

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR JUNE 16, 2004

- A. OPENING BUSINESS
- B. PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS FOR PORT HADLOCK/IRONDALE URBAN GROWTH AREA, MLA#04-30
- C. DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION TO BOCC ON GENERAL SEWER PLAN, COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS, AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS FOR PORT HADLOCK/IRONDALE URBAN GROWTH AREA
- D. ADJOURNMENT

A. OPENING BUSINESS

The regular meeting was called to order at the WSU Learning Center at 6:35 p.m. by Chair Tom McNerney. Planning Commission members present were Phil Flynn, Eileen Rogers, Edel Sokol, Bud Schindler, Jim Hagen, Allen Panasuk, and Jenny Davis. Dennis Schultz was excused.

DCD staff present were Al Scalf, Josh Peters, Kyle Alm, Marc Horton and Mark Personius, UGA consultants, Christina Pivarnik, public outreach consultant, and Cheryl Halvorson, secretary.

There were about twenty members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were Sandy Mackie, R. Lopeman, D. Eckstein, Daug Herrington, Dave and Peggy Johnson, Marianne Raines, J. Cambalik, Puget Sound Action Team, and Christopher Floro, U. S. Navy.

The minutes for May 19, 2004, were approved as submitted.

The Chair invited staff updates.

Al Scalf thanked the Planning Commissioners for their extra work on the various committees. Because the BOCC saw how much work the Planning Commission was doing and saw the need for staffing the commission, they had authorized DCD to advertise for the vacant Associate Planner position.

Al Scalf stated that the county was always interested in improving the permit process. To that end, the county was going to contract with a consultant to audit the DCD permit processes and make recommendations for improvements.

Al Scalf stated that the county had received a 180-day extension from the Hearings Board for the UGA work.

B. PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS FOR PORT HADLOCK/IRONDALE URBAN GROWTH AREA, MLA#04-30

Tom McNerney invited a staff presentation on the proposed development regulations for the UGA. Kyle Alm provided a brief presentation on the process for drafting the development regulations. He summarized the issues that were addressed in them: zoning regulations and districts, use table, building dimensions, setbacks, signage, landscaping, etc. Mr. McNerney asked how long the development regulations had been available to the public. Mr. Alm replied that they had been out since May 19. Josh Peters stated that the formal notice was dated June 2.

Tom McNerney read the rules for the public hearing process. He particularly noted that written testimony should be provided to the secretary before the close of the hearing because the Planning Commission would go into its deliberation process shortly after the close of the hearing. He then opened the hearing to public testimony.

Sandy Mackie, representing the owners of the Hadlock Inn, thanked the staff, stating that they had been participating in the process. He stated that the Hadlock Inn was an important part of the urban growth area. He stated that he understood that the Hadlock Inn had been included in the sewer service area, adding that they certainly supported that. He stated that the owners had been upgrading the hotel and planned to be an active participant in the urban growth development. He also thanked staff and the Planning Commission

for re-introducing the Visitor Oriented Commercial district because, for a recreational, tourist related use like the Inn, it was a much more appropriate zone than the General Commercial Zone. Mr. Mackie stated that he had a few questions to ask, just by way of clarification. He stated that a hotel/motel was a permitted use within the zone. He stated that his understanding was that it was not a "residential use" for density purposes. It must meet floor area ratios, building height and density requirements, but it did not go to the 7 to 24 units per acre density calculation. He stated that the reason he said that was because the building was already at about an acre and he thought it exceeded the 24 units per acre standard. Concerning the 7 to 24 units per acre, he asked if there was a minimum lot size specified. He stated that the nature of their site was such that they may have some residential in addition to the hotel. He was not sure how you would calculate it if that was a minimum density. He asked if it was an overall density factor or if there was a minimum density that went with it, again assuming that it would be hooked to the sewer. He thought it would be useful to have a clarification on that issue. Mr. Mackie referred to Table 2-1, Density and Dimensional Standards. He stated that it included Minimum Setbacks from Minor Collectors, Major Collectors, Minor Arterials, and Principle Arterials. He stated that a recreational, tourist facility like theirs may have internal streets that were private streets. His question was whether the Public Works Department had the authority to vary the setback requirements on private streets. He asked if there was a separate private street standard. If not, he suggested that the Planning Commission may want to add a category for private streets and suggested a 10-foot setback, unless Public Works determined that additional standards were necessary. He stated that, otherwise, it would tend to push property right out onto the beach, and you did not want to do that. You wanted to be able to set back close onto the street and sidewalk. The yard function would be met because it would be part of an overall larger community. He stated that they thought it was more important to have a setback from the water rather than setting back and having a traditional front yard. He reiterated that they suggested a 10-foot setback for private streets unless Public Works believed an addition was required.

John Cambalik, Puget Sound Action Team, congratulated the Planning Commission on a good reliance on, and reference to, the DOE 2001 Stormwater Management Manual in the stormwater management component of the development regulations. He also congratulated the commission on being consistent with the Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan in the stormwater provisions.

Dan Eckstein, Port Hadlock, addressed the sewer plan. He stated that he had done some detailed consideration of the cost figures in the plan. He stated that the plan had done a very good job on the costs even though it was a rough estimate. He stated that he still thought the major element that was lacking in the study was the immediate communication with the affected community, particularly about the potential for environmental impacts. He stated that the study itself admitted that there were potential hazards to public health with the potential contamination of the aquifer. He stated that the Planning Commission had heard most of the issues before. Decline in property values was a big factor that had been left out of the study. He thought there were others from the community who would echo his concerns.

Marianne Raines, Port Hadlock, echoed what Mr. Eckstein had said, stating that she had the same concerns as were expressed at the previous hearing. She stated that she was glad to see the article in the newspaper stating that there was a possibility of considering an alternative site as the preferred

site. She stated that she would like to see that come to be and not just be a possibility. She stated that all of her concerns were still the same, biological and social, as at the previous hearing.

There being no further public testimony, Tom McNerney closed the public hearing on the UGA development regulations.

C. DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION TO BOCC ON GENERAL SEWER PLAN, COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS, AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS FOR PORT HADLOCK/IRONDALE URBAN GROWTH AREA

Tom McNerney opened the discussion on the development regulations, although he acknowledged that most of the public present were interested in the sewer plan. He assured the public that the Planning Commission would discuss the General Sewer Plan next. He stated that the Planning Commission UGA Committee and the UGA Citizen Task Force had worked on the development regulations for quite some time.

Edel Sokol raised an issue concerning the building height standards on Table 2-1. She suggested that the standard be 70 feet in the commercial and light industrial districts instead of the 55 feet proposed.

Phil Flynn asked Mr. Mackie about the height of the Alcohol Plant. Sandy Mackie replied that the main part of the building, including the elevator, was right at 55 feet, but the penthouse and the old storage area were 70 feet. He stated that they did not plan to go above that. Tom McNerney stated that the concern was that, if the building was already above the limit, it would be considered a legal, nonconforming use. Mr. Mackie stated that he would then ask for clarification that, to the extent they did not increase the amount of nonconformity (in other words, they did not build another penthouse), but they could continue to build within the 55-foot envelope. He stated that if the penthouse would be grandfathered at the 70-foot height and they could continue to develop the rest of the building at the 55-foot height, it would be acceptable to them, although he was not opposed to increasing the height standard to 70 feet.

Jim Hagen advocated for the 70 foot standard, stating that he would also include the UHDR [Urban High Density Residential] district. He proposed that all of the 55-foot standards be changed to 70 feet. He stated that there was already the precedent for a building of that height with the Hadlock Inn.

Jenny Davis asked about the height standard in Port Townsend. Edel Sokol replied that it was 55 feet in the downtown. There were other standards in other zones in Port Townsend. Phil Flynn stated that some areas of the Port property allowed taller buildings.

Phil Flynn stated that the new building being constructed on Sims Way in Port Townsend was 35 feet. He suggested the commissioners consider a building like that being built on Nesses Corner. Mr. Flynn stated that citizens had indicated a strong preference for retaining a rural feel in the UGA; they did not want it to be truly urban. That was the reason the committee recommended 55 feet.

Tom McNerney asked Chuck Russell, a member of the UGA Citizen Task Force, for his feeling about what the Task Force had wanted. Mr. Russell replied that it [the height standard] was voted in by a majority but it was not unanimous.

Edel Sokol stated that people kept talking about how small the UGA was and how there really was not enough room to do everything we wanted to do in the UGA. She stated that we talked about the lack of housing and the expense of housing. Ms. Sokol stated that you had to go up in order to make it affordable, because there was not a sufficient land base. She stated that the only way to protect the rural area was to put people into the UGA. It would provide the opportunity for the UGA to grow. She stated that the more people you had in the UGA, the more chance the businesses had of being successful.

Allen Panasuk asked why we would have a limit at all. He thought that if a Marriott came along and bought the Alcohol Plant and wanted to build a 12-story hotel, they should be able to do that. Tom McNerney stated that the question corresponded with the feeling of some citizens on the Task Force. However, others felt there should be a limit. Mr. Panasuk stated that part of his thinking was that Jefferson County was not awash with money, so the county should be open to businesses that would bring in revenue.

Bud Schindler stated that there were energy economies if you built tall. If the land value was cheap enough, then you could build out. He stated that 55 feet was a lot of room. If people chose to go beyond that, he thought 70 feet sounded fine. He doubted whether we would find many people who would want to build that tall for quite a few years, but maybe we would.

Eileen Rogers asked again about the existing height of the Alcohol Plant. Sandy Mackie stated that he knew it was taller than 55 feet because they had a 5-story elevator. Then there was a full story above that. He estimated that 70 feet was probably pretty close.

Al Scalf advised the commission that, in the shoreline jurisdiction (within 200 feet of ordinary high water), there was a 35-foot maximum building height through the Shoreline Master Program. Mr. Scalf stated that any project over 4,000 square feet and 20 parking spaces would go through SEPA analysis. The fire district would be consulted and asked to comment on the proposal and offer any conditions or mitigations in the area of fire fighting.

Phil Flynn asked what the impact would be on traffic of a 5 to 6 story building. Al Scalf replied that the traffic impacts had been addressed for the multi-family. Mr. Flynn stated that the issue was the Hadlock Inn development, however, which could increase the number of rooms substantially, and with that the amount of traffic. Mr. Scalf responded that he did not think it had been addressed at that scale in the Public Works transportation piece.

Josh Peters suggested that another option would be to set a certain limit as an allowed use and then to have a conditional use for a taller building, say 55 to 70 feet. He stated that the transportation impacts had been analyzed for what was proposed as allowed uses. A conditional use would be allowed, although it would be a different type of permit process. It would have to meet certain criteria, including fire protection, transportation, and setbacks. He stated that, as Mr. Scalf had indicated, you would have that under SEPA anyway. He stated that a conditional use permit would go through a Hearing Examiner process. Then the commission could set a standard that anything beyond that would require a variance, which was typically more difficult to get. Some commissioners thought that would just add a lot more "red tape", and the commission was trying to reduce that.

Edel Sokol moved that the height limit standard be increased in the UC/VOC, UHDR, ULI, and P districts to 70 feet. Jim Hagen seconded the motion.

Jenny Davis stated that it was important for the Planning Commission to consider the public input at the open houses. She stated that there was a vote taken where the majority recommended the 55-foot standard. She thought it was very important to listen to the public.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried with five in favor and three opposed.

Edel Sokol raised a concern about political signs and the timing that they would be allowed. Al Scalf stated that the UDC currently said that political signs could be installed 60 days prior to any election. Ms. Sokol suggested that staff look into the issue because there was a court decision that would apply. Tom McNerney stated that, if it was based on a court decision, it would overrule the UDC. Jim Hagen stated that the pertinent section was 6.15, Signs, under #2, Exemptions, #g, political signs.

Edel Sokol moved that political signs be removed ten (10) days after any election with no limit on the time they may be posted prior to an election. Allen Panasuk seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried with seven in favor and one opposed.

The commissioners reviewed the questions raised by Sandy Mackie during his testimony. Tom McNerney stated that one had to do with the density and whether a hotel would come under high density housing or whether it would be considered a commercial property and not be subject to the densities of high density residential. Al Scalf stated that he could not answer that question at this time. He offered the opinion that all of Mr. Mackie's questions would take some staff review and a recommendation back to the Planning Commission. Mr. McNerney suggested that the Planning Commission make a recommendation about how the commission wanted the issue treated.

Tom McNerney moved that hotels be treated as a commercial property and not as high density, multi-family housing. Allen Panasuk seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried with seven in favor and one opposed.

Tom McNerney stated that another question raised had to do with setbacks on private streets, whether they would be the same as for public roads. Al Scalf stated that part of the question was whether Public Works had a different standard for private streets. He stated that the answer was "No". He stated that Table 2-1 listed the standards and it was currently listed as 20 feet. Mr. McNerney asked for clarification about whether the table differentiated between private and public streets. Sandy Mackie stated that the table talked about "Minor Collectors", adding that typically private streets did not have a designation. That was what raised the question. Mr. Scalf agreed. He stated that Table 6-1 of the UDC listed a designation of "Local Access Road". He stated that was typically where staff would put private drives. He stated that the standard was currently 20 feet. Mr. Scalf stated that staff had no objection to changing it to 10 feet. Edel Sokol stated that she would even support a 5-foot setback, if you were talking about a village. In that scenario, you could have a sidewalk and the house right there.

Al Scalf stated that there was an exception in a situation where a lot would become unbuildable through the strict prescriptive requirement of a front setback. In that case, the Administrator may reduce the front setback to essentially match the constraint. Tom McNerney stated that the commission was trying to get away from too many interpretations by the Administrator so that people would know where they stood. Mr. Scalf stated that he agreed with that sentiment completely.

Jim Hagen asked if language could be written to specifically cite private streets. Al Scalf stated that the minimum road standard came from the Fire Code, which said a minimum of 20 feet wide and 13 feet 6 inch clear height. Tom McNerney stated that the issue was the setback from the road, however. The street itself would have to meet those standards. Mr. McNerney stated that Mr. Hagen's question was whether language could be added to clarify the status of private roads rather than including them with Minor Collectors. Josh Peters stated that UDC Table 6-1 included private roads with "Minor Collector" and "Local Access". Mr. McNerney suggested that, for purposes of the UGA, the commission could recommend that Local Access roads should be 10 feet, and make them separate. Mr. Scalf stated that we did not have a definition in the UDC. He thought we would have to ask Public Works to develop a definition. He cited the types of roads Public Works termed "Minor Collectors". They included Anderson Lake and Cape George Roads. Mr. McNerney stated that Local Access roads would be different. Mr. Scalf agreed, stating that staff could support adding "Local Access Roads" to the matrix and make it 10 feet. The commissioners and staff discussed differences between rural standards and urban standards.

Eileen Rogers moved that the setback on private access roads be 10 feet and that it should be in the matrix separately from Minor Collector Roads. Phil Flynn seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The next question raised by Mr. Mackie was whether there was a minimum lot size that went with the minimum density. Sandy Mackie stated that the minimum density was seven units per acre. His question was whether there was a minimum lot size that went with that. He stated that where they were blending both the hotel and residences, he was not sure how you would count it, because they would not have ten acres with 70 units on it. He wondered whether the net density for the whole acreage would meet the intent or whether they would have to meet it with every structure. Mr. Mackie suggested that there be a footnote added to Table 2-1 for the VOC district, stating that density was calculated on the overall project and not parcel by parcel. He explained that the table listed 7 to 24 units per acre as the allowed residential density. He stated that normally when you had 7 to 24, you were required to get 7 units per acre. Al Scalf stated that we made no minimum lot size. Mr. Mackie suggested that, in that case, it might be useful to have a footnote to clarify that was an overall density requirement and there was no minimum lot size. He thought he would not be the only person who would "trip" over that density. Tom McNerney clarified that the suggestion would be for an additional footnote on Table 2-1.

Tom McNerney moved that Table 2-1 contain an additional footnote that density did not imply a minimum or maximum lot size. Allen Panasuk seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

There were no other questions or discussion relating to the development regulations. Tom McNerney suggested that the commission should not finalize its recommendation on the development regulations because other revisions may

become necessary when the commission reviewed the Comp Plan amendments portion of the package. He suggested that the commission could approve it in general now, however. Then when the commission had approved the Comp Plan amendments, the commission could reaffirm its recommendation on the development regulations.

Edel Sokol moved to approve the UGA development regulations as the Planning Commission had amended them pending the final recommendation on the Comp Plan amendments. Eileen Rogers seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The Planning Commission moved on to discuss the General Sewer Plan. Tom McNerney invited Christopher Floro, a U. S. Navy representative, to make his comments about the Indian Island alternative.

Christopher Floro stated that he was representing the Navy concerning Indian Island. He stated that one of his purposes was to set the record straight after the recent news articles. His second purpose was to talk about what was happening with regard to the sewage treatment plant and infrastructure at Indian Island. He stated that he wanted to set the record straight regarding comments that were made about the sewage treatment plant at Indian Island. There were comments made in the news article that there were no records and there was no accuracy as to what was being done at the sewage treatment plant. He stated that was false; there were records on the plant's operation. Mr. Floro stated that the second thing he wanted to address was the Navy's direction in the Northwest towards privatization. He stated that the Indian Island infrastructure, including the sewage treatment plant, were under consideration for privatization. He stated that they were currently going through a source selection process. He stated that he could not provide the details on that as it was sensitive under federal acquisition negotiations. He stated that they were in discussions with respondents to their request for proposal [RFP]. He stated that the privatization entailed the sewage treatment plant and the infrastructure whereby the Navy was trying to divest itself from operating and maintaining the plant. It had nothing to do with adding to the volume. He offered to answer any questions he was able.

Tom McNerney asked if there was anything secret about who or how many entities responded to the RFP. Christopher Floro responded that there was; it was determined to be sensitive information. He could not tell the commission if there was one or if there were twenty entities that responded. He explained the selection process the Navy went through. Based upon what they found, they would proceed to the next step and engage in a discussion about whether to ask for revised proposals or clarifications regarding the proposal.

Jenny Davis thanked Mr. Floro for coming to the meeting to answer the Planning Commission's questions. She stated that she gathered from Mr. Floro's comments that his impression was that the Planning Commission had some kind of negative feeling towards the possibility of being able to use the Indian Island plant. Christopher Floro responded that was not the case. He stated that there were comments made in the newspaper about the fact that the Navy did not have accurate records regarding the sewage treatment plant. He wanted it on the record that was not correct. Ms. Davis stated the opinion that none of the commissioners were coming from that perspective. She thought that where the commission was coming from was that the commission was really hoping there was an opportunity for sewage treatment on Indian Island for the UGA. She stated that one of the alternatives in the General

Sewer Plan discussed shared services with the Navy base. She stated that what the commission really wanted to know was whether that was a possibility. Mr. Floro stated that, unfortunately, he could not speak to that specifically because the technical data package talked about serving the Navy only. He stated that, as they went through their discussion with an entity or entities, it was an issue they could discuss. They could talk about what possibilities there were from that respect. He stated that, unfortunately, he could not discuss the specifics of it because they were in the procurement process.

Eileen Rogers stated that she was certainly glad to hear that the Navy maintained records on the sewer plant. She stated that it sounded like the Navy had put out an invitation to entities to respond to privatization. She asked if Mr. Floro could speak to how long the process would take.

Christopher Floro replied that they were at a point of verifying and validating the proposals. At this particular juncture, they were in the process of determining discussions that would be required to get clarification on the proposals and engage the proposer to take it further. He stated that the timeframe was that the discussions would take place over the next few weeks. They would have to make a determination as to whether revisions were required or subsequent proposals were required, and then literally start to talk one on one with a particular entity. Ms. Rogers asked if it would become public knowledge at some point. Mr. Floro replied that it would. He stated that they were under a Congressional and DOD mandate to have a decision made by September, 2004, for a certain percentage of their systems. By September, 2005, all determinations must be made about whether to privatize specific systems or to exempt them. He explained that there were two aspects of exempting a system from privatization. One was if it was uneconomic and the other was if there was a lack of market interest.

Al Scalf suggested that the Planning Commission ask Marc Horton to provide the background on the county's submittal to the Navy. Phil Flynn stated that the understanding was that it was really a placeholder kind of thing. Tom McNerney suggested that the commission wait until the commissioners had finished their questions of Mr. Floro.

Phil Flynn asked if the Navy's discharge permit had lapsed. Christopher Floro replied that they were not allowed to have a permit lapse. Mr. Flynn asked about the permitted volume. Mr. Floro replied that he did not have that information at his fingertips, but all of the specifics were in the technical data package that the county had privy to. He stated that they based their proposal on that technical data package. Mr. Flynn asked if it would be possible to see the plant. Mr. Floro replied that it was possible and would need to be done through their Public Affairs Office. Mr. Flynn asked for clarification about the September, 2004, date. Mr. Floro replied that what he had indicated was that they were working on two milestones. By September 30, 2004, the DOD was required to achieve a certain percentage of determinations of whether they would pursue privatization on individual systems or not. By September 30, 2005, that percentage was 100%.

Bud Schindler stated that he heard two things about the permit for the marine outfall. He asked that staff and Mr. Floro get together to determine the right answer.

Tom McNerney invited Marc Horton to present his information. Marc Horton, Economic and Engineering Services, stated that he worked with Jefferson County and the PUD in preparing submittals on the Navy infrastructure on

Indian Island. He stated that the permit information was in the data package. He stated that the permit had expired. He stated that it was not unusual for permits to be expired. He stated that it was not unusual for the EPA and/or DOE to let the date lapse; they had just not gotten around to the issue yet. The permit was valid until it was revoked. He stated that it was expired, however, and it needed to be reviewed and re-issued. He stated that it was expired at the time of the technical data package. If it had been re-issued since then, they did not know it. Concerning the submittal on behalf of the county, Mr. Horton stated that the reason a placeholder bid was used was because, at the time [a year ago], the county did not know what was going on relative to the sewer plan. At the time, the PUD was interested in pursuing the total infrastructure package. However, a ways into the process, they decided they did not want to pursue the sewer side of it. Then he went to the county to see if the county had an interest. Subsequently, he put a package together for the county to submit. Phil Flynn stated that the county's proposal was possibly one of several proposals.

Phil Flynn asked for Mr. Floro's business address. Christopher Floro replied that it was Engineering Field Activity Northwest, 19917 7th Avenue NE, Pouslbo, 98370.

Al Scalf asked if the Navy's existing system could be enlarged to serve a UGA and whether the Navy would be interested in that. Christopher Floro responded that he could not answer that at this time. He stated that there was no plan for expansion at this time. However, as part of a discussion in developing a proposal, if the county or whomever was involved in the process brought that to the table as a consideration for the overall infrastructure, it could be considered. He could not say that it would be part of the package. Mr. Floro stated that capacity of the plant would certainly play a large role along with what privatization might yield in terms of operation and maintenance costs, capital improvements, etc. He stated that all of that had to figure into any kind of economic analysis. He explained that, just as a matter of process, the Navy would divest itself from the infrastructure, but there would be an O&M contract that would be established.

Tom McNerney asked if all of the Navy's utilities were out for privatization. Christopher Floro stated that there were three utility systems that were out under the RFP: the water, wastewater, and electrical.

Al Scalf asked if the Navy would consider an alternative type of sewer treatment on the island in lieu of the outfall, using land disposal instead. Christopher Floro replied that, again, that was a specific detail that he could not discuss. Mr. Scalf stated that you would also operate from the assumption that, if sewage treatment was privatized, they would also want to cooperate with the utilization of that utility. Mr. Floro agreed.

Phil Flynn stated that the Planning Commission had heard that the Navy would require a priority clause. Christopher Floro stated that, if there was to be any kind of consideration for outside sewage treatment, there had to be a guarantee that the Navy capacity would have to be maintained.

Bud Schindler stated that his interest was tweaked about the county's proposal. He wondered whether the county should be interested in the details of it, or maybe it was too late to consider whether it was a good deal or what kind of a deal it was. He stated that he had not seen anything on it. However, if there was an advantage to the UGA, he thought the commission

should know more about it. He wondered whether it was something the commission should consider or not.

Tom McNerney stated that there were five alternatives before the Planning Commission. The original draft of the sewer plan listed a preferred alternative. However, the UGA Committee had worked on it and recommended the idea that there should be no preferred alternative and the Navy proposition should be one of the alternatives. He noted that the Port of Port Townsend had submitted a letter to the county proposing siting the sewer facility at the airport. While it was too late for the Planning Commission to consider that as an alternative because there was no background on it, it was possible for the commission to make a recommendation to the BOCC that a sixth alternative be added to the plan before they made their decision. Then the staff and BOCC would have six alternatives from which to select a preferred alternative. Mr. McNerney stated that the RCW said that we should have a preferred alternative "if appropriate". The question was what that meant. He suggested that the county could take the whole UGA package to the Hearings Board without a preferred alternative in the sewer plan, but with five or six alternatives, with the stipulation that the county would work on those alternatives in order to make a decision about which one would be preferred. The engineering report could go forward after the BOCC made its decision. That would give some time to explore the airport and Indian Island, because, obviously, it would take a little time to come to a decision on Indian Island. Mr. McNerney asked if that was something that was possible. Al Scalf replied that it was.

Bud Schindler stated that he did not know if there was an advantage for Jefferson County to win the proposal because of the proximity of the UGA, or whether it made any difference who won the proposal. He thought that if there was an advantage to Jefferson County, we should be right on top of it. If there was no advantage, then he thought the county could deal with that in the future when an announcement was made. His question was whether there was an advantage. Al Scalf thought there was. Mr. Schindler stated that if there was an advantage and the county lost that advantage, one of the alternatives became much weaker. Tom McNerney agreed, stating the belief that the county would not be the time factor; it would be the Navy.

Allen Panasuk agreed with Mr. McNerney's suggestion to go forward with the five alternatives and recommend adding the sixth, along with any others that may come forward. He stated that the bottom line was what was the best proposal? He stated that the point was that the commission did not know what the best proposal was. Tom McNerney agreed that we should be open to the best we could find.

Jim Hagen asked for clarification about Mr. Schindler's comments about the advantage to the county. Bud Schindler responded that if it was an advantage to Jefferson County to have the Navy's facility because of the UGA, the county should put in the most competitive bid on the proposal that it could.

Tom McNerney stated that the Planning Commission UGA Committee had been working on the details of the General Sewer Plan. He noted that the commission had received copies of proposed changes dated June 10. Also the UGA Committee had met on June 15 and had additional revisions to present. He asked Mr. Schindler to list those additional revisions.

Bud Schindler referred to the last sentence of the Introduction on Page 5-1. He suggested adding a sentence stating "Costs will likely change as new information is developed."

Bud Schindler proposed a revision on Page 5-3 under 5.4, System Costs/Repayment. He suggested that the first sentence be revised to indicate that the costs were more generic. The commissioners agreed that "preferred alternative" should be deleted. It was pointed out that the baseline costs were from Alternative 4 and were contained in Chapter 2 under the capital facilities section. Some commissioners advocated deleting Alternative 4 altogether.

Al Scalf stated that the Hearings Board would go to Chapter 2 and look at the table on the capital facilities. He stated that the GMA required capital facilities. He stated that the table in Chapter 2 tied back to the General Sewer Plan.

Tom McNerney pointed out that the costs in Table 5-1 and Table 5-2 on Page 5-3 of the sewer plan were based on Alternative 4. All of the capital costs were based on that alternative. He stated that everything would have to be reviewed again if we wanted to change it. It would necessitate revising the Capital Facilities Plan as well as the General Sewer Plan.

Al Scalf stated that Marc Horton would like to provide the reasons why a preferred alternative was necessary. Tom McNerney thought Mr. Horton would tell the commission that the statute said we had to have a preferred alternative. However, if we had to do that, we would have to go back to ground zero and start over again because we did not now have enough engineering knowledge and factual information to pick a preferred alternative. Mr. Scalf stated that what had been discussed recently was to drop back a step, not select a preferred alternative, show a Capital Facilities Plan that said we would do due diligence on a number of alternatives, and then select a preferred alternative, finalize the General Sewer Plan and proceed with the Capital Facilities Plan. Mr. McNerney stated that one of the County Commissioners had said there was no way we could get done by going back and re-doing the General Sewer Plan.

Bud Schindler stated that the Planning Commission had already agreed that this would be a phased approach. This phase, which would be finalized, was the concept and development phase. The next phase would determine a preferred alternative after we had done due diligence. He stated that, at this stage, we could not have a preferred alternative, although we could have a baseline alternative to use for financing.

Edel Sokol asked Mr. Horton why the words "preferred alternative" should be in the plan. Marc Horton responded that it was based on his interpretation based on his 30 years of experience, 20 years of which were working for DOE and the EPA and interpretation of DOE WAC 173.240.050. Under Sub k, it said that "... various alternatives evaluated and the determination of the alternative chosen, *if applicable* ..." [emphasis added]. He interpreted the "if applicable" term to mean that you could have a General Sewer Plan with only one approach, so there were no alternatives. He stated that you must have one because under Sub 2 it said "The General Sewer Plan must be sufficiently complete so that engineering reports can be developed from it without substantial alterations in concept and basic considerations."

Marc Horton discussed what he thought Mr. Scalf was trying to get to, which was the separation of the GMA requirements from the General Sewer Plan requirements. He stated that the GMA required the county to develop a Capital Facilities Plan and an analysis of infrastructure needs into the future. He thought what Mr. Scalf was suggesting was that it was possible to do a Capital Facilities Plan that had sort of a blanket analysis, using a range of money. It was possible to set the General Sewer Plan aside for a period of time. He thought Mr. McNerney would suggest that period be quite short. However, for GMA purposes, the Capital Facilities Plan would meet the Hearings Board requirement for a UGA. That Capital Facilities Plan could include completion of the General Sewer Plan, which would fall into next year. That was the GMA requirement. The General Sewer Plan requirement, in his opinion as well as others, was an evaluation of alternatives and the selection of a preferred alternative because you then needed to move on to an engineering report. The question he thought the commission was struggling with was how to move along from here, today. Mr. Horton stated that one suggestion was to drop back and for the Planning Commission to send on the sewer plan with the instructions that, as far as the analysis of the alternatives was concerned, no preferred alternative was selected. The commission was recommending to the BOCC that they evaluate one or two other alternatives, whatever the Planning Commission may recommend, and that they then consummate that in another version of the General Sewer Plan prior to BOCC adoption. That way the BOCC would have to hold another public hearing but the Planning Commission would be out of the process. The BOCC would have to wrestle with what the preferred alternative was and actually select it. He thought that was probably the only way to get it done in a short time period. If the timeframe was extended into the fall, it would give time for it to come back before the Planning Commission. Mr. Horton stated that the other alternative he thought about was to put the General Sewer Plan into next year and strip this plan down to make it simply an alternatives report. He reiterated that, for GMA purposes, a General Sewer Plan was not required. It was a separate statute; but prior to construction of a sewage treatment plant, you had to do it. However, it did not have to be done to satisfy the Hearings Board.

Tom McNerney asked Mr. Horton if he had read the section of the Hearings Board order that said the county must complete its planning, especially the sewer planning. Marc Horton responded that we were doing sewer planning, but the order did not say a General Sewer Plan. He stated that we would have a Capital Facilities Plan related to sewer, covering a range of alternatives, but no General Sewer Plan.

The commissioners returned to the discussion about Section 5.4 on Page 5-3. Phil Flynn stated that Alternative 4 was the least expensive. He suggested that the plan merely say that the least expensive of the alternatives was used as the baseline but still not select it as the preferred alternative. Bud Schindler agreed that was one option. He thought another was to make the plan more generic and include some range to the numbers. Tom McNerney stated that doing that would necessitate revising the whole plan as well as the Capital Facilities Plan. He stated that if we merely used Alternative 4 as the baseline numbers, we would not have to go back and re-do the numbers in the rest of the plan.

Tom McNerney stated that anyone could see from the Planning Commission's discussion that the commissioners were not favoring Alternative 4 in any way. Just because Alternative 4 was the one used to calculate the figures in the plan, it would not mean anything in particular. Also, we would not have to

go back and re-calculate all of the figures in the plans. He stated that there were five alternatives in the plan, and Alternative 4 was just what the costs were based upon. He asked if the other commissioners could accept that.

Jenny Davis stated that she understood the dilemma. There had been a lot of work done on it and a lot of expense. Then it came to the Planning Commission and received public input. The Planning Commission did not like it, but because so much effort and money had already been spent, the commission did not want to have to go back and re-work it. The commission just wanted to tweak it a little and send it on. She stated that was her take on what was happening. She supported re-working the numbers. Edel Sokol asked which alternative Ms. Davis would select as the preferred then. Ms. Davis stated that she did not want to re-write the document.

Phil Flynn stated that he did not understand why we could not just use Alternative 4 as the baseline because it was the cheapest. There was nothing wrong with that. He stated that price was just one aspect. He stated that the public had said it may be the cheapest, but it was also the worst.

John Hagen asked, since the commission was not recommending a particular alternative and we did not want to go back and re-work all the figures, whether the commission could suggest using a median figure. That approach was not favored by some commissioners.

Allen Panasuk stated that Mr. McNerney and Mr. Flynn were both on the UGA Committee and he was not. The point was to get something through, but we had no idea what would work. While we had to have something to meet the requirements of the GMA, the Planning Commission, not being engineers, did not know which alternative out of five might actually work. Tom McNerney stated that sending it back to re-work the numbers would not provide any more information unless we started doing engineering reports on the alternatives.

Josh Peters stated that, in terms of re-working the numbers, there were a couple of levels. If we took a preliminary step of re-working the numbers such that the Capital Facilities Plan focused on the most expensive alternative and not the least, from a GMA standpoint in terms of capital facilities financing, that would be sufficient. If we picked the most expensive scenario and figured out how to pay for it and it later turned out that a less expensive alternative was preferable, it would be perfect because we had already figured out how to pay for something more expensive. He reported that Mr. Horton had indicated that it would not take that much work to make that kind of change. Mr. Peters stated that staff could schedule another meeting with the Planning Commission and provide another draft with those more expensive figures, or the commission could simply send it on to the BOCC with the recommendation that the Capital Facilities element include the analysis for the most expensive alternative. Either way, we would be moving on from a GMA perspective and leaving the General Sewer Plan and the subsequent engineering report unfinished, but we would be moving along towards finishing it.

Bud Schindler asked how much time it would take to make the changes. Marc Horton replied that it would take less than a week. He stated that we had all the numbers for all of the alternatives. He stated that the obligation was to say that we had evaluated those alternatives and we had a Capital Facilities Plan to accomplish sewer treatment for the UGA. He stated that another alternative was to use a range of costs. That was up to the Planning

Commission's preference. The Capital Facilities Plan could be completed using either the most expensive alternative or using a range of costs. He stated that the question for the Planning Commission was what to do with the General Sewer Plan. If the commission wanted to complete it this year, the commission could send it on to the BOCC without a recommendation, saying that the commission was not happy with the alternatives and wanted others explored and leave it for them to figure it out. Or the commission could set a timetable that would allow for alternative development. Mr. Horton reminded the commission that there was a Technical Review Committee of engineers who had reviewed the sewer plan. They would have to be brought back together again as we moved through alternative development. It would take a little time and he could not say exactly what that might be. He stated that it was conceivable that the county could have a General Sewer Plan re-worked, revisited and adopted this year under some scenario. However, that was different from dealing with GMA and the requirements for a Capital Facilities Plan.

Tom McNerney asked for clarification about Mr. Horton's proposal. Marc Horton stated that he was not proposing to change the General Sewer Plan. The Capital Facilities Plan would be changed as the GMA requirement. He stated that the commission could forward a memo addressing the General Sewer Plan expressing the view that it needed more analysis. He stated that from a GMA standpoint, the county was required to do general sewer planning. That was the obligation. The Capital Facilities Plan was to show how much money was needed and where we would get the funding. We could show both of those things, using a range of alternatives including the most expensive. He stated that the Planning Commission could also forward a memo stating that the Planning Commission did not want a preferred alternative in the General Sewer Plan or that the commission did not want Alternative 4 included. He supported removing Alternative 4 if the Planning Commission felt that strongly about it. Mr. McNerney stated that the commission intended to forward a letter to the BOCC to accompany the documents. Mr. Horton stated that it got "messy" when you started changing the wording in a document because you may get into things that could actually make it inaccurate.

Jenny Davis stated that the GMA requirement was to have the total costs in there [the Capital Facilities Plan], not the details of the sewer plan. So the alternatives were to keep the plan as drafted using the Alternative 4 figures, or changing it to use the most expensive alternative figures. Al Scalf stated that there were five alternatives in the General Sewer Plan and the most expensive was Alternative 2. Ms. Davis thought that it made sense to put the most expensive alternative in. Mr. Scalf stated that what he was worried about was what was in Chapter 2, Page 2-16, for the 6-year capital facilities plan. That was where the Hearings Board would look. That matrix was what Mr. Horton was talking about changing in a week. He stated that the matrix started out with the engineering report. He suggested it could be revised so that the first piece was to do due diligence (examine the alternatives). The next piece in the logic would be to do an engineering report on the selected alternative. Tom McNerney stated that would all be done after the Hearings Board had done its review. Mr. Scalf suggested a few other revisions to the matrix. He stated that the Hearings Board wanted to see a commitment to build the urban service. They would not go into the specifics of where the sewer treatment should occur; that was up to the county.

Josh Peters referred to the sewer plan adoption issue. He stated that he understood that Mr. McNerney was talking about adopting the sewer plan now.

He stated that there was statute that said if you adopt a sewer plan, it should be part of the Comp Plan. Also, Mr. McNerney was concerned about meeting the Hearings Board order for capital facilities planning, especially sewers. Mr. Peters stated that, when we adopted a sewer plan as part of a Comp Plan amendment process, if we subsequently wanted to revise it, it would take another amendment process. Secondly, the adopted sewer plan must be approved by the state. That could be problematic from the standpoint of the sewer statute if the adopted sewer plan was so vague that we did not say what we would actually do. Mr. Peters stated that staff had discussed figuring out a way to finish the GMA work and leave the sewer plan adoption itself to a later date, which could be this year depending upon the direction of the BOCC. He stated that staff was not sure it would be accepted by the state if the county adopted a sewer plan the way the commission was suggesting.

Tom McNerney described a scenario in which the Planning Commission would adopt a sewer plan with five alternatives, but no preferred alternative, and send it to the BOCC. The BOCC may decide to add one or more additional alternatives, still with no preferred alternative. Then you would do due diligence to figure out which alternatives would actually work. He did not think the Hearings Board would object to that. Concerning the DOE approval, he stated that the statute said they had to adopt it, but it did not say when. It may be that their approval could wait until after the county had done some engineering evaluation of the alternatives and picked the one that would work.

Jenny Davis asked at what point the state would get involved. Al Scalf replied that the General Sewer Plan had already been submitted to the state as a draft. Josh Peters stated that it was submitted as a draft proposal for comments. He stated that it would be re-submitted after it was adopted. Mr. Scalf clarified that it would be re-submitted after adoption but before the engineering report.

Marc Horton explained the reason for the due diligence phase under Alternative 4. He stated that it was because the county was interested in pursuing purchase of the land. He stated that was usually done as part of the implementation of the project and not done prior to an engineering report. He stated that the phases of sewer planning were the General Sewer Plan and the engineering report. The kinds of studies that were planned for the site would actually be part of the engineering report. He described the issues an engineering report would address.

Josh Peters asked when in the process DOE would approve the sewer plan. Marc Horton replied that it was after the county approved it. Mr. Peters stated that the process was: (1) the county approved it; (2) the state approved it; and (3) then you would go on with the engineering report. Tom McNerney stated that, inbetween times, you would do an evaluation to see if the alternative was practical. If that turned out not to work, then you would move on to another alternative. Mr. Horton responded that if, in fact, you got to some fatal flaw during the process, you would back up and amend the General Sewer Plan. Then, because the General Sewer Plan was part of the Comp Plan, you would docket it for the next amendment cycle. He stated that would be true for any of the selected alternatives. He stated that it really did not bother him too much because he thought we were looking at a multi-year implementation process. So, there was time to do the due diligence on any of the alternatives. Mr. Horton stated that, even if we decided to add the airport alternative, there were still issues, such as wetlands and aquifers, that would have to be addressed. He stated that there were issues

with any of the alternatives. Whichever one we selected, we may find as work proceeded that it was not feasible for one reason or another. Then you would have to amend the General Sewer Plan through another Comp Plan amendment. That was just the way the process was set up.

Tom McNerney stated that Mr. Horton was talking about a process similar to what he was proposing - using several alternatives and doing enough analysis to see which ones were not feasible and which had more potential in order to arrive at a preferred alternative. Marc Horton stated that the county was not obligated to send the sewer plan to DOE for approval until the county was ready.

An audience member asked about the costs for the other alternatives and how Alternative 4 was selected as the preferred alternative. Marc Horton explained that all of the alternatives had costs in the plan but only Alternative 4 was used in the financing plan.

Bud Schindler stated that he liked the suggestion to use the most expensive alternative figures and to put them in Chapter 2. However, Chapter 2 said that the source of the data was the UGA sewer plan. Therefore, the sewer plan would have to be adjusted as well so that it would be consistent with the Chapter 2 data. Marc Horton responded that he would not throw the General Sewer Plan out. It just was not approved by the Planning Commission and it may not be approved by the BOCC. He stated that the record had the commission's deliberations on the plan, plus the memo from the Planning Commission to the BOCC that would be written. He stated that he could also provide a memo to the Planning Commission with the breakdown of the costs for Alternative 2 (the most expensive). That would be part of the record as well. He stated, however, that there was a lot of work in the General Sewer Plan that was perfectly valid from a GMA standpoint. If the Hearings Board wanted to see that the county was doing its "homework", the General Sewer Plan was a good example of looking at options for the UGA. The fact that the commission was not happy with the alternatives as they currently existed was just part of the process. He thought the Hearings Board would like that; the fact that the commission was deliberating on the alternatives and listening to the public.

The commissioners returned to the discussion of the first sentence under Section 5.4, System Costs/Repayment, on Page 5-3 of the sewer plan.

Edel Sokol moved that "preferred alternative" be deleted from the first sentence so that it would just read "Alternative 4". Allen Panasuk seconded the motion.

Bud Schindler suggested a friendly amendment stating "Preliminary system costs for the purposes of this analysis are those for the basic system under Alternative 4." The amendment was accepted.

Jenny Davis stated that she could not support the motion because she would not support retaining Alternative 4 in the plan. She stated that she would only support deleting Alternative 4 completely.

The motion carried with six in favor and two opposed.

Upon further consideration, Tom McNerney moved that the first sentence read "Preliminary system costs for the purposes of this analysis are based upon

Alternative 4." Phil Flynn seconded the motion. The motion carried with six in favor and two opposed.

Bud Schindler moved that the next sentence be split into two with some additional revisions to read: "These estimated costs are those necessary to provide the basic infrastructure for the respective service area. A phased implementation was assumed based on the number of potential customers." Edel Sokol seconded the motion. The motion carried with six in favor and two opposed.

Eileen Rogers moved to delete "preferred" from the second sentence in the second paragraph and replace it with "this" so that the sentence would read "... for the various phases of this alternative, ...". Edel Sokol seconded the motion. The motion carried with seven in favor and one opposed.

Tom McNerney stated that other revisions to the General Sewer Plan recommended by the UGA Committee were handed out at this meeting. He entertained a motion to accept the sewer plan.

Bud Schindler moved that the Planning Commission accept the General Sewer Plan as revised and distributed at this meeting. Phil Flynn seconded the motion.

It was noted that there was no date on the document but it should be dated June 16, 2004.

The question was called for. The vote on closing discussion failed, so the Planning Commission continued its discussion.

Eileen Rogers stated that she had set on the UGA Task Force that reviewed the sewer plan and appreciated all the hours that the committee members spent on it. She stated that she could not support the motion on the basis of Alternative 4. She stated that she would like to see it out of the plan. While she understood the reasons for not taking it out, she wanted to be on record that she was disappointed in the document. She could not understand why the Technical Review Committee could recommend it as the preferred alternative. She also was concerned that we did not have the foresight to look at the neighborhood and communicate with them. While she supported the UGA and wanted it to be done on an adequate timeline, she could not support including Alternative 4 in the plan.

Jenny Davis stated that she appreciated the committee's work on the plan as well. She stated that she could not support the motion either because of the inclusion of Alternative 4. She understood that the process would look at the alternatives. However, after hearing the public's concerns, she thought the alternative should be removed from the sewer plan, even though she understood it would take a lot of additional work.

Phil Flynn stated that the committee would have taken the same position with Alternative 4 even without the public input. He stated that the committee did not feel it should be taken out of the plan, however. He did not think the alternative would be viable.

Tom McNerney stated that the committee had discussed Alternative 4 the week before the hearing on the sewer plan and before the public came out in force against it. The committee had considered the issues that had been raised at the hearing. He stated that the committee decided to leave Alternative 4 in

the document because of all of the intertwining throughout the document to it. It would have required rewriting the document and moving back the adoption schedule. The committee thought the Planning Commission could forward the sewer plan with Alternative 4 in it along with the commission's recommendation citing the commission's concerns about it. He stated that the commission had to include findings of fact with its recommendation. He stated that he would propose a motion for some findings of fact to explain the reasons the Planning Commission felt the alternative was not suitable. He stated that the committee only proposed leaving it in to prevent having to slow down the UGA process. Mr. McNerney stated that the main objective was to get the UGA done and approved and in operation. The sewer plan would take two or three years and a lot of study before it would be done. He did not think it was worth stopping and regrouping at this time and to lose the momentum. He thought it was important to send a report with the Planning Commission's recommendation that explained the commission's thoughts on Alternative 4. He reiterated that he did not think it was the proper time to stop and regroup.

Marianne Raines asked a procedural question. She asked if the sewer plan would go to the BOCC with no preferred alternative. She asked if the BOCC had the option of selecting whatever alternative they wanted and going ahead with an engineering report on it. She understood that it would not come back to the Planning Commission and asked if that was correct. Phil Flynn replied that she was correct. Ms. Raines stated that the Planning Commission's concerns may never be addressed then. Tom McNerney stated that the commission's concerns had already been expressed to the BOCC informally and they would be expressed formally in the commission's recommendation. He stated that even if the Planning Commission recommended taking out Alternative 4, the BOCC could put it back in. He stated that the BOCC would consider the Planning Commission's report and recommendation, and then they would make their own decision.

The question was called for. There being no objection to going to a vote, the motion carried with six in favor and two opposed.

Tom McNerney invited public comments.

Dave Johnson, Port Hadlock, stated that the commission had asked for public input and they had diligently tried to provide what they felt was some fair public input to the alternatives that were selected. The sum total results of that effort was that the commission had dropped one word out of the document, "preferred", and nothing else had changed. He stated that it seemed to him that the Planning Commission had the opportunity to put a little more force behind its recommendation than just dropping the word "preferred" from the plan and saying something to the effect that "Alternative 4, while it was used as the baseline, should be dropped from further consideration because of ..." and list the reasons. He stated that it seemed like all the commission had done was ask the citizens to go forward and pursue their cause with the BOCC. There was no other way for them to get that input to the BOCC or to know that they were going to come back to the Planning Commission to hear that input. He stated that now the citizens had to start "hammering on the Commissioners doors." He thought the Planning Commission had not met what he had thought was the objectives by trying to utilize the input they gave.

Tom McNerney stated that the BOCC received the Planning Commission minutes, which were very detailed, and they read them thoroughly. Therefore, anything

that had been said at the Planning Commission would be seen by the BOCC shortly after the Planning Commission's meeting. Dave Johnson stated that the Planning Commission had nonetheless passed up an opportunity to make a recommendation that Alternative 4 be dropped from further consideration. That was a recommendation the Planning Commission could make. Mr. McNerney stated that was something that would be included in the commission's report to the BOCC that would accompany the UGA documents. He stated that he would propose that the Planning Commission support a finding that it did not like the preferred alternative and the reasons for that, which would be included in the accompanying report.

Dan Eckstein, Port Hadlock, stated that he found it fascinating that as a team the Planning Commission left the language in the plan for the alternative it did not support. He questioned why the Planning Commission just did not strike it now. It would save the commission a lot of grief and it would save the BOCC a lot of grief. He supported the views of Ms. Davis that, if the alternative was left in the plan, it would get carried forward. He stated that as it left the Planning Commission's purview and moved into the next, they would not be worried about the commission's accompanying letter or comments. It would appear that was the commission's choice, however. He thought the BOCC would look at it and think that it had the least cost and the Planning Commission left it in the plan, so it must be the right idea and decide to move on it. He thought this was the Planning Commission's opportunity to really speak the commission's mind and to put it in the sewer plan and not in an accompanying letter. Concerning making the changes, he did not agree with the idea that it would take a lot of time. He stated that he was able to make a detailed cost analysis of Alternative 4 in one day. He supported Mr. Horton's suggestion to use the most expensive alternative and work backwards. He thought it could be done in a couple of days. He stated the belief that adjusting the plan to accommodate Alternative 2 would not take a long time. Mr. Eckstein stated that his real concern was that to meet the timeline, the Planning Commission had jeopardized the interest of the community. That may be a mistake. While he appreciated the effort the commissioners had made, he felt the plan was what would carry the real weight, and Alternative 4 was still in it.

Chuck Russell stated that the Indian Island alternative was more than just the treatment plant the Navy had there. If that did not work, the real estate of Indian Island was still the best alternative to locate a treatment plant because there were no neighbors there. That hinged on whether the Navy would let us do it, however.

A Chimacum Creek Estates resident thanked the Planning Commission, stating that her sense was that the commission did take in the comments that had been provided by the public. However, she was still concerned that the sewer plan was basically unchanged. She stated that on the one hand, the Planning Commission was concerned about losing momentum; but on the other hand, the Chair had said a sewer had been talked about since 1980. She thought it should be worth the effort to change the document, especially if it would only take a couple of days.

Tom McNerney stated the belief that she misunderstood. He stated that to change the sewer plan, it would take 60 days. Marc Horton stated that everything in the document was open for discussion. He stated that he would almost prefer that the Planning Commission reject the entire document. Or, if the Planning Commission did not want Alternative 4 in the plan, the commission should just say so and recommend taking it out. He stated that

what we could do for UGA purposes was to adjust the Capital Facilities Plan to reflect either a range of costs or the highest cost. That would be very easy to do. He stated that there was other documentation before the Hearings Board that we were in the middle of sewer planning. There's been good public process. He clarified that he did not suggest rewriting the sewer plan document. That would be cumbersome. He did not think it appropriate since there were other alternatives that people wanted to have examined.

Rebecca Lopeman, Port Hadlock, stated that she had sung the Planning Commission's praises to a County Commissioner because it seemed the commission had really listened to their concerns. Now she was concerned, because that County Commissioner had said that he would rather miss deadlines than go forward with the wrong plan. She hoped the Planning Commissioners shared his sentiment that having the right plan was the top priority for their community.

Peggy Johnson, Port Hadlock, supported the commissioners who wanted to throw Alternative 4 out. She stated that this was a decision that we would have to live with for a very long time. She stated that she was supportive of looking at the airport because she thought the sewage treatment plant should go somewhere where somebody wanted it. She stated that she was not sure the commissioners wanted to de-value their homes. While other people may move into their homes, she was not sure that was what the Planning Commission wanted to accomplish.

Bud Schindler stated that he had heard the comments that the Planning Commission had not really changed anything in the sewer plan. He stated that the committee had made many recommendations for revisions to the sewer plan, but he did not think the members of the public had seen them.

Dan Eckstein stated that if Alternative 4 was still in it, he could not support it. He asked why it was not removed. Tom McNerney stated that it would take at least 60 days to make such revisions. Edel Sokol stated that if the Planning Commission had recommended that the airport alternative be added, it would necessitate another public hearing before the Planning Commission, which would take additional time. She stated that every alternative had to be vetted. She stated that somewhere along the line, we had to pass something to get the UGA going. She stated that she did not know which alternative would go forward. She stated the opinion that no one knew at this time.

An audience member stated that she was originally from Germany and they were very advanced with their sewer systems. She stated that they never put them where there were residential developments. She stated that there were other alternatives that were away from the residential areas. She supported finding an alternative where the sewage treatment facilities would be away from people.

D. ADJOURNMENT

Due to the hour, the commissioners discussed whether to continue their discussion or whether to continue with another meeting on June 30. Tom McNerney stated that the Stormwater Plan had met with some concerns from the UGA Committee with some revisions Public Works had proposed. Also the line-in, line-out amendments needed to be reviewed as well as completing Chapter 2 of the Comp Plan, including the Transportation and Stormwater Plans.

The commissioners agreed to hold another meeting on June 30 to finish its review and recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

These minutes were approved this _____ day of June, 2004.

Thomas McNerney, Chair

Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary