

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR JUNE 2, 2004

- A. OPENING BUSINESS
- B. PUBLIC HEARING (Continued) - GENERAL SEWER PLAN FOR HADLOCK/IRONDALE URBAN GROWTH AREA
- C. PUBLIC HEARING - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR HADLOCK/IRONDALE URBAN GROWTH AREA
- D. DISCUSSION ON GENERAL SEWER PLAN AND COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR HADLOCK/IRONDALE UGA
- E. 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 Bud Schindler, Phil Flynn, Edel Sokol, Jim Hagen, Dennis Schultz, Jenny Davis, Allen Panasuk, and Eileen Rogers.

DCD staff present were Al Scalf, Kyle Alm, consultants Mark Personius and Christina Pivarnik, and Cheryl Halvorson, secretary. Public Works staff, Jim Pearson, was also present.

There were about thirty members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were Chuck Russell, Dan Eckstein, Patty Minish, R. Lopeman, Elsie Lopeman, Jason and Marianne Raines, M. Hope, Carol Kenealy, Frances Johnson, Mark Benner, and Sandra Hill.

The minutes for May 5, 2004, were approved as submitted.

The Chair invited staff updates.

Al Scalf stated that the department was starting the budget season. DCD was preparing two budget scenarios. One was for a fifteen percent reduction in the general fund expenses, which was basically the Long Range Planning funding.

Al Scalf announced that Wednesday evening, June 9, the BOCC would hold a public hearing on the Fred Hill Materials Mineral Resource Lands designation at Chimacum High School auditorium.

Al Scalf reported that the close of the public comment period for the SEIS at the Port Ludlow Resort for a land use redevelopment scenario was on June 14.

Al Scalf stated that Josh Peters had sent an e-mail to some Planning Commissioners concerning the schedule for the Long Range Planning workload for the remainder of the year. He asked the commissioners to comment on it.

**B. PUBLIC HEARING (Continued) - GENERAL SEWER PLAN FOR HADLOCK/IRONDALE URBAN GROWTH AREA**

The Chair re-opened the public hearing for the General Sewer Plan, noting that it had been continued from the May 19 meeting in order to accept additional public comments.

Kyle Alm provided a brief staff report on the sewer plan. It contained five alternatives, with the preferred alternative being a wetland treatment system. He stated that a General Sewer Plan was a document that would get the county to an engineering phase where we could answer the difficult questions about whether or not the preferred alternative, or some other alternative, was the most feasible.

The Chair read the public hearing procedure rules and opened the hearing.

The secretary noted that the Planning Commission had received three written comments at this meeting from the public concerning the General Sewer Plan. Tom McNerney explained that the commission would not make a decision at this hearing in order to consider the written and oral comments received at the

hearing. He stated that the commission would likely make a decision on a recommendation at its next meeting [June 16].

The Chair opened the hearing to public testimony.

Rebecca Lopeman, Port Hadlock, stated that the USGS meeting she had attended raised further questions and concerns relating to the wetlands treatment alternative. After that meeting, she contacted the USGS speaker and asked him to comment specifically on the aquifer recharge issue and the level of the ponds that were proposed to take the effluent. She reported that the result was that the pond and the aquifer were essentially at the same ground level, with the pond being at the top of the aquifer. Therefore, whatever went into the pond would go directly into the drinking water. She thought the Planning Commission should be aware of that USGS study saying where the groundwater was. Ms. Lopeman stated that she had other concerns which she had outlined in a written comment. She submitted those written comments for the record.

Tom McNerney stated that any written comments received at the hearing would be copied and provided to the Planning Commissioners for their consideration.

Marianne Raines, Chimacum Creek Estates, Port Hadlock, expressed concern about the location of the wetland treatment area. She stated that she had just found out about the proposed location. She expressed concerns about the aquifer as well. She was concerned about their property values, stating that she did not know anyone who would want to buy a home right next to a sewer pond. She was concerned about the fact that it was located so close to a residential neighborhood, a restaurant, and the grade school. She was concerned about the smell. Ms. Raines stated that she had lived near a sewer treatment plant in Edmonds which was completely enclosed and there were days when she could smell it. There were also days when the pumps failed and there was sewage in the streets. She was concerned that the same thing might happen in this case and the sewage would spill into their neighborhood. She was also concerned about the natural wetlands and the wildlife that lived in the pond. Ms. Raines expressed curiosity about why this particular site was selected rather than looking at other possibilities that were not next to a residential neighborhood or that were not above the aquifer. She questioned why we were not looking at those places more closely. She stated that someone had told her it was because the topography lent itself to the gravity feed from one pond to the next. Ms. Raines thought there were many other places where that would work. She questioned why the Planning Commission was not looking into other locations a bit more seriously than this one. She asked why it had not been publicly announced so that everyone was aware of the location and what was going on. She stated that what was in the paper was simply that the Planning Commission would hold a meeting without providing information or details about the location of the planned sewer system. She stated that her experience was that the public was not aware. She stated that when she told neighbors that it was an open sewer pond that was proposed, they became very concerned for very good reasons. Ms. Raines stated that if there was a way to better inform the public about why this location was selected, she would be the first one to attend. She stated that she had started a petition against this proposed location, although she was not yet ready to submit it. She stated that everyone was aware that there would be a sewer plant somewhere, but this particular location was not one that was popular with the public.

Mark Benner, Chimacum Creek Estates, Port Hadlock, stated that he had similar concerns as those already expressed and would echo those concerns. He asked about the SEPA process and if anyone could tell him where we were in terms of the SEPA review. He thought a decision of this nature would have to go through such a review. Tom McNerney explained that the Planning Commission did not get into a discussion during the public testimony portion of the hearing, but there may be an opportunity for such a discussion after the hearing. Mr. Benner stated that his concern was one of process. He stated that his review of the sewer plan indicated that it seemed to focus on two things: economics and the "could it be done" sort of thing. He stated that SEPA would require you to look at all of the potential impacts, both environmental and social. He thought there was a real big social impact with the proposal that did not seem to be addressed in the document. He wanted to make sure that everyone in the community had an opportunity to express their concerns relative to the SEPA process. Mr. Benner stated a concern about the notification issue. He stated that he was a state forester with the Department of Natural Resources. It was common for them to send out a mailing to neighboring property owners about such projects, acknowledging that in their case it would be about timber sales. He thought this fell into the same category. He thought the county should have one-on-one contact with the people who would be immediately affected by the proposal. He stated that the notices in the paper were really not sufficient in terms of reaching out to the public so that the public could be aware and informed about what was going on. While he did not know about the attendance in the past, he stated that people were starting to figure out what was being put forth and the commission would see the meeting attendance go up as this process went forward. Mr. Benner stated his concern with the location of the ponds and the smell that would emanate from them, stating that Chimacum Creek Estates and the elementary school were directly downwind from the proposed location of the treatment ponds. He stated that the prevailing winds were a strong wind out of the South and it was right in line with the open ponds. He stated that he was concerned about his property values. He stated that he had spoken with some people who knew about such things and had been told that his property values would be affected. Mr. Benner stated his environmental concerns: adverse effects on the aquifer, using open natural wetlands for sewer treatment, stating the belief that it was an inappropriate use. He stated that, given the nature of the location of this proposal, it did not fit. This was not like a metropolitan area where such sites were really limited. It seemed like we had a lot of options and he thought we could do a better job of picking a better location. He stated that he had heard that there was the potential to take over the Navy's Indian Island system. He suggested that the county should look into that as an option. It seemed to him that an isolated island away from residential and commercial development was a much better location. He thought the county should look at all of the options more closely.

Dan Eckstein, Chimacum Creek Estates, Port Hadlock, stated that he was the facilities manager for Indian Island for a number of years and was quite familiar with the project there. He stated that was a very viable possibility. He stated that the Navy's treatment plant was just upgraded, so all the county would be looking at was piping. He echoed all the concerns already expressed. He stated that property values were a significant issue, particularly for him because his backyard directly abutted where the treatment facility was proposed. He had the same environmental concerns. He spoke about the wildlife in the wetland environment. He stated that he did not think much consideration had been given to the property owners. He was also concerned about the public notice. He thought it would have taken very

little effort to send letters to those adjacent property owners to notify them and provide details to them. Mr. Eckstein stated that he had reviewed the plan and, as a facilities manager, he thought it needed a lot of work. He thought the county was ignoring some of the environmental issues. He questioned some of the costs that were in the plan. He stated that the plan said that one of the advantages was phasing. He stated that phasing was more expensive because every time you phased, you had to pay mobilization and demobilization costs, which were one of the primary expenses in any construction project. Mr. Eckstein stated that he had a lot of concerns, issues and questions with the plan itself. He thought the plan needed a lot more work and a lot more effort in communication with the public, particularly the adjacent property owners.

In defense of the Planning Commission, Tom McNerney explained that the commission had received the General Sewer Plan less than ten days before the original public hearing on May 19. Therefore, that hearing had been continued to this meeting. He stated that the details of the plan had been out for some time. He stated that the Planning Commission was here to listen to the public's comments and to evaluate it. The Planning Commission did not write the plan.

Tom McNerney referred to Ms. Raines' comments about a petition. He asked if she would submit what she had now, because the Planning Commission could not receive or consider anything beyond the close of this public hearing. Marianne Raines stated that she would submit the petition and asked if she could continue to gather more signatures. Mr. McNerney stated that any additional information received after the close of this hearing would be provided to the BOCC for their consideration when the issue came before them. Ms. Raines asked if she was correct in assuming that the Planning Commission represented the public, in a way, to the BOCC. Mr. McNerney stated that, in his opinion, the commission was here to hear the voice of the people. He stated that the commission would listen to the people, consider the law, consider the staff's recommendations, and make a recommendation from all of that.

Marianne Raines stated that there were some of the public who would very much like to see the sewer treatment facility stopped in that location. They would very much prefer it to be in another location that was away from the public and away from the environmental impacts it would cause. She asked what they could do to stop it, what they could do to get the county looking at a different location and doing the constructing and engineering on a different location, and get this proposed area dropped as soon as possible. Tom McNerney stated that the first thing to do was to attend a public hearing and testify, which they were doing. The second thing would be to provide input directly to the BOCC after this hearing. He reiterated that the Planning Commission had not come to a decision yet.

Jeff Minish, Port Hadlock, stated that he had lived in the Chimacum Creek Estates for over twenty years and they had a very good neighborhood. He stated that he worked at Indian Island. He stated that you just did not find a neighborhood like theirs where everyone looked out for each other. He stated that he still had several years before retirement and did not plan to move. However, he had already heard some people talk about moving. Some were people he cared a lot about. He stated that he did not want to see this go in. He stated that Mr. Benner was right that their neighborhood was directly south of the proposed ponds and the prevailing wind was a South wind. He stated that everyone knew that there was no system that was

foolproof; they knew it was going to smell. He stated that he was an outdoorsman and was concerned about the wetland. He spoke about the wildlife that used the wetland, stating that he did not want to see all of that disappear. He stated that if it was going to go through, he would like to see it in another area. He thought there had to be a better area away from their residential neighborhood.

Rebecca Lopeman stated the understanding that the Planning Commission would put together a summary and an opinion about whether the county should support or not support the wetland alternative in a report to the BOCC. She asked if it would ultimately be the three County Commissioners who would make the decision. Tom McNerney explained that she was correct and any input the public wished to make after this hearing would be directed to the BOCC. An audience member asked if the BOCC would also hold a public hearing. Mr. McNerney explained that they may or may not. If they agreed with the Planning Commission's recommendation and staff, they were not required to hold a hearing. If they wanted to change the recommendation substantially, they were required to hold a hearing. For some issues, they would hold a hearing in either case.

Adam Sukert, Chimacum Creek Estates, Port Hadlock, stated that he had a new baby, so it was a concern for him because the proposed location was right in his backyard. He stated that he worked installing septic systems for Shold Excavating. He stated that, knowing a bit about the business and the county requirements, they had to "jump through a lot of hoops" to install a septic in the residential areas because there was such a concern about the aquifer recharge area. Yet the county was proposing to put a sewage treatment system right in the central area of that aquifer recharge area. Another concern was the fact that it was a wetland. While he was not an environmentalist, the fact was that if you looked at any kind of wetlands, or swamp or pond, there was a reason that water was standing there. The ground had a barrier and that was what was holding the water. He stated that the county was talking about using an area that was already holding back water and adding more water to that area. While he was not an engineer, common sense would tell you that when you add more water into an area that was retaining water, it would just hold more water. He questioned what would happen when that water backed up. He stated that we were not talking about a little bit of water; it [the plan] was talking about adding more systems to the line. He stated that one person had talked about the proposed system being preferred because of the gravity feed. He stated that gravity feed was not a mandatory requirement, citing many systems in Port Ludlow which used a pump station to get the effluent to the sewage treatment lines. He stated that it was not like it was a new residential area, stating that Chimacum Creek Estates had been there for many years. Since the neighborhood had been there for so many years, he could not see adding such a facility right in the backyard of that neighborhood. As big a county as this was, he thought there had to be a better place, that was open with no residences, and that could be designed to site the facility.

Dan Eckstein stated that he understood the plan was done by a contractor and they had done a very good job of documentation. However, he asked how he could get the answers to the questions he had about the specific proposal. Tom McNerney suggested that the commission could get into a discussion after the public hearing was completed and address that issue.

David Johnson, Chimacum Creek Estates, Port Hadlock, stated that he had submitted a written comment. He stated that the only comment he had not heard discussed at this hearing, which was in his letter, was a concern about

the cost of the system. As he read through the plan, he understood that they lived in an area that would not be required to hook up. However, as he heard other testimony, he understood that in order to pay for the system, the county would require pretty much everyone to hook up. In that case, they would be paying for a system they had no need for. He stated that the plan said the residential areas were good for the next twenty years without having to go to any kind of a sewage treatment system. He stated that it was not very clear in the document and it should be cleaned up so that people could understand what the requirement would be. Other than that, his comments were contained in his letter.

Bill Klein stated that he was the Environmental contact on Indian Island. He stated that he had reviewed the plan. He stated that, realizing that it was a preliminary stage in the SEPA process, his recommendation was to flesh out the preferred alternative a bit. He thought it was very sketchy. He thought it should reference the SEPA checklist and the Clean Water Act section about no net loss of the wetland. He stated that if you destroy a wetland you had to mitigate; you had to create, in kind, another wetland. He thought the preferred alternative needed to be beefed up as far as criteria and some of the pitfalls of pursuing it. He stated that he saw a lot of other triggers for environmental compliance at county, state, and federal levels that were not mentioned. He stated that in being in the business of NEPA compliance, he knew you had to have a more concrete plan, including public notification and an outline of the process. He stated that the bottom line was that he thought the plan needed to be beefed up relating to SEPA compliance issues, including some kind of at least preliminary strategy for environmental compliance.

Joe Beary, Chimacum Creek Estates, Port Hadlock, referred to the comment about cost and people being forced to hook up. He stated that he should not be forced to hook up or pay for the system when he did not need it. He thought the whole plan should have a better public information plan. He stated that the first he had heard about it was last week.

Russ Lopeman, Port Hadlock, stated that one issue he had not heard was the possibilities for airborne diseases. He stated that Hepatitis C and West Nile Virus were airborne diseases. He asked about the possibility of the people who lived south of the treatment wetlands contracting such diseases, given the prevailing winds.

There being no further public testimony, the Chair closed the public hearing on the General Sewer Plan. He then invited a staff response.

Al Scalf stated that, in terms of contacting staff, Kyle Alm was available to the public both in the DCD office and via e-mail. He referred to the DCD web page which was devoted to the UGA planning issue. He stated that staff would be available to the public during the breaks at this meeting. Mr. Scalf stated that the Planning Commission was in a public process and would consider all of the comments received, both written and oral. The Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the BOCC. He stated that, of the five alternatives in the sewer plan, the Planning Commission could select their own alternative as their recommendation or the commission could make a recommendation other than one of the five.

In the interest of public information and dialog, the Chair invited questions from the public.

Carol Kenealy, Port Hadlock, asked if the Planning Commission recommended something other than the preferred alternative, if a study had to be done to support it and who paid for it. Tom McNerney explained that the next step after the General Sewer Plan, which was a 20-year plan, was to do an engineering study to see if what was proposed in that plan was feasible or not. If it was not feasible economically or socially or any other way, then it could be changed to something that was more workable. He stated that the Planning Commission was considering a recommendation to change the plan so that it would be more flexible so that, if the engineering study showed one alternative was not feasible, we could go to another alternative without having to go through the General Sewer Plan process again. He stated that the 20-year General Sewer Plan was not final yet.

Al Scalf explained the SEPA process for the UGA and sewer plan, which was a programmatic review at this point and general in nature. He cited the previous SEPA documents relating to the UGA dating back to 1998. He stated that the SEPA review documents for this process would be a supplement to those earlier documents. He explained that any specific construction project would go through further project level environmental review. In answer to an audience member's question, Mr. Scalf stated that the sewer plan was currently going through a SEPA process and had gone through an earlier SEPA process. The audience member did not see how it could be termed a general process when it seemed like it was such a specific proposal. He stated that the whole purpose of SEPA was to evaluate the broad scope of potential possibilities, and evaluate all of the potential impacts, and then use that to arrive at the preferred alternative. It seemed like it was backwards to him because the plan proposed a preferred alternative. It seemed like it should be that we should use the SEPA process to look at the broad range of possibilities and to use that to narrow the focus to a preferred alternative. Mr. Scalf stated that was basically what had happened over the last several years. He stated that he would like to show the audience member the SEPA work that had been done, which started broad and was narrowed down.

Marianne Raines asked why this particular site and method of treatment was chosen. She thought it was the worst possible site that could be picked, being over the aquifer and next to a neighborhood and wetlands and a grade school. She thought there had to be some other site that was much more sanitary and feasible than this particular site. Tom McNerney responded that this was a 20-year plan. He stated that there were five alternatives in this plan. He explained that there had been a Technical Review Committee for the sewer plan which had evaluated many alternatives and arrived at these five and the preferred alternative. Al Scalf stated that Page 4-16 of the General Sewer Plan contained a matrix [Table 4-2] depicting the evaluation of the alternatives and the criteria used. That was the mathematical exercise used to arrive at the preferred alternative [Alternative #4]. Mr. Scalf stated that all five alternatives were still on the table, however. Ms. Raines stated that the preferred alternative was the one that was the cheapest, but it was also the one that was most detrimental to the community. She stated that she preferred that we pay a little more money but save their community.

Mark Benner read the evaluation criteria. He stated that none of them addressed evaluating the environmental impacts and the social concerns. He stated that the social part had been totally ignored thus far. He thought the process was backwards. While he knew staff could go back to 1998 and show them all kinds of paperwork on the UGA process, it was not contained in the sewer plan evaluation, and particularly not for this proposal. He stated

that he knew the group of people present had not had an opportunity to voice their concerns. He thought the plan was very one-sided.

Jason Raines asked about the consultant who prepared the General Sewer Plan. Al Scalf explained who the members of the Technical Review Committee were and that the consultant who prepared the sewer plan was from Olympia, although he was raised in Port Townsend and had family there. Mr. Raines asked if any of them lived in the Hadlock area. The answer was "No".

Dan Eckstein stated that he had noticed the same thing about the criteria. There was nothing about homeowner impact, social impact, or potential environmental impact. He stated that his concern was that he saw other problems with the document and he was afraid it would be taken as gospel that what it contained was accurate and that the information was credible. He stated that he questioned a lot of what the plan contained, particularly the costs. He stated that he had done a lot of facilities work and facilities construction contracting, and he did not agree with some of the numbers and other things he saw in the document. That was the reason he asked how they could question that in order to get validation of that information. Tom McNerney stated that the Final Draft of the sewer plan had been available to the public for two weeks, but there was a preliminary draft that had been available since January. Mr. McNerney stated that he wanted the members of the public to be assured that the Planning Commission was listening. He hoped the public did not think the commissioners were expressing any opinion one way or the other. Mr. Eckstein stated that he was not trying to shoot down the document. He stated that his working history told him that when a lot of money had been paid for a plan and a recommendation, it tended to stay on that track to fruition unless there was very credible evidence to take it somewhere else. He stated that if the Planning Commission was not willing to take their issues to heart and consider the alternatives and realized the impacts the preferred alternative had on their community, it would stay on track. The reason was that they would resist spending more money to backtrack and look at other alternatives once they engaged in the engineering study, because that was where the "big bucks" went. He stated that the county needed to hear the people now.

Tom McNerney asked Ms. Lopeman if she had remained after the public hearing at the last meeting to hear the commission's discussion. Rebecca Lopeman replied that she had left after the hearing. Mr. McNerney commented that the commissioners had not bought into the plan entirely. He stated that the commissioners had questioned the consultant about the plan and the other alternatives at that meeting.

Dan Eckstein asked if the Planning Commission members were familiar with the area. The commissioners responded that they were.

Chuck Russell, Marrowstone Island, stated that he owned the Valley Tavern. He stated that this was not "us" and "them", it was "us" and "us". He stated that the Planning Commissioners were citizen volunteers who donated their time to help the community in the planning process. He stated that it was not a fight.

Marianne Raines stated that they understood the Planning Commissioners role and they appreciated that. If they came across as angry, it was because they were angry at the situation. She reiterated that the public was not aware. She stated that the public could read the Leader and see the announcement for a meeting, but they would not know that there was anything to affect them

unless there were details in the notice. She stated that the announcement for this meeting said nothing about location or what the public had been discussing. It only said there was a meeting regarding the sewer plan. She stated that she would not have known that it had anything to do with her or that she should be interested if it had not been for a neighbor letting her know. When she polled her other neighbors, 97% of them said they had no idea. Ms. Raines stated that she had tried to get onto the county web site for an hour to find the sewer plan and never succeeded. She stated that it should not take an hour to find it. She stated that the public needed to be aware. There needed to be flyers put out so that people would know what was going to happen around their homes.

Christina Pivarnik, the county's public information consultant for the UGA, stated that she had tried very hard to communicate to the public and apologized if it had not been successful. She explained the public outreach that had been done, which included two open houses and flyers in the PUD bills. She stated that the last open house had information about the proposed location of the sewer treatment facilities. She wondered why people were not aware about the sewer facilities. An audience member stated that the PUD flyers did not indicate the location of the sewer system; it was just a general statement about there being a sewer plan. He stated that if the information had been clear about the actual location, he would have been interested much earlier. Another audience member stated that Ms. Pivarnik's effort had borne fruit now because the public was here. He stated that now that they were here, they hoped that their comments would be heard and acted upon.

There being no further questions or comments about the General Sewer Plan, Tom McNerney closed the public hearing on the sewer plan. He stated that the public comment period to the Planning Commission was also closed. Any further testimony could be directed to the BOCC. Jenny Davis stated that, after the next public hearing, the Planning Commission would hold discussions about the two hearing topics (the sewer plan and the Comp Plan amendments). She invited the members of the public to stay for those discussions.

**C. PUBLIC HEARING - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR HADLOCK/IRONDALE URBAN GROWTH AREA**

The Chair opened the public hearing on the UGA-related Comp Plan amendments. He noted that the same procedural rules applied as had been read for the first hearing. He invited a staff presentation.

Al Scalf stated that the county had been working on a UGA in Port Hadlock and Irondale since 1998. He reviewed the documents included for the Comp Plan amendment portion of the UGA work (the Staff Report and SEPA Addendum, the Notice of Adoption, the draft UGA chapter for the Comp Plan, the General Sewer Plan, which was the subject of the earlier public hearing, mapping, line-out pages for the other chapters of the Comp Plan, proposed Development Regulations, and a Buildout Analysis). Mr. Scalf stated that the first piece was the hearing on the General Sewer Plan as a separate issue. This hearing was associated with the rest of the components, including the UGA Element, the Transportation Plan and the Stormwater Management Plan. He stated that on June 16 there would be another public hearing on the Development Regulations component.

Tom McNerney stated that in 2003 the BOCC adopted an ordinance that adopted a boundary for the UGA. That was appealed to the Hearings Board which found

that the county still had some planning to do. That additional planning was what was before the Planning Commission now. Mr. McNerney stated that the county had solicited a Citizen Task Force to help in developing the plans and proposed amendments to the Comp Plan and Development Regulations. Those documents were now the subjects of the three public hearings. He stated that the thinking was that the sewer plan would be the most contentious issue, so it was allotted a separate public hearing. The other Comp Plan amendment components were the subject of this public hearing.

Jim Pearson, Public Works, stated that Public Works had developed the Transportation and Stormwater Management Plans for the UGA. He stated that what the Planning Commission had before it was a distillation of those much larger plans. His understanding was that the larger plans would be adopted by reference in the Comp Plan. He stated that if there were any questions about details, he would direct attention to the plans themselves. He stated that they had been before the Planning Commission some months ago with a presentation on the plans. Mr. Pearson reported that, as a result of some changes by the Citizen Task Force concerning zoning and land use, they had done some revisions to the plans.

Concerning the Transportation Plan, Jim Pearson stated that they had done an analysis of existing conditions. They basically at this point had no capacity problems in the UGA or adjacent to it. Looking into the future, based on projected populations in the next six years and twenty years, they did projections of the traffic in the UGA and in the immediate areas surrounding the UGA. He pointed out some highlights. He referred to Page 2-10 of the Transportation Plan there were tables that discussed intersection delays and the level of service on the roadway segments. If the commissioners had any questions about how Public Works arrived at their recommendations for projects in the UGA, those tables would be a good way to determine that. Concerning the actual projects they were considering, he stated that by 2010 SR 19 from the intersection of SR 116 to Four Corners Road would be a Level of Service E, which was below the established level of service (Level D). That would primarily be during peak hours; it would not be an all day condition. Mr. Pearson stated that SR 19 was a state highway and, therefore, was not subject to concurrency requirements. In other words, that improvement did not have to be made in order for projects to be developed in that area. However, Public Works would be working with Washington State Department of Transportation [WSDOT] because they anticipated SR 19 would become a Highway of Statewide Significance, which would move improvements up in WSDOT's priorities. He stated that the reality was that, with or without the UGA, SR 19 would require four lanes within the 20-year horizon. Mr. Pearson stated that the other projects they would be considering were primarily signalization. The first one would be SR 116 and SR 19, but also potentially some other intersections along SR 19. One potential signal point was the intersection at Cedar Avenue. He stated that one of the issues they had was that the intersecting roads coming onto SR 19 tended to get congested. It was not so much the right hand turn movements; it was the left hand turn movements. There had to be a balance between keeping traffic moving through on SR 19 and creating safe conditions and avoiding congestion on those intersecting roadways. He stated that it was a very technical issue that Public Works would be working with WSDOT on. He stated that Table 2-5 in Chapter 2 [the UGA chapter] showed those improvement projects, gave dates on them, a brief description, and projected costs.

Concerning the Stormwater Management Plan, Jim Pearson stated that the goal was to address increased stormwater runoff with the increased impacts of a

UGA. With a UGA would come additional impervious surfaces and the potential for additional stormwater runoff that could impact surface water resources as well as groundwater resources. He stated that Public Works had prepared a Stormwater Management Plan, which was a rather lengthy document containing a lot of background information. The conclusion was that the UGA could exist without the surface and ground water resources being significantly impacted. However, it would take provision of both facilities and a Stormwater Management Program to do that. Primarily the facilities they were considering were for the core area of Port Hadlock where there was a storm drainage system dating back twenty years that discharged to the lagoon behind Lower Hadlock. One proposal was to place a treatment facility on that. Also, the outfall would probably need to be replaced sometime in the next twenty years. The costs for both of those projects were included in both Chapter 2 and in the Stormwater Management Plan. Concerning stormwater management program activities, they were looking at the need to inspect stormwater management facilities. He stated that there was a map in the Stormwater Management Plan that showed all of the parcels in the UGA that had stormwater management facilities on them. There was a need to check those facilities to assure that they were being properly maintained so that the stormwater runoff generated by those developments did not have an impact. Mr. Pearson stated that there was a need for public education. He stated that they did not see a need for a lot of new regulation to protect surface and ground water resources. Public Works preferred to use public education and public outreach about stormwater management instead of regulation. He stated that there was also a proposal for ongoing water quality monitoring in the future so that we could see if the stormwater management facilities along with public education were, in fact, protecting the surface and ground water. Finally, there was a proposal for stream gauging on Chimacum Creek. The purpose of that was to assess over time whether there was increased stormwater runoff into the creek from the UGA. Mr. Pearson stated that there was a discussion about stormwater management fees in both the plan and in Chapter 2. The fee would be based on the amount of impervious surface that any individual parcel would have. One option was to spread the fees across the entire population. Another option was to limit the fees to the commercial, industrial, and multi-family areas since they would generate the most stormwater runoff.

The secretary noted that the Planning Commission had received one e-mail comment concerning the Comp Plan amendments component.

The Chair opened the public hearing to public testimony.

Dan Eckstein, Port Hadlock, asked about the credibility regarding the rate of population growth. He stated that he knew a lot of it was based on the 2000 Census data. Tom McNerney stated that the Planning Commission was taking public testimony and would not enter into a discussion at this time.

Chuck Russell, Marrowstone Island, stated that one of the most important things a UGA would do for this area was affordable housing, which was really lacking in the county. With a UGA, we could have higher density and have apartments, someplace besides a trailer park, which was the only affordable housing we had now. He thought that was a very important aspect of a UGA. He pointed out that the only other UGA in the county was Port Townsend, which was not a very cheap place to live.

Sandy Hill, Shine, stated that what Mr. Russell said was true. However, she hoped the affordable housing was placed in appropriate places rather than

putting it in undesirable areas. When such housing was developed in a pleasant surrounding, it enhanced the surrounding property values. She hoped it would be placed in appropriate areas.

Dan Eckstein stated that he had lived in the area for over twenty years. He had seen a significant decline in the "feel" of the area because of a lack of regulations on property owners concerning what they could do. He thought that anything that could be applied to this plan to enhance that would be a benefit and go a long way towards making the area a more pleasant place.

There being no further public testimony, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Tom McNerney invited staff to address the question about population. Kyle Alm explained that the county used state Office of Financial Management population figures and was required to do so by statute.

Dan Eckstein stated that the reason he asked was because Chimacum Schools just built the new school based upon population projections and now their school was half empty. He thought it would be a sad thing to plan for a lot of projects based on a population projection that did not materialize. Jenny Davis stated that her daughter was on a waiting list for the Chimacum Creek Elementary preschool. An audience member stated that she had just signed her child up for kindergarten and had been told that their classes were full.

Tom McNerney stated that he had talked to OlyCap about low income housing. They had told him that single family housing was no longer considered low income housing; only multi-family housing was considered low income. He stated the hope that the commission had placed the multi-family zoning appropriately.

#### **D. DISCUSSION ON GENERAL SEWER PLAN AND COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR HADLOCK/IRONDALE UGA**

Tom McNerney invited a report from the UGA Committee. It was noted that a new revision of some General Sewer Plan pages had been handed out along with a revised Chapter 2 for the UGA Element. Phil Flynn stated that the UGA Committee had worked on the two documents and suggested some revisions which were contained in the new drafts received at this meeting. Al Scalf stated that these revisions were basically the committee's recommendation to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Allen Panasuk asked about the noticing to the public for the proposal. Al Scalf replied that, at this level, noticing to neighboring property owners was not required. At this stage, legal notices in the Leader about the availability of the documents and the public hearings were all that was legally required. He stated that the county had gone well beyond the legal requirements and hired a consultant to do public outreach, which included the open houses and the flyers in the PUD bills. He stated that, when it got to a project stage, the adjacent property owners would be notified.

Eileen Rogers stated that the county and Planning Commission had gone to great lengths to try to inform people, but apparently we had failed. She thought that when the General Sewer Plan came out with the preferred alternative, the county could have, and probably should have, notified the neighboring property owners. Phil Flynn described the public outreach that had occurred. He stated that, apparently, there was a problem with accessing

the county web site for the UGA. He thought that was something that should be fixed.

Tom McNerney referred to the General Sewer Plan revised document, which had been handed out at this meeting. He also referred to the stack of documents the Planning Commission had been reviewing which related to the UGA amendments. He stated that the UGA Committee had tried to introduce into the sewer plan language that would allow the county to move on to another alternative if the preferred alternative turned out to not be viable, rather than having to revise the sewer plan through another Comp Plan amendment process, which could take a year and a half. He stated that the committee wanted some flexibility in the sewer plan to accomplish that objective. Mr. McNerney stated that the county was required to adopt a 20-year General Sewer Plan for the UGA. Otherwise, the county would not be compliant with the GMA. Mr. McNerney stated that much of what the public had brought up at this hearing had also been raised by the Planning Commissioners. He used the analogy of starting up a ladder and coming to a missing rung. He stated that we wanted to be able to step across to another ladder instead of going back down and starting over.

Phil Flynn stated that the objective of the revisions proposed by the UGA Committee was to show that the sewer plan was a "living plan" that matured over time resulting in a final recommendation and implementation plan and was organized into three phases. He stated that we were just in the early stages of this process. He stated that we wanted to be able to, over time as we got some engineering analysis done, have the flexibility to go from one alternative to another or to come up with another alternative. He thought that approach made more sense.

Jenny Davis proposed that the Planning Commission discuss what the public was interested in, which was the location of the system. For instance, she wished to know what the UGA Committee thought about the Indian Island alternative. She also asked what the committee thought about the preferred alternative. Phil Flynn responded that the committee did not think the preferred alternative was the most viable plan. Bud Schindler stated that, generally, the committee was uneasy about the recommendation and had ideas about other alternatives which the committee felt should have been considered. He stated that he had expressed the same concerns about the preferred alternative as were expressed by the public tonight.

Jenny Davis asked about the UGA Committee's review and activities, stating that the Planning Commission had not had a report for some time. Tom McNerney stated that the committee thought the first step was to get a General Sewer Plan approved, but it should have enough flexibility so that the county could get some engineering studies done to determine the most feasible alternative. Ms. Davis asked if the engineering studies would be done on just the preferred alternative, or if it would be done for several alternatives. Mr. McNerney replied that the committee did not know yet, but he thought it would be on the preferred alternative. Bud Schindler disagreed, stating that the committee would prefer to look at all of the alternatives and perhaps even make modifications to some of them. He stated that the committee wanted to look at everything, including what the public felt, collect data and engineering and financial data, in order to arrive at the best solution, which he thought would be fairly obvious. He stated that, so far, all we had collected was the conceptual ideas. He stated that we were in a conceptual phase from which we could make recommendations, but he questioned how meaningful they would be.

Jenny Davis stated that the next phase was the engineering report. She asked if that was budgeted for all of the alternatives or if it was just for the preferred alternative. Al Scalf responded that there was \$32,000 budgeted to do the due diligence phase, which at this point, would be on the preferred alternative. That would include hydrology, hydro-geology, and wetland delineation for the wetland alternative. However, if the Planning Commission came up with a different alternative and/or the BOCC adopted a different alternative, then the money would be used for that alternative. He stated that he would not spend the money until he knew which alternative would be used. Dennis Schultz stated that, if the money was spent on an alternative and it was determined that it was not a viable alternative, the county would have to find the money to research another alternative. Phil Flynn stated that the committee was not at a point to recommend a preferred alternative.

Tom McNerney stated that the first step the county needed to do was get a 20-year plan that was flexible enough that we could change it based on engineering studies or other data. That package, including the other Comp Plan amendments and development regulations, if it passed the Hearings Board scrutiny, would allow the county to go ahead with its work and not be subject to the Hearings Board. He offered the opinion that the county could not go forward without the 20-year sewer plan.

Allen Panasuk asked if the Planning Commission could do that without a recommendation for a preferred alternative. He stated that, at this point, we did not know what would "fly". He questioned if we needed a preferred alternative. He stated that another question was who recommended the preferred alternative. Al Scalf responded that the Technical Review Committee made the recommendation for the preferred alternative. He stated that it was not necessary to have a preferred alternative. Tom McNerney thought that, as the Planning Commission heard during the hearing, there were probably things, such as environmental issues, that were not taken into account, although he did not know for sure. Mr. Scalf responded that environmental issues were considered.

Edel Sokol thought it would help if the county addressed it as a conceptual plan, rather than just a plan. If that would get it through the Hearings Board, then the county could work on "the plan". Tom McNerney commented that Mr. Schindler had proposed language that would accomplish that, proposing three phases. The first was concept development, the second was detail analysis, and the third was a final recommendation and implementation plan. He asked staff if it was acceptable to say that there were five alternatives recommended in the plan and we could not arrive at a preferred alternative until we had more information. Al Scalf responded that the difficulty was tied right to the Capital Facilities Plan depicting financing for the 6-year plan. He stated that the state law did not say we had to choose a preferred alternative or that we needed a certain number of alternatives. It said we needed a General Sewer Plan. Then the GMA said we had to have a Capital Facilities Plan that showed costs and financing for the urban service. Mr. McNerney stated that the first year budget in the 6-year Capital Facilities Plan was for the engineering studies. If we did not have a preferred alternative, he asked if that engineering study could be used to generate the information to select a preferred alternative. He thought we would not have to change the Capital Facilities Plan; we would just not have a preferred alternative. Mr. Scalf agreed.

Phil Flynn stated that the difficulty would be that the \$32,000 would certainly not analyze all of the alternatives in the sewer plan; it would take a lot more money than \$32,000 to do that. Al Scalf stated that the next step was the due diligence, whether or not it was on the wetland alternative. The next step after that was the engineering report. That was estimated at \$60,000.

Tom McNerney stated that the cost of the alternatives was included in the sewer plan. He raised the issue of the effect on real estate value and asked if that was considered in the cost analysis. Al Scalf replied that it was not. Mr. McNerney commented that the cost analysis may not be as accurate as we would like it to be. Mr. Scalf stated that was why he recommended that the Planning Commission look at Table 4-2 [Page 4-16] and the criteria and put their own weighted numbers into the mix and see which alternative the Planning Commission would prefer. Mr. Scalf stated that the matrix was how the Technical Review Committee arrived at Alternative #4.

Eileen Rogers stated that Mr. Horton had raised the question about whether the county would even be allowed to release into the natural wetland from the constructed wetland. She asked how we could get Alternative #4 as the recommended alternative when we did not know if we could do it. Al Scalf stated that the letter from DOE pointed that out. Jenny Davis commented that it appeared to be an experimental treatment option, citing the Cle Elum facility as the only one in the state. Dennis Schultz stated that a risk factor was not included in the table.

Bud Schindler stated that it had been pointed out that there was no evaluation of the risks for either the preferred alternative or some of the other alternatives that were using land within the UGA. He stated that we had two alternatives. One, that the UGA Committee advocated, was to try saying that the sewer plan we had was just a concept and we were using it as a lever to get some financial approvals. Whether we used those finances in the way we suggested in the plan was optional; we could choose to go another direction. He stated that what the committee was saying was to put enough flexibility into the plan so that as we gathered more *real* facts, including the risks, it would point to an alternative. He believed that it would not point toward the preferred alternative. He believed that when we gathered all the facts, it would point towards the alternative we should be using. He stated that we needed to look at several alternatives, gather all the data, and make the correct decision. He stated that we did not want to make a mistake; we wanted to make the right decision. He thought we should look at a number of possibilities and then narrow them down to the one that was the most appropriate.

Jenny Davis stated that we could only do due diligence on one of the alternatives. She stated that the committee was recommending not having a preferred alternative. When it got to the next step, eventually someone would have to make a decision, either the Planning Commission or the BOCC. She asked who would make that decision. Bud Schindler stated that there should be a team put together to do that. Al Scalf stated that the plan talked about an implementation team. He added that, ultimately, the BOCC would select the preferred alternative. Mr. Schindler asked if the decision would come back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Scalf replied that he did not think it would. Tom McNerney explained that if the Planning Commission came up with a 20-year sewer plan as part of the total UGA package, and the BOCC adopted it, it would be up to the BOCC, through staff, to hire consultants to do the work. Those actions would not be a land use planning

process that would come before the Planning Commission. He suggested that the Planning Commission could recommend the county take certain steps and recommend a sewer plan with some flexibility in it. As facts were gathered, it may point to a certain direction and away from another. Mr. McNerney stated that, for example, the comment had been made that wetlands held their water. He stated that the sewer plan said that 1,300,000 gallons per day would be dumped into the lagoon. If it did not go down into the aquifer, it would go into the wetland if DOE allowed it. If that much water was dumped into a wetland, it would not go anyplace; it would build a lake. So it might be that the county would be "dead in the water" if DOE did not allow the wetland use. If that was the case, the county would have to look at another alternative.

Phil Flynn provided information on some of the committee's findings relating to the elevations of the wetland and Chimacum Creek. He stated that just as lay people they had come up with several problems and listed some of them. He expressed some serious reservations about the wetland alternative. The question was what the Planning Commission wanted to do with it. He stated that it was unknown whether Indian Island would even want to participate in that alternative. He discussed the improvements to the Indian Island sewage plant, adding that the Navy was proposing it be privatized. He stated that a question was whether the county wanted to get into the sewer business. He stated that the PUD had indicated that they were not in the sewer business and did not particularly want to be. All of that aside, if you could have some engineers sit down with the Indian Island people, it could be that a joint venture to develop a plant there and pipe the UGA sewage to the plant was possible. He pointed out that one of the alternatives was to actually water a large forested area on Indian Island, rather than discharging it into the bay. He expressed a concern that the Hearings Board, particularly with DOE and DOH coming on board with questions, would send the issue back to the county, which would take a longer time.

Bud Schindler stated that, if we put enough flexibility into the plan and called it a concept phase and made a recommendation based on some data, although not necessarily all the data, but it was done for budgetary reasons, if we showed the Hearings Board that the next phase was where we would analyze several alternatives and all of the data, and arrive at a final recommendation followed by an implementation plan, he did not know how they could misconstrue that. He pointed out that the proposed revisions to the sewer plan listed what was included in each of the three phases of planning.

Phil Flynn stated that the question was, then, whether we would have a preferred alternative. Bud Schindler asked whether we needed that to do due diligence and SEPA. Al Scalf responded that the statute said that we did not have to have a specific preferred alternative. However, obviously, if we could conclude on an alternative, it would move us farther down the road to an urban growth area. Jenny Davis clarified that we could submit the sewer plan without a preferred alternative. Mr. Scalf agreed. Mr. Schindler suggested that if there was a rationale and strategy that would get us closer to acceptance of a UGA, but clearly state that the plan was conceptual, and after looking at the data, we may come up with another recommendation. Ms. Davis questioned why we would need to say all of that. She suggested that we just submit the sewer plan with the five alternatives. Tom McNerney stated that the objective would be to have a plan that was flexible enough so that we would not have to go back and do another Comp Plan amendment in order to change it.

Eileen Rogers stated that her problem with recommending Alternative #4 was that, even as lay people, we were questioning it. She noted that we already had a letter from DOE saying they did not know that they would approve putting anything into the existing wetland. She thought it was suicide to recommend Alternative #4.

Phil Flynn asked if the Planning Commission minutes went to the Hearings Board. Cheryl Halvorson replied that they were part of the record that would go to the Hearings Board.

Jim Hagen stated that, even though we may not need one now, eventually we would need a preferred alternative so that we could do an engineering study. He stated that Alternative #2 for mechanical treatment would generate the same opposition, although it would be from a different neighborhood. He stated that the purpose of establishing a UGA, in large part, was for commercial, urban light industrial, and multi-family density. He stated that the proposed location for Alternative #2 was in the future designated urban industrial areas. That would lead right back to the social issues. He stated that the point was that there seemed to be financial advantages, even though we did not need to pinpoint a preferred alternative, because all of this work had been done already. Mr. Hagen stated that the Planning Commission could forward a conceptual plan to the BOCC, but then they would have to form a team to carry forward.

Tom McNerney stated that if the commission forwarded a conceptual plan approach, and the BOCC accepted that, the next phase would be after the UGA was approved as legal. The BOCC would not have to hire someone to do a study before UGA approval. The engineering and other studies would come after. Al Scalf agreed, but stated that eventually we would have to come to a point where we would have to do due diligence on a site. The question was what site. He stated that there was only so much money for that work. However, he understood getting through the Hearings Board and agreed that we did not necessarily need a preferred alternative for that. Mr. McNerney stated that, if we could get through the Hearings Board, we could do a preliminary study of one or more sites to determine which was most feasible from an engineering standpoint. He did not think you would need a complete, indepth study on one site, which would take all the budgeted money.

Phil Flynn stated that we could get an engineering firm to analyze what had already been done. He thought that a firm that had been building sewer systems for years could easily see which alternatives were worth pursuing. He spoke about the Indian Island alternative again.

Bud Schindler stated that he had been a proponent of saying the plan was a concept phase and that you should not put too much stock in it. However, now he was wondering about the effort and the implications of dropping back and just saying "Let's go to Indian Island" as being the safest alternative. He thought the Hearings Board would give that more credence than Alternative #4. He thought the Hearings Board would look at Alternative #4 as an unproven means of treatment and question whether the county should be a "test tube". He wondered whether there was more risk in going to the Hearings Board with Alternative #4 than there would be in just dropping back and going with the Indian Island alternative. Dennis Schultz pointed out that we did not know if we could even go to Indian Island. Jenny Davis stated that would be part of the due diligence. Mr. Schindler stated that this was a concept phase and we would have to go collect more data. If we told the Hearings Board that we were going to collect more data and negotiate with Indian Island, and that

was going to be the direction rather than the constructed wetlands, the Hearings Board was more likely to approve it. He was of the opinion that we would eventually go in that direction anyway and advocated going in that direction now rather than wait until after the Hearings Board review.

Tom McNerney invited comment from Dan Eckstein on the commission's discussion.

Dan Eckstein stated that the Navy had just done an upgrade on their primary treatment plant. They also had two tanks on the north end of the island that they used for the ships. The idea of working with the county to share resources was not new to them. The concerns the Navy always had were having the ability to meet their mission. He stated that when a carrier came in, it brought a lot of "gifts" and they needed to be able to handle it. So they needed to make sure they maintained capacity to handle the mission. He stated that they never got clear consensus that the Navy had priority. What had complicated that was the fact that "big" Navy had said they must privatize their utilities. So all of their water, electrical, and sewer systems were now out on the street in the bidding process. Since that started, he did not know what the current status was, although he could find out. He believed they should be close to making selections, but he did not know who the participants were, and whether there were some private entities who bid on it or if the PUD bid on it. He stated that once the sewer system was awarded, the county would have to get agreement with that entity, not the Navy. He stated that they did have a lot of capacity on the island with the upgrades they had done.

Bud Schindler asked if the Planning Commission making a recommendation to go in the direction of Indian Island would help as leverage to get negotiations going immediately between the county and the Navy. Dan Eckstein reiterated that it would not be the Navy; it would be whoever won the contract. He stated that, obviously, the Navy would want to have a say in it because of the potential impacts on the Navy's mission. Al Scalf stated that the PUD was bidding on the water. He stated that the county asked the PUD to bid on the county's behalf for the sewer system. Mr. Scalf stated that he had asked consultant Marc Horton to get an update on the status of the privatization bidding process. He stated that he would be at a PUD meeting on June 16 to address the same issue. He reported that they were interested in the operation of the urban service. He stated that Marc Horton would provide an update on the privatization bidding process at the Planning Commission's next meeting. Phil Flynn commented that was farther along than the committee had known.

An audience member stated that he worked in wastewater treatment. He stated that a comment had been made about running the effluent into a plant before pumping it to Indian Island. He stated that a preliminary treatment facility was not necessary. Using pumping stations, whatever came through the pipes could be pumped to the island treatment plant.

Chuck Russell stated that there was precedent for such shared resources. He stated that the Navy base on Whidbey Island treated the sewage from the adjoining city. There were also similar situations around the country, so it was possible to do that with the Navy.

Dan Eckstein stated that the big challenge would be that it would take a lot of pumps and a lot of line to get to the island. Bud Schindler stated that assumed that the county would not build a separate facility to partially

treat the sewage before pumping it to Indian Island. He stated that the county knew the Navy had a mission it had to fulfill and we had to take that into account. He thought this may be a totally separate facility. Mr. Eckstein stated the belief that they would have the capacity.

Phil Flynn stated that the county would not be coming to the island poverty stricken. He stated that there would be funds available to enhance whatever system the Navy had.

Dennis Schultz asked whether the Navy would be willing to give up the ground space to put the county's treated wastewater on the ground instead of pumping the county's effluent into the bay. Dan Eckstein stated that it would be a Navy environmental issue. He stated that they had done that on one occasion for an exceptional case. Mr. Schultz stated that we would be talking about permanently dedicating a fairly substantial piece of property. Bud Schindler stated that it would depend upon what treatment process we used. Mr. Eckstein suggested that we should go with the existing process. It could be expanded in the future if necessary. Mr. Schultz asked whether it could be expanded to get more discharge without going through excessive permitting "hoops". Mr. Eckstein stated that their plant was permitted for 15,000 gallons per day, but that had been around for twenty years. He was sure they could get the additional outfall.

Bud Schindler stated that he supported redirecting the preferred alternative to Indian Island, although he did not know how much work that would require and what the political implications were. Dan Eckstein recommended that the commission address two alternatives because the county needed the budgetary implications in the plan. Mr. Schindler agreed that two alternatives could be selected, perhaps the wetland alternative and the Indian Island alternative, but they should be treated equally. He stated that the money for due diligence did not have to all be directed to Alternative #4; the county could use the money in any way it chose.

Dennis Schultz stated that either of the two alternatives could be "shot down" immediately. The Navy could say they would not allow it and the DOE could say they would now allow Alternative #4. Then we would be back with no alternative.

Al Scalf stated that this was the process. If the commission wanted to change alternatives, it should, and staff would amend the plan.

Jenny Davis asked staff what the problem was with the Indian Island alternative. Al Scalf stated that it was difficult to get information about the system on Indian Island because of security reasons. He stated that he got more information from Mr. Eckstein at this meeting than they were able to get from the Navy. He stated that a major problem was records and the function-ability of the system as it stood as they evaluated it prior to going to the PUD for bidding. He stated that the county asked for more time to do better due diligence on the site, but the Navy refused. Subsequently, we moved away from that alternative. He stated that the marine outfall could very well be problematic. The Navy's permit was for 15,000 gallons per day and the UGA figure was much larger. He stated that we understood the Navy's need to be the priority. He stated that under the feasibility issue, the unknowns between the alternatives [Indian Island and Alternative #4] were equal. Ms. Davis stated that since the Navy was under a mandate to privatize, it seemed that they would be open to talk to the county.

Tom McNerney stated that the Planning Commission would not make a decision at this time because the commission would want to read the written comments and the meeting minutes with the oral comments.

Allen Panasuk asked staff what the Hearings Board would need in order to accept the county's work. He asked if staff wanted a recommendation or if something else in the plan would be acceptable. Al Scalf responded that the Planning Commission would not get into the engineering details; it should get into the planning concepts. He stated that his preference was to pick an alternative the commission believed was feasible, met the community's needs, and staff would put in the appropriate numbers in the Capital Facilities Plan. Dennis Schultz stated that there was enough money planned for the Indian Island alternative. Mr. Scalf stated the opinion that the Hearings Board would not be concerned about what alternative we chose. They would be interested in whether we had enough money, the general cost and a financing plan. Mr. Panasuk stated that the reality was that the alternative would probably change.

Tom McNerney stated that the UGA Committee's objective was to make the language in the General Sewer Plan flexible enough so that we would not have to go through another Comp Plan amendment process if we changed alternatives.

Tom McNerney invited final public comments.

Rebecca Lopeman asked if the Planning Commission would consider recommending that any residents with property in Phase I be able to opt out until the rest of the residences were required to hook up. She stated that her property was commercial property in Phase I, although it was used for residential purposes. Tom McNerney stated that he did not believe any single-family residential uses were required to hook up. Ms. Lopeman stated that from what she had read, they would have to hook up. Mr. McNerney responded that he had not read that in the plan. He thought there were some alternative suggestions about who would have to pay and when, but that would be determined later when we got more into the financial phase. He stated that if there was something in the plan that said she would still have to hook up even though they had an adequate septic system, he would like to know where it was in the plan before the next meeting.

Rebecca Lopeman stated that she was encouraged by the Planning Commission recommending putting the study money into some other alternative. Concerning the wetland, she stated that she could speak from her lifelong experience in this county. She stated that the water level went up to the fence of the Lopeman residence many years during the wet season. It also went into the region of Lopeman Road. Her concern was what would happen when the effluent water was dumped into that wetland.

Jason Raines stated that he had lived in the community all his life and his parents before him. He stated that Chimacum Creek flooded about every twenty years and Chimacum Creek Estates would be flooded. If the sewage treatment facilities were put in there, when the floods came, they would have the sewage all over their yards and running down the roads. He stated that land was in a flood zone. It was low land and their houses were not much higher than the wetland.

Chuck Russell stated that it was important in a decision like this to not put off a decision because you did not know everything about all of the alternatives. He thought it was important to choose what the Planning

Commission thought was the most feasible option with the information available.

Tom McNerney stated that the commission would read the written comments and the minutes before the next meeting and come to a decision then. Phil Flynn pointed out that the Planning Commission was on schedule.

Dan Eckstein agreed with Mr. Russell, stating that we did not want analysis paralysis. He stated that if there was a more detailed plan of the project, it would be nice to see it publicly available. Mr. Eckstein stated that he was convinced that the Planning Commission had their best interests at heart and he appreciated that. He offered his help in any way the Planning Commission wished.

Phil Flynn stated that Mr. Eckstein had expressed concerns about some of the costs. He asked if Mr. Eckstein had an opinion about the Indian Island costs. Dan Eckstein replied that, while he would not want to give an opinion at this time, he would be happy to do so at a later date. He stated that, as a taxpayer, the county had already paid a consultant to do the plan. He thought the consultant had enough time and opportunity so that he should have addressed those issues. He did not think that was a good use of public funds. However, we were past that, and we needed to make a decision, and we would have to go back and revisit some of the issues.

Edel Sokol asked about the deadlines for the Planning Commission recommendations on the UGA material. Tom McNerney stated that the commission must make its recommendation to the BOCC on the Comp Plan amendments and the General Sewer Plan at the next meeting. Also, the Planning Commission would hold a public hearing on the UDC amendments on June 16. He stated that the Citizen Task Force and Planning Commission had reviewed that document already. If the commission did not need to revisit it again, the commission could make a recommendation on it on June 16 as well. If the commission could come to a recommendation on all of those issues on June 16, we would achieve the deadline to the BOCC. If the commission did not reach that deadline, the Planning Commission would meet on June 30 to finalize its recommendation. That would still meet the BOCC deadline of a Planning Commission recommendation by July 1.

The commissioners discussed the process for the next meeting concerning written comments received at the next public hearing. Tom McNerney stated that the Planning Commission could make a recommendation. Waiting to make a decision because of receipt of written comments was merely a past practice of the Planning Commission; there was nothing that required the Planning Commission to wait.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

**F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

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

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

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