four phases. The first phase is fully funded, mostly along SR 3. The next phase is Old Belfair Highway, and then the Newkirk connection, and then the south. The initial grants run out at the end of 2010. We will start using rates in 2013, along with as many grants as we can obtain. It should be around 53 million dollars for the entire Belfair project.

Cathi Bright noted an error on page 21, under 'Justification'. It should read 'The treatment plants at North Bay and the new Belfair plant have a need to address continued increases in biosolids' Cathi Bright inquired about the grant money available for the North Bay Sewer System.

Emmett Dobe explained it's the same being divided evenly by thirds.

Ken VanBuskirk inquired about the inter-local agreement with Kitsap County regarding the Solid Waste Utility, and does it in fact, cost Mason County \$60 per customer no mater what the charge?

Emmett Dobe explained it is because of the out of county charge or a surcharge.

Cathi Bright inquired if Kitsap County residents bring their waste to Mason County do they charge the same as well.

Emmett Dobe responded they pay much more that \$60. It reflects the mobilization costs.

Miscellaneous discussion regarding Belfair Household Hazardous Waste Facility Improvements starting in 2015, and the question if that timeline could be moved up. The \$60 is not actually charged to the customer, but is allocated out of a grant.

Emmett Dobe explained not in the current rate structure we have in place. We have tried not to raise the rates at any of the facilities in the last three years. A rate does not support any of the critical facilities. If we have a rate increase, we could do some of these things quicker. We do not foresee a rate increase in the near future. In Shelton, DOE has allowed us to continue with our facility as it is, although it is really out of compliance. All of our capital facilities in solid waste are driven by rates. We have been able to keep the rates as they are by reducing the hours at the facility.

Cathi Bright and Jim Reece acknowledged how great the employees are at all the facilities.

Jim Reece noted on page 25 "Shelton" should be added under the project name.

Ken VanBuskirk inquired about the wording on page 27 regarding the Belfair Drop Box. He noted it is actually cheaper for north end residents to go to Kitsap County. It says that due to the location, it does not make sense to increase the tonnage without exporting directly to rail, or at least to rail containers. Ken inquired if there is a way the county can look into expanding it through an inter-local agreement with Kitsap County for waste, or site a Mason County site closer to the rail line?

Emmett Dobe stated it depends on the rate flow. From a customer standpoint, it might be cheaper for people to go to Kitsap County.

Discussion regarding the potential of privatizing sold waste collection.

On page 37, under Parks, Ken VanBuskirk inquired why Theler Center was crossed off the list. It should be listed in two places. There would be 72 acres under public school facilities section, and 62 acres under Fish and Wildlife, with the interpretative trails under school facilities, and trails on the Fish and Wildlife section.

Randy Neatherlin stated both parts are leased out to the Mary Theler Community Center from the school district. They are a stand alone corporation. Part of the trails go on the Salmon Enhancement property. It

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2010

should be put under the private section.

Cathi Bright noted on page 40, under Justifications, it should read 'There is no current plan of record for this park site and it is the only' ...

Randy Neatherlin talked about the Sand Hill Park Renovations on page 42. Years ago when we first did the upgrades and changes there, we have been on an every couple of year schedule for the renovations. Did we move the renovations out further and move up MCRA's renovations?

John Keates stated they did because of the funding sources. They will then do the remaining work on Fields 1, 2, & 3 at Sand Hill. John Keates stated MCRA has so many problems right now we need to work on that.

Randy Neatherlin stated that Sand Hill has more drainage problems than MCRA. We know we've had a huge influx of use, and it would be nice to have those same tournament dollars come to the north end. He inquired if what was a possibility to switch that around.

John Keates stated he already has money allocated for MCRA through 2010.

Randy Neatherlin inquired how far out it has been pushed.

John Keates stated it is all about funding. MCRA has had problems stemming way back and needs some TLC, but we will try to get some funding for Sand Hill in the future. John did note that the Youth Athletic Facilities Program, which is a state fund, may become available again.

Dennis Pickard inquired about the county and administrative buildings, and if there was a need for any more facilities or renovations on the horizon for space needs issues.

Barbara Adkins explained there are no projects identified at this time. Foster and Williams came around for a few years and assessed the needs for each department. She noted that was not done this year.

Cathi Bright stated she recently had jury duty and wondered about the efficiency of that building. District Court has some need for evaluating the HVAC system. They even tell you on the message that the temperature varies quite a bit during the day. You might save on utilities if those concerns were addressed.

Dennis Pickard noted on page 67 it should read 'however that plan'.....

Cathi Bright inquired about the search and rescue equipment and tactical equipment asking where they were located.

Dean Byrd of the Mason County Sheriff's Department explained it's stored out at the old Public Works Facility at Johns Prairie.

Cathi Bright inquired if there is an emergency that the sheriff's department needs to respond to they have to go out there to get the equipment.

Dean Byrd responded not necessarily. We do have a lot of equipment housed out there. The emergency equipment is kept near and dear to our personnel that care for that equipment and that equipment is assigned to. There are also vehicles out there, though. We have five vehicles mothballed out there. We have boats stored out there. The boats used during the boating season are moored at key facilities throughout the county and on the canal, as well as Puget Sound. It is accessible.

Dennis Pickard inquired about plans for any future needs mentioned in the outline.

Dean Byrd explained there is a project on the board right now that is being funded by a small grant providing some additional security and fencing at that facility, specifically to make our evidence facility more secure. We don't have any other projects underway because of the budget constraints we're facing right now.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2010

Randy Neatherlin stated that the building at the Port of Allyn is ready for any needs you may have.

Dean Byrd stated they are aware of that and at this point in time, we're pretty well fixed up at the north end. We have the portable for our office that's next to the old fire station. We also have a small facility in the Safeway Store that has been serving us well. If the need comes up we will review that in the future.

Ken VanBuskirk inquired about the stormwater facility that the county recently worked on in the Belfair UGA and if the county owns that facility.

Charlie Butros of the Mason County Public Works Department stated they do not. Charlie stated they are entering into an agreement with the owner of that property to upgrade it and maintain it. It used to be a facility that treated the water coming off of the Safeway Complex. It wasn't well maintained, or at all. We needed to add treatment; water to be treated at the same facility from Roy Boad Road. It is upgraded to be a regional treatment facility and add the runoff from Roy Boad Road. This will also provide for higher volume treatment.

Ken VanBuskirk inquired if that would show up as a capital facilities project for the county.

Charlie Butros explained it is part of the plan in the capital facility as one of the projects that we are developing. It will show up as a capital facility, but we won't own the property.

Ken VanBuskirk noted in the first paragraph on page 69, it states 'More stringent control is proposed for the UGA's' ... He inquired if Belfair being a UGA, would there be some sort of a stormwater system developed for the UGA.

Charlie Butros stated that is their plan.

Randy Neatherlin stated he knows someone on the stormwater committee and they say they're getting close to trying to put forward a taxing district.

Charlie Butros stated they're not quite there, but through a consultant, we are developing a set of funding options that we are going to submit to that committee to get their feedback on the preferred options and move forward. Fees imposed could be different funding options to provide funding for future stormwater programs and facilities. Until the options are well defined, we do not have an idea of what authority will be needed to apply the option.

Cathi Bright noted on page 76 under 'Justifications', it should be 'its' instead of 'it's' ...

Ken VanBuskirk noted in the 'Purpose' statement the forecast will be updated in 2011 for the Belfair Sewering Project.

Emmett Dobe stated there will be a preliminary number November 30, 2010, and actually adopted as the sewer system comes on board sometime in April or May, 2011.

Ken VanBuskirk inquired when this information becomes available, if that could affect how the future connections happen. He wonders if this might be a good agenda topic for the PAC to consider next year. When the initial phases were set up, there wasn't very much public involvement in setting up those phases. It seems once those forecasts are updated, if on page 95, that the area in the Old Belfair Highway connection, the county had suggested that that might be a Utility Local Improvement District (ULID). He suggested if those parcel owners in that area were notified that there might be a public hearing about phasing of that sewer, it might be beneficial to pursue that, especially once we get the forecast of what the rates might be. It would be a good agenda topic for the PAC to review.

Dennis Pickard stated going back to the history of our involvement with the project out there, I wonder whether if that particular element is something that is appropriate for this body or not. I would be open to considering it provided there's a place that fits under our role to advise in terms of this particular issue.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2010

Ken VanBuskirk inquired if this appendix was developed by CH2M Hill.

Emmett Dobe responded along with the county. There was two drivers for the development of the Belfair Sewer. The first being water quality issues in Hood Canal, and the second being economic development. The first phase was selected because it's primarily the most densely populated area; therefore the most septic tanks, therefore the greater water quality impacts, as well as the greatest opportunity for redevelopment to higher and better uses. The second area that happens, based on population and water quality, is the Old Belfair Highway. It is more developed than the other two areas. The other two areas are primarily going to be developed by the extension of utilities by the development community as opposed to any public financing. If today the developer came in and said they wanted to develop a southern connection first, which is closest to the sewage treatment plant, and were willing to put the infrastructure in the ground, it would become the second one. The system is set up so that any one of the three remaining can go next. What we felt was more likely to get public financing was the Old Belfair Highway because of the number of developed lots that were already there.

Dennis Pickard inquired if it would be practical if the situation arises like you are discussing and a developer wanted to work on that, could you do that simultaneously with the Old Belfair Highway.

Emmett Dobe explained the development capacities are based on the land use plan and existing zoning. If a developer wanted to come in and make changes to the zoning, therefore changes in the capacity, we would want to discuss that. The treatment plant is designed for the ultimate buildout, which is about 1,700 customers. If you were to create changes in land use that would double that capacity, we would want to know how we were going to do that and how we would finance that cost if there were public monies involved.

Randy Neatherlin talked about the ULID. He inquired if the neighbors know that they're looking at that, and what kind of costs are we looking at.

Emmett Dobe explained the way we have distributed the existing grant money is between the first and second phases. It's between the initial connections and we've also taken some of that money and appropriated it for the development of the Old Belfair Highway. The idea is that we would have a fairly consistent utility rate between the two. The difference between the two might be the connection charge. People along SR 3 will pay less, around \$3,200, and we're trying to figure out a way to have the grant money pay for that. Future development, a lot that is undeveloped right now, in both of these areas, would pay about \$15,000 to connect. It depends on future development.

Randy Neatherlin inquired how the ULID down Old Belfair Highway would impact an individual.

Emmett Dobe stated we will try to keep rates consistent; both connection and monthly utility rate. I can tell you the way our rate model is structured, is that future development pays a much higher cost.

Randy Neatherlin inquired if there is a setup fee for the ULID area for the folks that live there. If it's scheduled for two years, are they aware of it.

Emmett Dobe responded as we have developed the first phase, the meetings have all discussed the four phases so people have an idea of who could be next. If you had a Local Improvement District, it would be an assessment. We would like to be able to include in that assessment your connection charge. So instead of paying the \$3,200 up front you could make it a part of that assessment so you could pay it out over the term of that LID.

Randy Neatherlin stated his biggest concern is that everyone down there, different than the business core, that kind of an increase out of their pocket could be devastating.

Emmett Dobe stated they are trying to work out a formula that would allow for the grant money to be used for that connection fee so that it's not so much out of pocket up front. We are looking at the monthly rate to be somewhere between \$86 to \$100 plus a month. That's what troubles me.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2010

Randy Neatherlin inquired if they were prepared to go forward with the ULID in two years.

Emmett Dobe responded we're prepared to go forward serving it. How we do it, with what mechanism, we're not sure right now. The third reason why this area is being sewerd is because of GMA issues. We had a UGA that didn't have municipal services, especially sewer. GMA dictated that we provide a plan for providing sewers for this entire area. It's based on a seventeen year plan, and to meet each of those plan years, that's when this development has to start in order to meet that cycle to get all four areas sewerd by the GMA deadline. It is an arbitrary number but it is based on projected growth; we think there will be a lot of demand for redevelopment which creates additional revenue which can be used for extensions as well. Connection charges are a way to pay for future growth. You're assuring that you get the capacity and ensuring that the next person in will get capacity as well. I can have the financial consultant come and explain to you how all this works. We are scheduled to have a preliminary connection number and monthly number sometime late in November, moving forward with the public involvement process sometime after the first of the year with a rate and a connection charge that would be adopted by the BOCC as the sewer comes on board next April or May.

Ken VanBuskirk stated there was not a lot of public involvement in the phasing portion. With the Old Belfair Highway phase, if those parcel owners were aware there may be a potential ULID, there might be more public involvement.

Emmett Dobe explained to create a ULID you have to have a public process.

Randy Neatherlin inquired if the ULID was something the BOCC could approve.

Emmett Dobe stated they could, but it would have to go through a public process, but not a public vote.

Jim Sims requested to be excused from the meeting as he had another commitment.

Emmett Dobe clarified that with a ULID there is a preliminary assessment that's established in the beginning. An example would be if it would cost \$50 to serve it, if they came back and said it actually costs \$60, the county would have to make up that difference. There is a process where there is a public hearing on what that assessment is going to be, and then the BOCC moves forward with accepting that assessment.

Once the assessment is established, it can't go above that. That's simply an alternative, but we will continue to pursue grants like we did for the first phase. Emmett further explained that there was a Belfair utility created so there's already a utility in place that covers the entire UGA. So if you had a ULID it would be a LID within the utility. One formula that is used is by the front footage, or benefitted area. Or you can do it simply by the number of connections.

Randy Neatherlin inquired about latecomers fees for the upper area.

Emmett Dobe responded latecomers fees will be discussed as a part of the first phase, and they'll be put in place. There may be some latecomers that would be involved in the initial connection. There may be some undeveloped property within the area along SR 3 where developers will go ahead and put in a line for now to be served by that initial first phase; we are looking at that issue right now. We're applying for a Centennial Grant for where the opportunities are for existing extensions, and then as people came in to develop their property, they would pay a prorated share of the cost of that line. The downside is your property has to be developed within fifteen years, and after that they don't get anything back.

Dennis Pickard opened the public comment portion of the hearing. There was no public comment presented, so the public comment portion of the hearing was closed.

Cathi Bright inquired about where we're at on our bonding rating.

Charlie Butros, Public Works Director, stated we do have a favorable bond rating. The recent bonds that were sold financed the Public works facility three years ago. There were no outstanding debts the county had so I know that didn't consume any significant portion of the county's ability to finance other facilities.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 18, 2010

Cathi Bright noted we have a lot of expensive projects in the next few years and that could push us towards a problem.

Emmett Dobby explained most of the project has been pay as you go. There has been very little bonding that has occurred.

Charlie Butros stated the public works projects are funded, for the most part, in house. They would not require any outside funding sources.

John Keates explained the parks and sports facilities have a parks capital fund, and the rest comes in donations or grants or other sources.

Randy Neatherlin inquired if we are paying some things with REET.

John Keates stated there is some funding that comes from REET.

Dennis Pickard noted we have made some housekeeping suggestions and inquired if there was any more discussion.

Randy Neatherlin made a motion to recommend to the BOCC the adoption of the updated facilities plan with the editorial changes.

Cathi Bright seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned