IN THE MATTER OF DECLARING INTENTION)
TO VACATE COUNTY ROAD RIGHT OF WAY)
PORTION OF SARATOGA ROAD,)
SECTION 33, TOWNSHIP 30 N, RANGE 3E)

RESOLUTION NO. R-50-84

WHEREAS, the Island County Board of Commissioners hereby declares its intention to vacate and abandon that county road right of way located in the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter and in Government Lot 1 Section 33, Township 30 North, Range 3 East, lying South and West of the present Saratoga Road as reconstructed in 1981 under County Road Project No. 80-15; and

WHEREAS, the Island County Board of Commissioners has determined that the above described property is useless as a county road, and it is for the best interest of the public that said property be abandoned and vacated; and

WHEREAS, the above described road right of way has been abandoned in fact due to the relocation of Saratoga Road and associated right of way; and

WHEREAS, the Island County Board of Commissioners intends to vacate and abandon said property;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, as follows:

1. The Board of County Commissioners for Island County intends to vacate and abandon all the above described property, and

2. The Island County Engineer is directed to report on such vacation and abandonment, and

3. A public hearing on said vacation and abandonment will be held at 10:00 a.m. on the 25 day of June, 1984, in the Public Hearing Room, Courthouse Annex, Coupeville, Washington, where anyone may appear to consider the report of the Engineer, together with any evidence for or objection to such vacation and abandonment, and anyone may appear and be heard for or against such vacation and abandonment, and

4. The Island County Auditor shall give public notice as required by statute of said public hearing.

APPROVED and set for hearing this 29 day of May, 1984.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON

E. Duane Kemp
Wm. F. Dunlop
Gary D. Bostrom

ATTEST: Harry H. Ferrier
County Auditor & Ex-Officio
Clerk of the Board

CHANGE PROPOSALS TO DETENTION/CORRECTION FACILITY

Upon recommendation by the Island County Engineer, the Board, by unanimous motion, approved Contract Proposals to the Island County Detention/Correction Facility as outlined by Mr. Allen, as follows:

Change Proposal Number 35 in the amount of $4,585.00
Change Proposal Number 43 in the amount of $1,281.00
Change Proposal Number 46 in the amount of $6,428.00
Change Proposal Number 47 in the amount of $1,635.00
Change Proposal Number 51 in the amount of $2,079.00
Change Proposal Number 52 in the amount of $3,839.00

CERTIFICATION TO URBAN ARTERIAL BOARD OF REVIEW - CITY OF COUPEVILLE'S SIX-YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Allen asked that the Board consider acknowledgement of the City of Coupeville's Certification to the Urban Arterial Board of Review for its

Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program, as provided for under RCW 47.26.230. Commissioner Bostrom moved the Board's acknowledgement of the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Certification for the Town of Coupeville. Motion, seconded by Commissioner Dunlop, carried unanimously.

HEARING CONTINUED: FRANCHISE APPLICATION NUMBER 223, HOME SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION - WATER/SEWER LINES, PLAT OF ONAMAC

A Public Hearing was held at 10:30 a.m., having been continued from the meeting of 23 April 1984, to further consider Franchise Application No. 223 by Home Savings & Loan Association, for the placement of water and sewer lines in portions of County Roads: West Camano Hill Road from West Camano Drive Easterly, for the Plat of Onamac.

Roy Allen referenced the previous hearing of 23 April, noting concerns expressed which had not received clear-cut identification, and indicated that in line with Resolution No. R-45-84 adopted by the Board on 7 May 1984, Regarding Utility Franchise Applications for water and sewer, that Exhibit "A" to that Resolution provided a delineation of what constitutes a utility franchise application for water and sewer systems. Mr. Allen therefore requested that the Applicant present information consistent with following the requirements as outlined in a "checklist" format according to Exhibit "A" to Resolution No. R-45-84. Mr. Allen reported that as of this morning, the Engineering Department had received a copy of a letter written to Karen Rahm, Secretary, State Department of Social and Health Services, dated 14 May 1984, by Albert Sandberg, President, Camano Island Protective Association, and read and entered same for the record at this time: (Exhibit #1)

> Representative Mary Margaret Haugen forwarded to us a copy of your letter to her, dated March 1, 1984. We of the association, and we personally, are still concerned about the impact and possible effects that the proposed Onamac community drainfield will have on the area surrounding the drainfield.
>
> Our concerns are centered in four areas that we feel have not been adequately or properly addressed. These areas are:
>
> (1) The past failures by the owners of Onamac Point to come up with a properly designed drainfield and their vacillation in the number of homes to be served by their drainfield;
>
> (2) The type of soil in and around the proposed site, plus the lay of the land in the area;
>
> (3) The possible detrimental effects on the area surrouding the proposed drainfield;
>
> (4) The possibility of a future failure of the drainfield and trying to determine who could/would be held liable.
>
> Item One:
> Per your letter of March 1, 1984, paragarph two, line three, site change. One of the reasons why they (Onamac) had a site change is due in part to the fact that when the design and lay out plans, engineered by Cascade Surveying and Engineering, Inc., of Arlington, Washington (Onamac engineers), were presented to, and scrutinized at a public hearing held at Coupeville, Washington, in August of 1978, the design proved to be faulty and inadequate to handle the vast number of homes to be served, 132. The design concept and plans were supposedly approved by Mr. Mo Batria of your department.
>
> In 1980 Onamac again tried to put a community drainfield in the field located next to Camano Hill Road. This time the design was different and the working capacity was lowered from 132 to 68. This time there proved to be a conflict between the soil reports provided by Cascade Surveying and Engineering and the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Survey.
>
> Evidence presented on September 3, 1980 at a public hearing, indicated that the proposed design was inadequate because:
>
> (1) Criteria used for application rates were based upon the design for a seepage bed as opposed to a conventional trench or drainfield;
> (2) Large systems require a 100% reserve area that was not provided for in the original design;
> (3) Sewage would not get proper treatment due to high application rates and highly permeable nature of the soils on the site;