

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR JANUARY 21, 2004

- A. OPENING BUSINESS
- B. DISCUSSION ON SEWER, TRANSPORTATION, AND STORMWATER PLANS FOR PORT HADLOCK/IRONDALE UGA
- C. DISCUSSION ON 2004 GMA UPDATE OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
- D. ADJOURNMENT

## A. OPENING BUSINESS

The regular meeting was called to order at the WSU Learning Center at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Tom McNerney. Planning Commission members present were Dennis Schultz, Phil Flynn, Eileen Rogers, David Whipple, Edel Sokol, Tom Murray, and Robert Morgan. Jenny Davis was excused.

DCD staff present were Randy Kline, Josh Peters, and Cheryl Halvorson, secretary. Marc Horton, UGA general sewer plan consultant, was present. Bruce Laurie and Jim Pearson, Public Works, were present for the UGA transportation and stormwater management plan discussions.

There were two members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were Chuck Monson and Mike Regan.

The minutes for January 7, 2004, were approved as submitted, with two abstentions.

The Chair invited staff updates.

Josh Peters reviewed the Planning Commission's projected work schedule for the first quarter.

Phil Flynn asked for further information about the UDC HOPE (Housekeeping Omnibus for Permit Efficiency) review. Josh Peters stated that staff would be before the BOCC on January 26 on that package of material and to get some direction from them. He stated that the schedule was for the Planning Commission to take up the package during the second quarter. Mr. Peters explained the two tracks that had originally begun. One track related to a list of things staff had identified in the process of implementing the code. Another track related to permit efficiency. He stated that one way the Planning Commission could approach it might be to have staff prepare a package of amendments and the commission review those amendments. Another way might be for the Planning Commission to form a committee to weave in other issues the commission may think appropriate. He stated that the idea was to present a package of amendments to the code that could be reviewed all at once rather than putting forward single amendments all the time.

Tom McNerney stated that the Agriculture Lands Committee had been working with the UDC for the last several months, so they were familiar with it. Therefore, he had asked the Ag Lands Committee to continue the review of the UDC into these other areas. He stated that the committee would review the proposal brought forward from staff and the BOCC, as well as suggesting other amendments that may be appropriate.

Josh Peters stated that there was still work to be done with the BOCC on the HOPE package. He explained that he still had other issues to address first. Tom McNerney explained the long list of issues that staff had to address over the next six months, with much of it being SEPA review work.

Tom McNerney discussed the Comp Plan amendment docketing process. He stated that it was necessary for the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing on the preliminary docket, although it was really a formality since all of the proposed amendments were essentially proposed by the BOCC. He reported that it had been agreed that the joint meeting with the BOCC on the preliminary docket need not be held this year. The commission agreed by consensus to hold a public hearing on the docket on February 18.

Tom McNerney asked if the Planning Commission would receive the amendment for the UGA capital facilities plans earlier than February 1. Randy Kline replied that the formal applications would be done on February 1 and provided to the Planning Commission for their February 4 meeting.

There was no public comment received during the first comment period.

**B. DISCUSSION ON SEWER, TRANSPORTATION, AND STORMWATER PLANS FOR PORT HADLOCK/IRONDALE UGA**

Randy Kline stated that Marc Horton, the consultant for the General Sewer Plan, was present. Also Bruce Laurie and Jim Person from Public Works would be present later in the meeting for the Transportation and Stormwater plans.

Tom McNerney asked Mr. Horton to provide an update on the sewer plan process from the time of his last presentation to the Planning Commission.

Marc Horton stated that at the general sewer planning stage of sewer system development the intent was to check out options for sewer development and evaluate their feasibility. He stated that, originally, they had been considering only the Hadlock core. At the request of the Planning Commission, which had been generated by public input, they had added consideration of the Rhody Drive commercial area and the Old Alcohol Plant and Indian Island areas.

Marc Horton summarized the process of the General Sewer Plan Review Committee. He stated that the committee considered six treatment options and six disposal options. Mr. Horton explained that they started with what to do with the wastewater and whether they could sustain a disposal method over the long haul. He stated that the review committee eventually arrived at a recommendation for one option, which was wetland treatment and disposal. He explained that the marine disposal option was discarded because of the difficulties with permitting. Staff displayed an aerial photo of the area proposed for the wetland treatment and disposal.

Marc Horton explained that they did not use population projections as a guiding principle because the commercial cores were not necessarily population driven. Instead they used water use figures from the PUD in order to determine waste water flows for the commercial areas. Then they projected flows for the future based on experience elsewhere in the state in urbanizing commercial areas. He stated that it was just a question of how fast that commercial core evolved to determine how fast you would have to upgrade the treatment system to expand to the full area. He stated that it was important to know, from a planning standpoint, that they based the sewer plan on some assumptions about the commercial sizing for the UGA.

Marc Horton stated that it was important to remember that the funding numbers in the plan included some huge assumptions. One, all the numbers for costs were currently planning level assumptions. Second, no one built a sewer system any longer without having some kind of outside funding assistance, either grants or loans. Therefore, all of the cost assumptions figured that 45% of the costs would be covered through grants. Third, it was important to remember that they assumed that everyone would hook up, although that was probably not true. Also, they were planning to build a system that was twice the size needed for the current development. He stated that they then went through some scenarios about how to actually get the money to pay for the

system. Mr. Horton stated that what would happen when it was actually funded would be a combination of the different types of funding. Therefore, it was important to keep the numbers in perspective.

Tom McNerney stated that it was important to note that this sewer plan was only for the commercial areas and not for the residential areas. Marc Horton stated that they had done an analysis of the septic capacity for the residential areas. The analysis showed that there was plenty of capacity for the expected development over the next twenty years. He stated that, as a result, the residential areas were not targeted for sewers at this time. He stated that they included a residential buffer hookup area around the commercial sewer areas so that those residential people could hook up if they wished. It was optional, however.

The Chair opened the floor to questions from the commissioners.

Dennis Schultz asked if there would be costs to the commercial businesses to switch from their septic to the sewer, other than the hookup charge. Marc Horton replied that there generally would not be much cost. Typically they would want to fill the old septic tank.

Dennis Schultz asked about acquiring the land for the wetland disposal area. Randy Kline stated that he had contacted the property owner informally. He stated that the BOCC would have to give permission to begin negotiations with the land owners. He described the process for purchasing the land. Mr. Kline and the commissioners discussed funding methods for purchasing the lands.

Edel Sokol asked about a residential property being allowed to hook up if the sewer ran by their property. Marc Horton stated that was the purpose of the residential buffer area around the commercial areas. He stated that there needed to be a discussion about how the costs would be apportioned to the residential property owner. Mr. Horton stated that it should be remembered that if too many residences hooked up, it would take away from the planned sewer capacity for the commercial areas. Randy Kline stated that only those people in the residential buffer areas would be allowed to hook up if they wished. Residences beyond those designated areas would not typically be allowed to hook up. The only way it might be possible would be to revisit the sewer plan and re-define the planning area in order to allow the additional hookup. Tom McNerney commented that he was thinking in terms of the sewer line that would run down Nesses Corner Road to Rhody Drive and the residences along that road. He commented that there was probably no policy established yet about that issue.

Eileen Rogers asked about the timing for funding. Marc Horton stated that it took awhile but he did not see any difficulties in getting funding. He stated that the funding timeline they had been discussing was three years. He stated that he had seen the opportunity to get the funding agencies on board this year.

Edel Sokol asked about Indian Island. Marc Horton stated that Indian Island had a sewage treatment plant and was looking to privatize that facility. He stated that the county had made an offer to assume the Navy's facility. One reason for that offer was the impetus of the UGA sewer planning. A second reason was that Indian Island had a lot a land that might be used in a land treatment option. Mr. Horton stated that the bottom line was that it did not "pencil out" in terms of cost for that option. Ms. Sokol asked if Indian

Island would be able to hook up to the Hadlock sewer. Mr. Horton explained that, on the surface, it looked like it would be very expensive for them to do that. He thought it would be more cost effective for them to continue using their present system because they had very small flows. Ms. Sokol stated that the reason she asked was because if the Navy hooked up to the Hadlock system, there would be federal funds available. Mr. Horton stated that they would have to pay their proportionate share.

Phil Flynn asked about whether the Navy's system was failing. Marc Horton replied that he had done the work for the county on its privatization offer. He stated that, based on the information he had been provided, he had suggested a bid of "0" dollars. He stated that he had asked for further information. Mr. Horton stated that the Navy was under the obligation to privatize their system. If the county was the only bidder, they were under the obligation to negotiate with the county. At that point, they would be under the burden to demonstrate to the county that their system was functioning properly.

Phil Flynn stated that the assumption was that everyone would hook up. He stated that there were a lot of small shops in the commercial areas. He asked what the incentive was for those small shops to hook up. Mr. Flynn acknowledged that one incentive would be that the commercial owner could use more of their property. Marc Horton stated that there were some types of businesses that would have a big cleanup issue, i.e. a dry cleaner or underground fuel tanks. However, most businesses would not have cleanup problems. Mr. Horton stated that the incentive could be an increase in property value. He stated that the reason they used the 100% assumption was just to use a number for the computations. He stated that, clearly, the sewer system would not go unless you got some reasonable number of people who wanted to hook up. Mr. Horton stated that, additionally, whoever ran the sewer system would have to assume some kind of risk. He stated that the assumption was 100% hookup of the current businesses, but we were planning a system that was twice that size. Therefore, there was a portion of the plant that would have to be paid for and carried by somebody while those new customers came on line. So if you moved away from the 100% hookup to something less, that amount of money that was carried over time would increase and would be a risk to whoever was building it. It related to how one read the economy, how you read the benefits, how much risk the policy makers were willing to take, but that was the way sewer systems got built.

Robert Morgan commented that if the sewer plan had not used 100% and had not assumed twice the capacity for the current development, it may have created a problem if someone with higher sewer flow came along and wanted to hook up. He cited the example of a multi-family development in the residential buffer area. Mr. Morgan stated that if they had not assumed a larger capacity, it might have created problems almost immediately. Marc Horton responded that it hinged on how you viewed the world, whether you were optimistic or pessimistic. Mr. Horton stated that the next step was to develop an engineering report. It would analyze the wetland very thoroughly and would provide more finite costs. At the same time, the county would be talking with the community to hone in on who was really interested. Mr. Horton reiterated that it was very important to recognize that the current numbers were just planning numbers based upon assumptions.

Robert Morgan asked at what phase we would start getting a more detailed plan. Marc Horton replied that was the next phase, the engineering plan. He stated that it would really work with the preferred alternative and develop

plans and specifications and thus more accurate costs. Mr. Morgan asked if the county would wait for the engineering report before going out to seek funding. Randy Kline replied that the county was starting to investigate it now based upon the numbers we had in the general sewer plan. Mr. Morgan asked if that meant the county would be bringing on a grant writer or if it would use Mr. Horton's firm. Mr. Kline replied that he did not know at this time. He explained that the plan called for an implementation team who would look at funding and property acquisition, etc.

David Whipple asked about a county match for the grant funding. Randy Kline agreed that matching funds would be necessary. Marc Horton stated that the reason the general sewer plan did not dwell on the match was because the matching funds were relatively easy to get. He explained that if a large portion of the costs came through grants, it was fairly easy to get low interest loans for the match. He stated that the loan portion would typically be paid back by the rate payers. Also, there may be county funding through some of the special county programs which would be considered matching money. Mr. Whipple stated that in his experience in writing grants, he had found that if you were required to have a 10% match and you could show that you had 20% committed, you would rank much higher. Mr. Whipple stated the opinion that the sewer would be a county-wide benefit so there should be some county-wide bearing of the costs. He agreed that was a budgeting and policy priority issue for the BOCC. He wondered if the county would commit to using its special funding sources before going out for grants. Mr. Horton stated that the whole issue had multiple facets. There were community issues, funding issues, perhaps political issues, and technical issues. He stated that he saw the need to create a leadership to coordinate the whole project. Mr. Horton stated that on the funding side, whoever was working on funding needed to look at various options and the strategies for going after them. He stated that he would recommend the county pursue the suggested implementation team as the means for addressing all of those issues, including funding.

Phil Flynn discussed the property value benefit to property owners on Marrowstone Island with a water system. He stated that the increased property values would result in increased taxes. He stated that the answer he had seen on Marrowstone Island was that some people would not hook up because they had good water. He wondered how that would work with the sewer system if someone had a perfectly good, working septic system, and did not hook up to the sewer. Marc Horton stated that was an issue with any infrastructure improvement, and particularly so when you were considering an LID. David Whipple stated that one reason to hook up would be that they would already be bearing some of the cost; what they would not be getting was the full option of the benefit. Mr. Flynn stated that his concern was that the sewer system would be carrying additional costs for those people who did not hook up. Mr. Horton stated that Mr. Whipple was correct in stating that when the person sold their property, they would be selling it at an increased price because of the availability of sewer.

The commissioners and staff discussed the wetland treatment process. The concern was that people in the community may be concerned about degrading the wetlands. Tom McNerney commented that he thought the wetland discharge would be into constructed wetlands. Marc Horton explained how the system would operate, stating that only treated waste water would be discharged into the wetlands. Josh Peters asked if there were examples of operating systems that we could cite. Mr. Horton stated that he thought there were probably a

couple of examples in this state. Some commissioners thought the wetland issue could be sensitive.

The commissioners moved on to the issue of the Transportation Plan. Bruce Laurie, Public Works, was present to answer questions.

Tom McNerney asked about what would happen if there was more development along Rhody Drive and the traffic flows increased considerably. Bruce Laurie replied that it would get more crowded. He stated that there were things you could do to mitigate that. Mr. Laurie stated that there were currently things in the Comp Plan to address that issue and the state DOT would require it. An example was common driveways. Mr. Laurie stated that the DOT planned for a light at Rhody Drive and Nesses Corner Road in the future. He stated that the intersections were the first problems to arise. Mr. Laurie stated that in the overall scheme of things, when you compared our traffic to Seattle, we had nothing.

Bruce Laurie explained the planning assumptions they used in the Transportation Plan. He stated that the traffic forecasts the county had used in the Comp Plan were not coming true; the actual figures were lower. He admitted that Rhody Drive would see additional traffic flows. He reiterated that there were things they could do to mitigate that. Mr. Laurie stated that the DOT was currently considering designating Rhody Drive a highway of state-wide significance. That would give them control of level of service standards, etc.

Bruce Laurie pointed out that the 20-year Transportation Plan estimated costs were around \$30 million. He stated that the preferred sewer alternative cost was \$4 to \$7 million. However, the sewer was the issue people were worried about.

Bruce Laurie stated that transportation issues, especially on Rhody Drive, would increase but it would probably increase anyway, even without the UGA. He stated that there were things they could do to alleviate the transportation problems that would arise.

Bruce Laurie stated that the Executive Summary pretty well summarized what the impacts would be. As we developed standards for the UGA, some of the problems would be mitigated. Also, developers who wanted to develop in the UGA would have to mitigate their traffic impacts.

Robert Morgan asked about the classifications of Highways 19 and 20, with Highway 20 being a higher classification. Bruce Laurie replied that the DOT would be re-classifying Highway 19 when it designated it a highway of state-wide significance.

In response to Tom McNerney's comment, Bruce Laurie discussed the level of service standards and the criteria for them. He agreed that typically they lowered the level of service standards for a UGA.

David Whipple commented that the worst traffic area in the overall area was when Chimacum High School was getting out and the school busses were coming onto Rhody Drive from West Valley Road. He admitted that area was not within the UGA. Mr. Whipple stated that another safety concern was the students walking near the school. Bruce Laurie stated that they considered areas around the UGA because the UGA would have an effect on those areas. Mr. Laurie agreed there was a problem there, adding that it was a short term

problem in terms of time taken in the day. He agreed that the potential existed for a bad accident, but that was present wherever a road intersected with a main road. Mr. Laurie explained that there were things that could be done around schools, including safe walking lanes (trails or sidewalks), for a mile around a school. He stated that the Non-Motorized Recreation Trails Plan addressed possible solutions. He stated that enforcement in that area would gain additional safety.

Dennis Schultz asked if the county could pressure the state to make improvements based on their own standards. Bruce Laurie replied that the county, as a local agency, could certainly spend county money on a state highway. He stated that the county worked with the DOT in a number of ways to help alleviate problem areas. Mr. Laurie stated that it was a matter of priorities at the state level. He stated that Jefferson County did not compete very well with places like Tacoma or Seattle. However, the state did recognize that there were some problem areas, noting that they had plans for a light at Rhody Drive and Nesses Corner. He stated that the county was pressuring the DOT to shorten their time frame for that installation.

The commissioners moved on to the Stormwater Management Plan. Jim Pearson, Public Works, invited questions. Mr. Pearson stated that sewer was the big issue in the UGA, even though transportation was a much larger cost item.

Jim Pearson stated that there were some important things to keep in mind related to stormwater management. We had a UGA that we wanted to grow and develop, which would increase the impervious surface. And we had a salmon stream which was valuable to the community and contained a Summer Chum run, which was an endangered species. There was a nexus between those things.

Jim Pearson stated that, hopefully, what they had shown in the Stormwater Management Plan was a way to address stormwater so that it was not a "big ticket item". Most of it would be paid for by the individual developer with the stormwater treated onsite. Mr. Pearson stated that there were a couple of things that needed to be addressed. One was stormwater treatment in the Hadlock core. Also, there was a need for a stormwater management program with a public education component.

Tom McNerney asked for further information about stormwater treatment onsite within the UGA. Jim Pearson explained that typically the development must contain and treat its stormwater onsite. He stated that, fortunately, this area had good soils for infiltration onsite; it was very sandy and gravelly. He stated that the newer developments in the area had installed good stormwater systems.

Jim Pearson explained why you would have to treat the stormwater prior to infiltrating it. He used the example of the new NAPA store as one that treated its stormwater onsite. He stated that it was really a technical, engineering issue.

Edel Sokol asked who maintained the systems. Jim Pearson explained that the county currently required the developer to enter into an agreement with the county that the property owner would maintain the system on their property. That requirement transferred with the sale of the property to the heirs or successors. Mr. Pearson stated that a lot of the systems were newer systems and did not require a lot of maintenance. However, in the future, maintenance may become an issue. He stated that, currently, the county did not have a program in place to inspect the systems or do the maintenance or

require that the maintenance be done. Mr. Pearson stated that one of the policies in the plan was to set up a system for that purpose.

Jim Pearson described two stormwater management systems, one at the NAPA store and another at QFC. He agreed that there was a need for stormwater treatment in the Hadlock core. He explained that there were three entities that should share in those costs - the county, the DOT because of their roads, and the individual property owners. Mr. Pearson stated that there were different ways to finance the treatment and described one method that was being used in Port Ludlow.

Tom McNerney invited public comments or questions related to the UGA plans. There were none received.

Tom Murray commented that it was comforting to see the level of expertise displayed by the people working on this project.

Tom McNerney handed out copies of a letter from the BOCC to six citizens who would participate on a task force for the UGA development regulations and zoning. In addition to the six citizens, the task force would consist of one County Commissioner, staff, and the Planning Commission UGA Committee members.

Randy Kline explained the purpose of the task force. It will assist in formulating the development regulations for the UGA as well as the Comp Plan amendment for the UGA. Mr. Kline stated that one issue would be a review of the zoning within the UGA. He explained what staff expected to cover at the first meeting of the task force on January 27. Mr. Kline stated that all of the citizens were veterans of the UGA planning process.

Robert Morgan asked if the consultant had begun drafting the development regulations. Randy Kline replied that he had a framework, but they had not begun on the substance. He stated that the task force would be asked to "fill in the blanks".

The commissioners and staff discussed having the flexibility to allow apartments over commercial businesses. Also discussed was the possibility for higher density around the commercial areas with lower density as you expanded outward.

David Whipple asked how many of the citizens on the task force lived in the UGA. The answer was that some lived in the UGA and some owned businesses there. Mr. Whipple asked how decisions would be made by the task force. Tom McNerney replied that he thought the task force would be making recommendations. Staff would list those recommendations to the UGA Committee, who would act on them and bring forward those the UGA Committee thought appropriate to the full Planning Commission, and hence to the BOCC. Mr. Whipple suggested that the task force have a set of guidelines for those issues. He commented that the Blue Book was actually pretty useful along those lines.

Tom Murray asked who the task force would report to. Tom McNerney replied that the task force would make a recommendation to the Planning Commission through the UGA Committee, whose members were on the task force. He stated that whatever came out of the task force process would result in formal UDC or Comp Plan amendments, which would go through a formal public process.

David Whipple expressed a concern that the citizens on the task force not be overwhelmed by the UGA Committee and BOCC members. He thought it was important that they not feel out-voted or that they did not have a voice because of the majority held by the BOCC and Planning Commission. The commissioners discussed the public input on the UGA issue received to date. The citizen representation had been fairly poor in the recent past. The citizen sentiment was that they did not want to participate unless there was something worthwhile to address. It was noted that the task force meetings were open to the public and it was probably important to invite public comments at the task force meetings. The commissioners discussed the efforts to get the information out to the public. The general result in feedback had been that the public did not want to be involved unless there was something of substance to discuss. Now we were getting to the point of discussing something of substance.

#### **C. DISCUSSION ON 2004 GMA UPDATE OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Randy Kline stated that the way it had been left at the last meeting was that the Planning Commissioners were to look at the Comp Plan and make suggestions for any items the commissioners thought should be changed.

Tom McNerney stated that he would appoint a committee to look at the Comp Plan as well as the UDC.

Tom McNerney invited any comments from the commissioners about the issue. There were no comments. He asked that the commissioners provide input to staff or the committee once it was formed.

Tom McNerney asked staff about what they would be proposing. Randy Kline stated that the law required that the county update the Comp Plan to reflect the changes in the law since its adoption. Mr. Kline stated that the county was in pretty good shape in that regard, although there were a few things that should be updated. One was that the county must address best available science, which the county had already done. The staff report would discuss that. Another was an update of the population projections. Another was a public participation program where the county would invite the public to suggest changes. Mr. Kline stated that the capital facilities plan must be wound into the Comp Plan as well.

Randy Kline stated that the county had hired an individual (Kyle Alm) under a state grant to be the lead person on the Comp Plan update.

#### **D. ADJOURNMENT**

The agenda for the next meeting will include a presentation by the Agriculture Lands Committee of their proposal to the full Planning Commission. Tom McNerney asked if the material would be available to the Planning Commission before the next meeting. Josh Peters stated that it would depend upon whether the Ag Lands Committee could finish its work in time. Also, staff would have to do the SEPA review on it. He stated that it may be necessary to hand the proposal out at the next meeting. However, the commissioners would have two weeks after that to review the proposal before the public hearing on it.

The Chair invited public comments.

Chuck Monson stated that the UGA was called the "Tri Area" but it did not include three areas. He suggested adding Chimacum.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

These minutes were approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of February, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas McNerney, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary