

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

The Honorable Board of Franklin County Commissioners met on the above date. Present for the meeting were Bob Koch, Chairman; Rick Miller, Chair Pro Tem; and Neva J. Corkrum, Member; and Mary Withers, Clerk to the Board. Fred Bowen, County Administrator, was on vacation.

PUBLIC WORKS

Engineer Tim Fife met with the Board. Present in audience: Tri-City Herald Reporter Joe Chapman.

Sheriff's Vehicles

There was a collision between two sheriff's vehicles on Saturday.

Vouchers

Mr. Fife asked for approval of payment of the retainage fee to Apollo for the boat launch project. Today is the last day we can spend money on that project and get reimbursed for it.

Motion – Mr. Miller: I move we approve the County Road Fund voucher for \$28,766.39 as listed to Apollo. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 1)

Resolution: Surplus and Transfer Title for CS-2303

Shop Superintendent Darrel Farnsworth has requested approval to surplus the vehicle that we have been using parts from to repair other vehicles (Exhibit 2). The only thing left is basically a shell. We believe the best way to do it is to transfer the title to Columbia Basin College (CBC). The value is well under \$2500. CBC has done a lot of work for the county basically free gratis.

Motion – Mr. Miller: I move that we surplus and transfer title for CS-2303, 2003 Crown Victoria, title changed to Columbia Basin College Body Shop. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-267.

Resolution: Equipment Rental Rates for the period January 1, 2008, through June 20, 2008

The proposed resolution shows the rates that have been charged. A new rental rate schedule will be prepared for coming months including a fuel surcharge rate. The Board reviewed the paperwork.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Motion – Mr. Miller: I move that we accept the equipment rental rates for January 1, 2007, through June 20, 2008. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-268. (Clerk's Note: The dates on Resolution 2008-268 should have been January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, as shown on the attachment to the resolution. The Board re-signed the correct resolution as Resolution 2008-268.)

Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Fife said a hearing is scheduled to amend the current TIP on July 7. The East Foster Wells Road project will be amended because some additional federal funds are available. Assistant Engineer Guy Walters will be present during the hearing because Mr. Fife will be on vacation. A process was followed so that two additional years of Federal funds have become available. Mr. Fife hopes to do the project this year.

Mrs. Corkrum asked if there are sufficient funds to do the whole project. Mr. Fife said no, we still have to come up with \$647,000 if prices remain what they are now. Mrs. Corkrum asked then would only a portion of the project be done? Mr. Fife said he hopes to complete the project. He would like to accept bids for the East Foster Wells Road Project and hope it comes in at an okay price. If it doesn't, he would like to finish East Foster Wells Road project instead of doing some other projects. He said the East Foster Wells Road project has been in process for about 20 years.

On the same day after the hearing to amend the current TIP, there will be a second hearing to adopt the new six-year TIP. Mr. Fife said a list of unfunded projects will be included in the new TIP.

Mr. Fife said we'll get at least 25 miles of roads paved roads but probably not the 30 miles we had hoped to do. He feels that we need to pave at least one of the two roads that connects with the Pasco-Kahlotus (PK) Highway that was on the list to get paved. It would provide paved access to orchards.

Cattleguards

Mr. Koch said he looked at a cattleguard near Eltopia. Mr. Fife said we'll work with the landowner regarding the cattleguard.

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson and Assistant Director Greg Wendt met with the Board. Present in audience: Joe Chapman.

Public Hearing: Conditional Use Permit CUP 2008-06, applicant Andy Mix requests a conditional use permit to construct an accessory building that encroaches into the front yard area.

Public Hearing convened at 10:19 am. Present: Commissioners Koch, Corkrum and Miller; Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson; Assistant Director Greg Wendt; and Clerk to the Board Mary Withers. Present in audience: Joe Chapman.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the information on the Action Summary (Exhibit 3). He said the Planning Department expects to receive additional applications for the same area for similar types of projects because of the topography of the area near Sandy Ridge Road.

Mr. MacPherson showed a copy on the screen of a generic plot plan of the area.

Mrs. Corkrum asked if the building is compatible with the area. The planners said there is one existing home in the area where the homeowner built an accessory building located behind the house. The house is the focal point of typical residential property so we encouraged Mr. Mix to put the building to the north or south so it wouldn't be right in front of the house. Mr. MacPherson showed an aerial photograph.

The planners gave some examples of the elevation of various areas of the developments in the vicinity.

Mr. MacPherson showed an actual site plan of the area.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the conditions of approval. It will match the home in siding and roofing and color.

A woman and man joined the audience.

Mr. Koch asked three times if anyone would like to speak against the conditional use permit. There was no response.

Mr. Koch asked if anyone would like to speak for the permit. He said we're talking about the conditional use permit for Andy Mix. There was no response.

Mr. Miller said the house is on the slope on the ridge with the shop off to the side. He said it seems to be fair and there are really no complaints. Mr. Wendt said the hope is

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

the shop will be pretty close to where the houses go so it wouldn't be in the front yard of a house located behind it.

Motion – Mrs. Corkrum: I move that we grant approval to the conditional use permit application 2008-06 subject to the six findings of fact and eleven conditions of approval. Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-269.

Public Hearing: Conditional Use Permit CUP 2008-07, applicant Heinen Brothers, Inc. Request for a conditional use permit to operate a concrete and asphalt batch plant in the Agricultural Production (AP-20) Zoning District.

Public Hearing convened at 10:30 am. Present: Commissioners Koch, Corkrum and Miller; Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson; Assistant Director Greg Wendt; and Clerk to the Board Mary Withers. Present in audience: Tri-City Herald Reporter Joe Chapman, Gloria and Ruben Lemos and Janet Swanson and one other man.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the information on the Action Summary (Exhibit 4).

Mr. MacPherson showed a copy of 2007 aerial photograph with parcel overlay. He said the asphalt batch plant will be placed at the lowest elevation of the site.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the conditions of approval. One condition is the timeline for approval. Staff had originally proposed a five-year timeline, trying to strike a difference between a temporary or permanent site. The Planning Commission chose to tie back to be concurrent with the original conditional use permit from 2003 which was a 20-year term, so in 2023 the applicant would have to come back and get additional permits or extension of the existing permit.

The Planning Commission also discussed the distance south of East Elm Road. Condition of Approval 13 states the asphalt batch plant shall be located at the lowest elevation as well as being southeast of Elm Road. The Planning Commission wanted to make sure the facility of the actual batch plant is at the lowest elevation of the pit site. Mr. MacPherson said the thought behind that was to utilize the lowest elevation and the natural topography and consider the existing homes.

Mr. MacPherson said the Planning Commission said the prevailing wind is typically in this direction (indicated).

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

There were three landowners that had existing homes or vacant property with some plans to construct in the future.

The applicant will have to meet all air quality and water quality permitting standards with the Department of Ecology (DOE).

Mr. Wendt reviewed the other requirements.

The planners said at the 20-year time review, the applicant could get one conditional use permit kind of under the umbrella for gravel pits and batch plants or separate permits.

Mrs. Corkrum said a gravel permit is one thing but asphalt is another. She said she kind of agrees it should be a shorter time for the asphalt portion of the permit. Mr. Wendt said we originally threw out five years because it was kind of a break between what would be temporary and permanent. Mr. MacPherson said the Planning Commission had quite a bit of discussion about the initial cost of production. The applicant said it would cost well over \$1 million for the initial cost and that cost would not be worth it for five years. We did not receive any appeals or hear from any of the neighbors.

Mrs. Corkrum asked how far the site is from Heinens' new subdivision?
Mr. MacPherson said it is at least a mile or mile and a half.

Mrs. Corkrum said she is aware of the controversy of Central Pre-Mix here in Pasco. Mr. MacPherson said that was discussed a little bit as well by the Planning Commission.

Mr. MacPherson said there was a lengthy discussion regarding the zoning ordinance under special permits. If the site becomes a nuisance, a special permit can be discussed through a hearing process and become revoked. If it becomes a problem, someone can seek recourse from the Board.

Another man joined the audience.

Mr. Koch asked three times if anyone would like to speak against the CUP. There was no response.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Mr. Koch asked three times if anyone would like to speak in favor of the CUP.
There was no response.

Motion – Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I move we grant approval to the conditional use permit application CUP 2008-07 subject to the six findings of fact and seventeen conditions of approval. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-270.

VOUCHERS/WARRANTS

Motion – Mrs. Corkrum: I move for approval of County Road Fund payroll for \$80,445.89; and Motor Vehicle Fund payroll for \$11,517.00. Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor.

OFFICE BUSINESS

Secretary Patricia Shults met with the Board.

Consent Agenda

Motion – Mrs. Corkrum: I move for approval of June 20, 2008, consent agenda of the eight items as listed:

1. Approval of Out-Of-State Travel Request for Adam Morasch to attend the IAAO Course 102 (Income App) July 27 – August 1, 2008, in Boise, Idaho. (Exhibit 5)
2. Approval of **Joint Resolution 2008-271** for the Personal Services Contract between the Juvenile Justice Center and Washington State University.
3. Approval to cancel treasurer's checks that are one year old or older and due for cancellation. (Exhibit 6)
4. Approval of **Resolution 2008-272** approving the cost estimate of \$2,530, not including sales tax, for ImageWorks to develop a website for the Franklin County Prosecutor's Office and authorizing the Chairman to sign on behalf of the Board.
5. Approval of **Joint Resolution 2008-273** for the Personal Services Contract between the Juvenile Justice Center and Ernie Chapin to conduct classes, clinics and/or workshops for the Diversion, Truancy and Juvenile Drug Court programs. (Exhibit 7: Information sheet.)
6. Approval of **Joint Resolution 2008-274** for the Contract Amendment between the Juvenile Justice Center and Frederico de Voe, DBA, Well Spoken Interpreting,

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

thus amending Benton County Resolution 07 217 and Franklin County Resolution 2007-155. (Exhibit 8: Information sheet.)

7. Approval of **Joint Resolution 2008-275** for Program Agreement Amendment #0763-17677-01, between the Juvenile Justice Center and Washington State Department of Social & Health Services, division of Children and Family Services, to pay according to the conditions set in Consideration section of the program's Special Terms and Conditions in the County Program Agreement Amendment. (Exhibit 9: Information sheet.)
8. Approval of **Joint Resolution 2008-276** for Contract Amendment #0763-26165-01, Reinvesting in Youth, between the Juvenile Justice Center and Washington State Department of Social & Health Services. (Exhibit 10: Information sheet.)

Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor.

Vouchers

Motion – Mr. Miller: I move that we approve the Current Expense vouchers #558 through 563 for June 30, 2008, in the amount of \$28,179.64. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 11)

Recessed at 10:55 am.

Reconvened at 11:00 am.

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Public Hearing: Subdivision SUB 2007-06 to consider amending the conditions of approval specifically pertaining to roadway width of Road 62.

Public Hearing convened at 11:00 am. Present: Commissioners Koch, Corkrum and Miller; Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson; County Engineer Tim Fife; and Clerk to the Board Mary Withers. Present in audience at beginning of hearing: Assistant Planning Director Greg Wendt, Assistant County Engineer Guy Walters, Tri-City Herald Reporter Joe Chapman, and eleven other people (including two children). Other people joined the audience during the hearing. Sign-in sheet (Exhibit 12).

Mr. MacPherson said this is a public hearing specifically for the Road 62 construction width from a preliminary plat that received approval in 2007. The plat has

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

been approved and has conditions. We're here specifically talking about whether Road 62 should be a half a road or a full road.

Mr. MacPherson said this is unusual. It is not a typical subdivision hearing. Back in 2007 the county granted Homes and Land Real Estate which is Bob and Dave Greeno preliminary approval for a subdivision to subdivide 17.27 acres into 24 single-family residential lots and three commercial lots. The property is located between Road 64 and Road 62 and south of Court Street. He showed the subdivision area on the screen using an aerial photograph. We're talking about whether it should be a half road or full road here (indicated).

Mr. MacPherson showed the plat on the screen.

Mr. MacPherson said the typical process when we have subdivision applications is that we send out applications for review to various departments including Public Works, Health Department, and others, and incorporate those comments into the preliminary approval conditions. We received conditions from the Public Works Department that they requested the full road width construction for Road 62 and that was incorporated into the staff report. Then the Public Works Department reevaluated the proposal for consistency from previous comments and modified their requests to encourage a full road but, to be consistent with previous subdivision applications, requested that it be a minimum of a half road. Unfortunately the revised conditions did not get incorporated into the staff report and so on down the line. The engineer for the development developed the engineering plans at a half road. They were approved by the Public Works Department under the premise that conditions were for a half a road. It's a little bit of a mix-up. That's why we're here today. We have preliminary approval that the board signed for a full road. The developer has engineered plans signed by the Public Works Department for a half a road. He requested that we have a hearing and discuss the issue.

Mr. MacPherson asked if Mr. Fife wants to add anything about the conditions of Road 62 and what we typically see. Mr. Fife said he doesn't have anything further to add.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

He said Mr. MacPherson did a good job of explaining what has happened to date. He suggested the Board open the hearing up to the public to hear what they have to say.

Mr. MacPherson pointed out on the screen parts of the road on the subdivision application.

Two more men joined the audience.

Mr. Koch opened the hearing to public comment.

Gloria Lemos asked for clarification. She said you stated Road 64 is a full road. I've lived there 30 years and it's only a one-way road. Mr. MacPherson said it will be a full road once it's constructed. That's part of the conditions of approval, to construct to the minimum city standards. Ms. Lemos said we can't currently get out of our house some days because it's blocked by vehicles. We have to get on each other's lawns with the 11 houses we have on the road.

Ms. Lemos said I'll continue. I myself am against it. I think it should be a full road on 62 as stated initially. That was the approval. We came to the courthouse to check on it. I was considering buying property even though I own across the street. Right now if we do pave the full road, it's going to be overcrowded anyway. She said there are 11 houses on the road. She spoke to everybody in the neighborhood and everybody's against it. Unfortunately, because the hearing is at 11 o'clock people are working and could not be here.

Ms. Lemos said all the traffic will be coming into Road 64. We can't handle it. We already have the Grange. We love the Grange. They've now opened the Flower Farm. It comes into our road and people make u-turns. It's congested. You also have a gas station across the street. She explained how people use her road, sometimes making it so she can't get in and out of her house.

She said the new development will add 29 residents total. They each will have two cars if not three. That's a lot more traffic that we can't handle on it. Our road is a dead end towards the river.

Mr. Koch asked you're talking about Road 64? Ms. Lemos said yes. Mr. Koch said it will be a full road.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Ms. Lemos said I supported a two-way road on Road 62. I do not support it being a one-way. We have to think about the future. Pasco continues to grow. We've been here 40-some years and it's growing. Think of the long term.

Janet Swanson, 909 Road 64. To elaborate on what Gloria is saying, Road 64 has a dead end. There's a sign but nobody sees it. There are constantly cars, even semis. They think they're on Road 60 that curves into Sylvester. Now people will come down Road 64, see it's a dead end, double back and cross on a cross street and try to take a right, again trying to find Sylvester. If that's only a one-lane road, semis are going to be getting trapped in there. Number one, there is not adequate signage. Number two, people attempt to use Road 62 when they find Road 64 is a dead end and what's being proposed is illogical with the design of things. We have so much congestion. I brought it up in September. There are a lot of accidents that already happen at the end of Road 64. If it becomes the only two-lane road in this whole subdivision, everyone will want to go in that direction. It will get worse and worse and worse.

Ms. Swanson said now you're talking about reducing the size of it. It's just a snowball issue that it's going to get worse and worse and worse. I heartily object to keeping Road 62 only one lane. It's going to defeat the purpose in every manner. She said it's only logical that it should be a proper width road.

Ruben Lemos, 1220 Road 64. We've lived in that area for over 30 years. I ask you to please not amend what you have already approved. That is to have Road 62 be a two-way street, because as you've heard from the previous two speakers, it's going to be a mess. It's going to be a lot of congestion. We who live on Road 64 many times, as was stated earlier, have to get on our neighbors' lawns so that the approaching vehicle can pass us. We know all of our neighbors and we want to be courteous to them so we get to the side of the street so they can clear the driveway for us. With all of these new homes going up and each of the households having a minimum of two vehicles, possibly three, it's going to create more traffic coming through there. Since they're not going to be able to exit on Road 62, they'll probably want to come over to Road 64 to exit by the Grange Hall.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Mr. Lemos said I just want to go on record that I'm opposed to you amending what you already approved. I'm sorry that the engineering department didn't get their act together but you gave the proper instructions to begin with.

Mr. Fife asked to make a point of clarification. It's not a one-way road. It's a two-way road, it just does not meet standards. It is 20 feet wide which is probably wider than what Road 64 is now. Two-way traffic can get by.

Mr. Koch asked what will it be when they get done on Road 64? Mr. Fife said he wasn't involved in that because it's a city street and they came up with the standard. He does know the developer thinks that he's putting in more than his fair share so it's going to be a wide road when it's done.

Darrel Shepherd, 1120 Road 64. I've only lived there 15 years but my dad built the house 30 years ago. To me there's going to be more traffic going out this way (indicated) than there is presently. People have to use Road 62 or cut over like they're saying, which will cause congestion on Court Street. We've got the meat market, gas station and the Grange. A lot of times when you come into Court you can't see west because the house next to the meat market has a great big magnolia tree. It grows out across the road and you can't see out there. You're going to have more traffic coming up here and it's going to be worse. They almost need a street light. None of the houses have exits onto Road 64 so they will have to go out Road 62.

Mr. Shepherd said he definitely disapproves of narrowing Road 62.

Ms. Swanson said may I just add that the residents of Road 64 did not want the road widened. We like our nice little road.

Robert McCarthy, 6203 Buena Court, the small cul-de-sac which is adjacent on the Road 62 side of things. With all due respect to my neighbors, none of us want the road going through. I just want to say on behalf of the people in the cul-de-sac, we would prefer that the road remains single. Since commerce is on Road 64, this hearing isn't about future planning and traffic lights and other similar things that would make sense to be the road that has double width with the caveat that at some point hopefully there will be some kind of traffic light to alleviate what is getting to be a busier and busier area.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Steven Smith, 1200 Road 60, which is on the other side. I have a question. Is this portion of the road going to be a double here (indicated)? People in the audience responded, saying that is what was approved but they're wanting to amend it and make it single. Mrs. Corkrum said eight feet less than what was approved, from 28 feet to 20 feet. Mr. Fife said that is correct but it would all be built on the west side of the right-of-way. That way we're not getting into any of the improvements as far as the fence line, irrigation, and other items.

Mr. Smith asked there's an easement in the back of our property that they would take, is that correct? Mr. Koch said yes. Mr. Fife said if it goes full width, yes. The fence would have to be moved and the irrigated adjusted.

Mr. Smith said I think we have a little bit of dichotomy between people who live on Road 60 who would prefer not to have extra traffic in back of their homes and land that they're used to having back there and people on Road 64. I used to live at the end of Road 64 and I understand the problem with the narrow road there. But if that road is widened to a full -- He asked if it would be a 28 foot road. Mr. Fife said 28 feet or better.

Mr. Smith said I guess I'm in favor of leaving the road the way they have proposed which is a half width road on Road 62. A man said they want to amend it.

Gloria Lemos, 1220 Road 64, spoke again. The problem that exists now is that when you propose to widen Road 64, it's only half way that's going to be widened. The other half is not widened unless the city has plans they haven't told anyone about. It's only going to go up to the development. The rest is still going to be the one way and a dead end. That's one of the problems that will exist. You'll still have all the traffic going down there and it's only a little road there and only half is going to be widened, not the whole road. Mr. Koch asked on Road 64? Ms. Lemos said Road 64 will get widened only -- Mr. Smith indicated by using the screen. Ms. Lemos said that's not being expanded and that's where all of the people go and it's a dead end street. People have to turn around at the Swenson's property. There's no way to get to Road 60. So that part isn't being widened at all.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Jane Beyer, a real estate agent. I don't see the purpose of widening either road because we still have Road 60 and we still have major traffic going that direction and I just see a lot of money being poured into engineering that could be used elsewhere and we already have the problem with the gas station that has been so well documented. We're going to add additional traffic to that area when Road 60 is already a major arterial.

Joe Haverkamp, 1020 North Road 60. I have property that joins up to Road 62. I feel it should be built a full width road because it's just a dirt trail now while they're working on it but I see pedestrians walking, kids riding bikes through it, and that road is going to go on through. There are cul-de-sacs down below and Park Addition is all going in. A lot of that traffic is going to be using Road 62 to get to Court Street rather than going out on Road 60. I just feel for the safety of the people and the neighborhood it should be a full width road.

Ray Sadesky, 1116 Road 60, which is the last house in the county area (indicated). My southern fence is the border between the city and county. I mostly have a question about the width of the road, narrow versus wider. How does that affect any future development of these back lots (indicated)? As you know, the houses along Road 60 are on very narrow, very deep lots, and they were originally intended to be two residences instead of one. Does the narrow versus wide road affect any future development of those back lots?

Mr. Fife said yes, it does. Using you as an example, if you want to split the back half of that lot off, if we allow them to do the half road, you would have to build the other half before you could plat that off. If it's built to county standards and meets current county standards at the time that you subdivide, no further roadwork would be required from you.

Mr. Smith spoke again. He asked if the road is widened, where would the utility stubs be? The developer has come in now and taken a fence down and taken a tree out without permission. What are we going to have to do to get water to the back of our lots?

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Are we going to have to go into the street to get water or are they going to stub water out for us?

Mr. Fife said I don't have an answer for that. It's up to the city for what they require on the utility. If they ask them to stub them out, they'll have to stub them out for them to improve their water system. They have to build it to city standards. If the city doesn't tell them to stub it out, then yes, you would have to go into the street to hook onto it.

Ms. Swenson spoke again. I own the property at the end of Road 64 and my husband and I got tired of the kids from the neighborhood between Road 60 and 62 cutting across our property without asking permission. We posted No Trespassing signs. Those are the kids that are now walking and riding their bikes up the trail that has become Road 62 and there are a lot of children in that neighborhood that go that direction up to Court Street and then go over to the grocery store, the gas station, at Road 64. It should be a safe road for the kids, number one, and number two, with the widening of Road 62 which one way or another it's a bummer to me because we loved our vineyard and the country feel and we can see that's going away. However, the city is already talking about putting in a light at Road 68 and Court Street. They are not going to sponsor another stop light at Road 64 and Court Street. So once again the congestion problem comes up that with it being the wider of the two roads to use, all of the congestion will stay at Road 64 rather than being split equally between the two locations.

Erin Plumb, 1220 Road 60, the second two-acre lot there (indicated). The back of our property is adjacent to what would be Road 62. My question is if we were to subdivide that back acre -- I was a little unclear -- because we're county now, we would not have to pay to make that road wider if we were to subdivide that off? That would have to meet the city standards?

Mr. Fife said no, that's not what I said. What I said is if it's built full width and at the time that you subdivide, there wouldn't be any further road requirements necessary. In other words, you wouldn't have to build the other half of the road.

Ms. Plumb said but we would have to build eight feet then?

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Mr. Fife said yes. If a half road goes in, you would have to build a minimum of eight feet on that side to subdivide.

Ms. Plumb said I would be for them building the road the full width then because there's also a neighbor there that I would then have to worry about as well.

Mr. Fife said if any of you have any desire to subdivide in the near future, I would suspect that you would be for a full road, yes.

Bob Siegfried, living on Road 64. I think it's a bit of a safety issue to narrow Road 62 because of all the additional houses that will be built and the increase in traffic. Most cars will have two cars, lots even three. That will also mean more foot traffic on that road. I'm afraid if you narrow up Road 62 it will push even more traffic onto Road 64. I've lived on Road 64 for the last 30 years. I kind of feel like I'm being penalized for this development because you're going to push that much more traffic onto us. I'm against the narrowing. I think it should be left where it was approved at 28 feet.

Ray Sadesky. Now that I understand it a little bit better, with respect to my neighbors, I would prefer that road remain a narrow road. Considering the fact that it's been about 10 years since those homes along Road 60 have been built and several of us have made improvements or other things in the back half of that property, I think that could possibly interfere with those things we've already done.

Mr. Koch asked if the Board has any questions.

Mrs. Corkrum asked regarding the Road 60 lots that are long and narrow that butt up to Road 62, is that where the problem is with fencing and irrigation? Mr. MacPherson showed on the screen where Road 62 ends and the properties in question are located that have improvements within the easement right-of-way. Mrs. Corkrum said so we would be disrupting those homes that face Road 60. Mr. Fife said yes. Most of the homes have irrigation and fences. There would be improvements that would have to be relocated. Mr. Koch said it is county easement though. Mr. Fife said yes. Mr. MacPherson said it was put in when these lots were subdivided. Mr. Fife said it was reserved at that time.

Mrs. Corkrum said the road was reserved for the future? Mr. Fife said the right-of-way was, yes, as an easement.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Ms. Lemos commented that most of the homes are on Road 60 facing Road 60. Their backyards are facing Road 62. Mrs. Corkrum said abutting. Ms. Lemos said the homes all face the road. Mrs. Corkrum said that was my question. Mr. Koch and Mrs. Corkrum said there is no road there now. She was wanting to make sure was where existing fences and irrigation are located. Mr. Fife said they are where the centerline of the road would be if it was built full width.

Mr. Smith asked is this road going to be a full road or a half road here (indicated on screen)? Mr. MacPherson said it appears to be a half road for a small stretch and then it's a full road (indicated). These lots here once they develop will contribute here (indicated). He showed more on the screen.

Mr. Smith said I used to live here (indicated about the southern end of Road 64). This is a mess. Either way, all these people will have a problem because this is a little tiny road and it gets real congested. He pointed out half roads. You really haven't solved the issue by either widening this road -- You have to widen it all the way to solve the problem.

Mr. Shepherd said it is widened. He showed on the screen and explained.

Mr. McCarthy said he'd like to point out that this development where Road 60 joins Sylvester, this is a right-turn only (indicated). So this is really the only egress that is going to allow you to go to either direction. This is just a neighborhood. There are no sidewalks. It really looks like it's going to be some kind of a traffic flow issue with people coming down however they get there. I'm in great sympathy to everyone on Road 64.

Ms. Swanson said Road 64 is a dead end. Road 62 is a through street and you've got Park Road and Sylvester and while you can only take a right here, this goes left or right (indicated). Road 64 dead ends. There's nowhere to go. With improvements being done on Road 64, it's going to look like a main thoroughfare to use but it's not; it's a dead end road. What I'm hearing is if you do wide, narrow, wide, narrow, on Road 62, we're going to be revisiting this in five to ten years and that's just insane.

A man in the audience said it's double all the way down now.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Mr. Shepherd asked who owns the property that he indicated on the screen, the back lots? Do they own the property or did you just put the fence there because it was open at the time?

Mr. Smith said the grape orchard had the fence along the back. He pointed on the map. There was a lot of audience comment.

Ms. Sampson said I live in this lot (indicated). I subdivided this (indicated) into two lots. It was only \$500 to extend the irrigation. I have sold this lot (indicated). I am not selling this lot to _____. I want to be perfectly clear about that.

Ms. Lemos said part of the problem is part of us are in city and part are in the county. Where I live, we were county. It's just that all of a sudden we're now in the city with nothing to improve and the road's still the same so while these other people might be county, how long is it before they get to be city. That's why we have to think long term. That's why we elected you to be our leaders and think long term.

Ms. Beyer said to think of the value of the riverfront property where the dike is going to be lowered.

Bob Bongers, 1208 Road 60. I'm all for the 28 footer. You people on Road 64, I think your concerns are way off. When you get a nice new road in there, it will be great. He explained his idea. There was a lot of discussion in the audience.

Mr. Haverkamp asked who is going to build Road 64 by the Grange Hall? Is the contractor going to do that or will it still be a little narrow road? A man in the audience said they've already moved it, the pump and everything else. Mr. Fife said he can't answer that. He doesn't know whether the city required that. They probably did.

Mr. Sadesky said his well is probably 30 feet from the proposed road. If the road does come in there, what kind of zoning and other restrictions would be in place? Would my well still be saved or would I have to get put on city water? There was a lot of audience comment. Mr. Fife said if your well is outside the existing right-of-way and not bothering the improvement, then there won't be any issues with it.

Mrs. Corkrum asked is there any way you could do a pointer and show me where both 28 feet of road is and where 20 is? She doesn't like wide and narrow.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Mr. MacPherson said the problem is this is city limit here (indicated). You have a 20-foot-wide road to this point and if you leave it the way it is now, it would be 28 feet centered all the way down to this point (indicated) and tie into a half road here in the city (indicated). If you approve a change, it would be a full road from here to here (indicated) and then it would be 20 foot the rest of the way.

In response to a comment by Ms. Lemos, Mr. MacPherson said there's a jurisdictional problem of coordination between landowners, what's fair, should this developer have to pay for a full road that these people will reap the benefits from. They are all valid questions.

Mr. Fife said that's why our original comments were for a full road. There are enough lots to justify that. After reviewing it and the consistency issues as far as what we normally require, we made that change. We thought it got incorporated but it didn't. We approved the plans as if it did.

Mrs. Corkrum said but there is an easement for a full road. Mr. Fife said yes. The fact that we approved the plans and if you build it to a half road, it would comply with what you currently have, so if you do nothing today, he's got to go back and give us plans for the other half and submit new plans and he builds the whole thing, or you decide to amend it.

Mr. Haverkamp said I own the property that lays right in here (indicated). The half road will not line up with the half road in the city. There is a jog in the property line of about six feet. It will not be lined up if they don't build the full road. Mr. MacPherson said you're saying if they build the full road, it will line up better? Mr. Haverkamp said yes.

Mr. Koch asked if there are any other questions from the board? Mr. Miller and Mrs. Corkrum said no.

Mr. Miller said I feel for safety reasons we need to make that a full road for future growth and the travel and to protect people.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

Mrs. Corkrum said my question has been answered that it would line up better with the half road that's existing on the south. I'm for leaving it be the full 28-foot width.

Mr. Koch said this hearing is closed then with no actions or amendments.

INFORMATION SERVICES

IS Director Kevin Scott met with the Board. Also present: Rosie H. Rumsey.

Two GPS Tracking receivers for project

Mr. Scott asked for approval to purchase two additional GPS tracking receivers from the same line item. He explained the need and the budget considerations.

Motion – Mrs. Corkrum: I move for approval of inter budget transfer in the amount of \$1960 from Current Expense Non-Departmental Budget #700, Contingency Reserve line item, to Capital Outlay Budget #710 for additional GPS receivers. Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-277.

HUMAN RESOURCES (HR)

HR Director Rosie H. Rumsey met with the Board.

Deferred Compensation Plan

Ms. Rumsey has been asked by a salesman to offer a third deferred compensation plan. The county already offers employees two plans. Ms. Rumsey feels we would have to go out for a request for proposals if a third plan were offered. Mrs. Corkrum feels it would be difficult for the bookkeeping department to do a third plan. She would be opposed. Mr. Miller said I agree. Mr. Koch thinks two investors are sufficient for county employees.

MINUTES

Motion – Mrs. Corkrum: I move for approval of Commissioners Proceedings for June 16, June 23 and June 25. Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor.

LAW LIBRARY

The Board discussed the signs for the Law Library. Judge Yule requested a matching sign for inside. The Law Library said they will pay for it.

Adjourned at 11:58 am.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners Proceedings for June 30, 2008

There being no further business, the Franklin County Board of Commissioners meeting was adjourned until July 7, 2008.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FRANKLIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Chairman

Chairman Pro Tem

Member

Attest:

Clerk to the Board