

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
December 18, 2006

(Note audio tape (#2) dated December 18, 2006
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

(This document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript)

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Dewey at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bill Dewey, Wendy Ervin, Jay Hupp, Terri Jeffreys, Dennis Pickard. Tim Wing and Diane Edgin were excused.

Staff Present: Emmett Dobey, Steve Goins, T.J. Martin.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the October 30, 2006 and November 20, 2006 meetings were approved as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0075) Steve Goins opened the public hearing to consider an amendment to the Belfair / Lower Hood Canal Wastewater Reclamation Facility Plan, including establishing a LAMIRD (Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development) within the North Shore / Hood Canal area for the purpose of extending sewer to that area and providing sewer services to a portion of the North Shore area. The facilities plan update was deemed necessary because of items that were identified in the Belfair Improvement Plan that we needed to address and in addition, the population allocation for the Belfair UGA didn't coincide with the plan as it was currently drafted. It also didn't adequately

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

address the need for addressing the water quality in the North Shore area and Lynch Cove. The EIS has been prepared and it evaluates the impacts for the changes to the facilities plan. The EIS also evaluates the impacts associated with establishing the LAMIRD. *(Steve offered the graphics to explain the area in question).* We would create the LAMIRD to include all these areas that are predominately these small parcels. These are residential parcels developed at suburban standards but are on septic systems. There may be a need to further address water quality issues once the LAMIRD is in place and the sewer is in place, and monitoring would occur. If it is determined we need to study other ways to address water quality issues and if the studies determine that sewerage these areas would improve that, we would have the ability because we've created the LAMIRD to include those. Within the GMA, part of the justification is trying to determine the LAMIRD boundary based on the built environment that existed on July 1, 1990. There's an area above the state park where there are some commercial operations and well as some mobile homes where there seems to be a general consensus that it would be a good idea to have on septic. The LAMIRD is not an urban designation; it will remain a rural area, and it would become RR 2.5. It really doesn't change what they can do from a residential standpoint.

Tom Perry and Molly Adolphson are here as well tonight. Tom was the principle in preparing the facilities amendment and Molly is with Adolphson and Associates, who prepared the EIS.

(#0550) Tom Perry, Murry Smith and Associates, spoke next. We were retained by the county to update the wastewater facility plan for the Belfair area. We started with this project a couple of years back by doing the Belfair Urban Improvements Project, which was a study that looked at the core area of Belfair and all the needed urban improvements. We were in charge of the utility improvements and looking at sewers. Our charge was to initiate the existing facility plan at that time in Belfair to develop some cost estimates to help the county make some decisions. In doing that, we did find two limitations with the existing wastewater facility plan. One was it didn't reflect the current population growth that was anticipated in the Belfair UGA, and two, it didn't define the service area in the North Shore area. The facility plan identified going out to the North Shore and serving an area around the state park, but there was no justification for it at that time. Based on that, we helped them update the facility plan. We prepared the draft to the facility plan, which is the supplemental information. That plan is how do you provide sewers for the Belfair area? We took the new population numbers and considering the potential North Shore service area information to get a wastewater flow to look at what is needed for the Belfair area with respect to sewer and treatment system. We looked at how to collect the wastewater and where do you treat it. *(Tom shows the proposed service area on power point).*

We will provide sewers for the growth that is anticipated in that UGA. The recommendation of the plan proposed is providing a sewer collection system in Belfair that services the core area and along the SR3 corridor. Wastewater will be collected in Belfair and then we propose pumping it up to a water reclamation facility up above Belfair just outside the UGA and land applying the effluent from the facility in an area that is commercial forested. It will be Class A effluent, which is the highest treatment standard that you treat to in a wastewater treatment plant. We've not only identified what the immediate needs are but we've identified how this is compatible with future build out of the UGA. We sized the components in the collection system to accommodate the full build out of the UGA. The pump stations and the force mains were sized for a ten year growth period because the growth projections in Belfair are so large that if we used a twenty year growth projection you would get an unusually large facilities with huge capital expenses that would be difficult to fund for the initial project. This system will require good planning for when you are approaching that ten year limit.

(#0830) Bill Dewey expressed concern regarding Pump Station #2 near Lynch Cove and based on their experience in North Bay when the sewer system went in, one of the pump stations is located adjacent to a creek and it has failed and goes into the creek and has potential harm for the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

shellfish harvest there.

(#0855) Tom Perry noted that was a good point. He explained this is a low spot on the system and so that's where we proposed this station. It is close to Lynch Cove and we are proposing a station that has redundant pumps so if any one pump is out of service is still has capacity to handle all the flow that is anticipated for that station. There will be back up emergency generators that's fixed at that site.

(#0880) Bill Dewey explained that the same explanation was made of the North Bay system and if there's any place to put in a pump station for a twenty year growth system that would be the place to try to do it so as not to strain that system.

(#0920) Tom Perry talked about the fact that that area will have limited growth on that side of the system. On the north half of the system, that's where a lot of the growth will occur so your point of accommodating the twenty year wouldn't be too difficult to add that one station. We've also identified where future pump stations would be as well. We are showing a pressure sewer system coming in up from the North Shore area and connection to up to the treatment plant.

(#1030) Bill Dewey noted some concerns regarding the overlap with the Belfair Bypass and has that been taken into account.

(#1050) Tom Perry explained that our project and the Bypass project are on parallel tracks and we just recently found some information where that Bypass could be so we need to have some discussions with DOT to see what their thinking is. We're looking at obtaining easements outside the WSDOT right-of-way to parallel their right-of-way and to be out of their utilities. We feel there are cost savings to that. Regarding the North Shore area we only sizing for that Part A of the LAMIRD and sizing for that only. The pipe will be sized for that area so if there's a need, we would have to have another parallel pipe down the highway.

(#1200) Wendy Ervin inquired that if you're digging the hole and dropping a pipe of a certain size in there and you know that you're going to have to increase the volume at some point, would it be practical to drop two pipes in that hole, with one of them being capped off and when you're ready for it, it's there.

(#1250) Tom Perry noted that was a common practice and very practical. A lot of time the expense is the initial digging up of the street and disrupting the traffic.

(#1275) Wendy Ervin stated that there's been several years of discussion and now we're coming up on ten years and no action yet. She inquired how much more money it's costing us now rather than if we had gone with the plan ten years ago.

(#1300) Tom Perry noted that the service area has changed and our cost estimated for providing the sewer and treatment facility and going out to North Shore is 33.8 million dollars. What it would have been ten years ago is hard to say. Things are costing more and your dollar doesn't get you as much as it did a few years ago.

(#1340) Bill Dewey brought up for discussion the groundwater resources and the affect on the vegetation.

(#138) Tom Perry explained that when we talk about impacts we look at contaminants and this plant will be a mechanized treatment facility that will treat a number of things but will also guard against problems in the Canal. That's saying that we've designed an irrigation rate in this whole area that looks at the uptake of the vegetation on average for nitrogen and so we're applying it at a rate where the vegetation should uptake that nitrogen component and it shouldn't go to the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

groundwater. This was carried over from the old facility plan where they looked at the area needed for the irrigation system and we looked at the loading rate for nitrogen and then we apply a factor of safety of three. So if we needed ten acres, we'll spray it over thirty acres. We're being very conservative in our application. There will be a water component that will get to the groundwater but it should be relatively free of contaminants in the vegetation. This is the MBR treatment technology.

(#1450) Terri Jeffreys brought up the concern about crossing watershed boundaries.

(#1500) Tom Perry responded that the issue is that this is on a well system. The wells are scattered about but it is taking from the well system drinking water and then it becomes wastewater and then we're applying it to a watershed that goes in a different direction. It's coming out of one watershed and going into another watershed. It's a very minimal amount of water and the issue of changing watersheds is really an issue that's related to stormwater and not to wastewater. This is a common occurrence in many wastewater applications.

(#1550) Wendy Ervin noted that many agricultural crops do well with nitrogen in the soil and do the trees not need it. She inquired about the difference.

(#1600) Tom Perry explained the key is we want to make sure we balance it with the need for the vegetation. If we were actually applying it to a crop we would balance it for the need of the crop or the need to water the crop. We don't want to overload it and push it down into the water table.

(#1650) Steve Goins summarized that the consideration is to establish the North Shore LAMIRD with a Comprehensive Plan Amendment where part of it is sewerred and create policies where we would monitor water quality to determine what we would need to do with the rest of the LAMIRD. Stormwater management would be a part of that and we would establish thresholds to determine whether the system seems to be improving water quality in Lynch Cove.

(#1700) Molly Adolphson, with Adolphson and Associates, spoke about the EIS. This is a Programmatic EIS. That is a different level document than a project level EIS. The EIS is usually the first phase of your environmental evaluation. This is really the foundation of evaluations that will follow. As you can hear from the discussion tonight, there are many elements of this proposal that needs to be finalized. In this EIS we take a broad look at the alternatives and there will be subsequent evaluations under SEPA as more details are known. We did look at three alternatives in the document. We looked at the Belfair / UGA / LAMIRD with the alternative which Tom just described. SEPA does require you to look at alternatives. The other alternative we looked at is the Belfair UGA / LAMIRD and existing Allyn plant. We also looked at the no action alternative. In this case the no action doesn't mean doing nothing but it means that you wouldn't have a centralized wastewater treatment approach in the Belfair area.

So because of the high level of treatment and the proposed application method there are really very minimal impacts to surface or groundwater. The odors will not be noticeable to people or other types of receptors adjacent to the treatment plant. The treatment plant and the application area are located in areas away from any kind of development. Also, the reclaimed water does not have an odor to it. There will be construction related impacts associated with the pipelines. Traffic is going to be an issue associated with construction of these facilities. That along with the utility conflicts will cause inconveniences to the local residents and people on Highway 3. Many of these can be mitigated. There are construction techniques to allow you to avoid digging in the busiest areas but this is something that will definitely be a noticeable impact to the residents. Alternative #2, which sends the wastewater to Allyn, would have higher impacts on these lines because it is a longer pipeline. By collecting the wastewater and sending it to a treatment location, there will be a

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

reduction in bacterial and nutrient loading to Lynch Cove. When installing a sewer type of system, the improvements that you get to water quality resulting from constructing the sewer could be offset by increases in stormwater. As you build the sewers and new development comes in if your stormwater controls are not adequately implemented you could be seeing an offsetting impact from these other sources. That will continue to need to be monitored and managed.

One of the impacts is that they are expensive. The cost of providing the sewer system will be a financial burden for some of the existing residents. We have heard from folks who say that they simply won't be able to afford it and will have to sell and move. That is a consideration. There are financial aids available with low interest loans and as this moves forward there are a number of ways that will be looked at.

(#2000) Terri Jeffreys inquired about the fees of \$155.00 to 225.00 per month.

(#2025) Tom Perry responded that the rates you're looking at we had as part of our planning process looking at potential rates and really taking a look at existing resources. What that rate is telling us is that we have a lot of work left to do before this becomes a real project because those rates are ridiculous. The reality is it's very expensive to put in a new infrastructure. It wouldn't be unreasonable to have it between \$70.00 to \$100.00 after we get some more grants. The cost of operating the system is over \$40.00 a month per connection. The remainder of the fee is for debt recovery to pay off loans.

(#2100) Bill Dewey inquired about the replacement cost.

(#2135) Tom Perry explained that there's no replacement cost factor built into this initial charge because they're so high already. There's some reserve built up but definitely not a replacement reserve.

(#2165) Wendy Ervin added that the fear that people would have to sell their property and move is not a fantasy. During a hearing regarding the Allyn project a lady said her income was \$900.00 a month and they wanted her to connect at \$1,800.00. They county representative said she could make it in two payments. So maybe she wasn't going to have any power or food for two months. This is the kind of insensitivity that some people fear.

(#2195) Molly Adolphson stated that is a real issue. There would likely be some folks who just have to sell. We try to acknowledge that in the document. As we talk about the no action alternative, there are definitely costs associated with the no action alternative. While there are fewer construction impacts there would be continuing water quality impacts.

(#2200) Linda Hoffman, county consultant, stated she was here earlier and spoke on the work plan. She stated she is part of a consultant team that has been working with the county on the facility plan. She has been looking into obtaining additional funding for the construction costs. The ongoing cost of O & M of the system is projected to be about \$45.00 a month. When you look at rates, you establish your rates based on the O & M and the cost to pay off any debt on construction. Right now the county has about 11.2 million dollars of appropriated state money for construction of this system. The projected cost at this point is about 33 million. To the extent that the county gets additional state or federal funds to bring that capital cost, then the county won't need to debt finance it or will have lesser to debt finance, which in turn brings down the portion of the rate that's needed to pay off that debt. The county has been developing a funding strategy to be conducted along with the next phases of this project, which would be engineering, so the next step after a facilities amendment plan is that you go into the design phases. At the same time, you're getting more precise costs and you're coming along with your funding strategy to get more grants and in addition low interest loans. That is what we'll be working on next with the Utilities Department and

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

the BOCC. Once the full project definition is approved, either as it's proposed tonight, or as it's revised.

(#2375) Emmet Dobey stated that we have 11 million dollars now because the legislature took back 4.8 million dollars that is likely to come back so we're really closer to having half of the funding.

(#2400) Linda Hoffman added that two years ago the legislature appropriated 16 million dollars for this project. Then one year ago they took back 4.8 million because this project was not ready to use it yet and they wanted to put that money into upgrading the wastewater systems in state parks along Hood Canal and Puget Sound. That 4.8 million dollars was committed to be restored to us. It is earmarked for this purpose.

(#2475) Jay Hupp inquired if the \$225.00 a month assumes that we've got the 11 million in hand. If we get more grants, it drives down that \$225.00 a month.

(#2495) Emmett Dobey responded that if we can get to double of the funding we can get the fee to around \$100.00. We figure for every million we get in funding we can reduce the fee by \$7.00.

(#2520) Gary Parrott inquired how much consideration was given in this plan to possibly expanding the initial service area from Zone A in the LAMIRD to portion of Zone B to help mitigate some of the initial costs.

(#2535) Steve Goins responded that was initially considered. As the map identifies, the soil conditions specifically in the upland areas don't confirm that they necessarily contribute to the water quality problem in Lynch Cove. With the economic hardship of some of these residents in this area, we thought there might be a lot of resistance to imposing that on them. On the other hand, a lot of the nearshore area presented a more profitable proposition.

(#2590) Tom Perry added that initially they looked at the inclusion of that area as far as the service but in the final analysis we did not so we don't have a specific comparisons to give you at this time. I can say that servicing the existing LAMIRD area does not reduce the cost of the system per user in the Belfair UGA.

(#2636) Molly Adolphson also added that the main purpose of the wastewater system is to serve the UGA and to help achieve the land goals and to help improve and achieve water quality goals. The reason for extending service to a portion of the North Shore is to address water quality problems in part caused by failing septic systems from existing development. It's not to extend urban development out there or to prompt more development than would be allowed to occur under its rural designation. In many communities there is an interest in expanding a service area to reduce the cost of the sewer system. In the case of North Shore, that's not the factor for extending the sewer line there. Any expansion of the service area needs to be based on the same rationale for extending it all, which would be the water quality concerns and the environmental concerns rather than for reasons of reducing the cost of the sewer system.

(#2745) Terri Jeffreys stated that there is discussion about smaller systems in the Hoodspout and Potlatch area and she inquired why that was not an alternative that was considered for this North Shore area.

(#2775) Molly Adolphson responded that was considered and many others prior to having this current facilities plan amendment.

(#2795) Tom Perry stated we were involved in the initial evaluations. We retained a hydrogeologist that helped us evaluate the conditions of those areas to come up with the designations we have

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

here. In doing so, one of the criteria was the lot size and then the depth to groundwater, the type of soils, and discussed this in depth with the county. We looked at advanced onsite systems that would treat for nitrogen, we looked at cluster systems, where you have a group of homes that go to one system for treatment, but what we found in that area is that the high groundwater in that area makes it very difficult for alternative systems to be properly installed.

(#2875) Molly Adolphson added that with the small sites, septics, when they're functioning well, are effective in removing bacteria, but not nitrogen. Even with the advanced treating systems we were finding that in order to try to come up with a system to deal with both bacteria and nitrogen inputs, that the types of systems that were available for onsite just were probably not going to address the issues. They also were almost as expensive as the big pipe solution.

(#2950) Terri Jeffreys stated that what she's read in the press and heard from various people is that we haven't really tapped the federal funding pool yet.

(#2995) Emmett Dobe responded that it's quite the contrary. The prospects are even much higher than they were two weeks ago. We are actively pursuing other ways to obtain funding.

(#3030) Molly Adolphson added that PUD #1 and the Skokomish Tribe have been successful in gaining federal appropriations for what they call State Tribal Assistance Grants for the Hoodspout / Skokomish treatment plant. There has been about six million dollars worth of appropriations so far in that and that's through congressional sponsorship from Congressman Dicks and Senator Murray over previous sessions. Congressman Dicks has indicated very strong concerns about Hood Canal and interest in using his new position in Interior Appropriations but there are a lot of monies so we don't know much might be coming to Mason County for this system. It will be continually pursued.

(#3095) Jay Hupp inquired about Tom's assumptions that the soils and the water table were such that there was a high probability of septic failures in that area, and if that was backed up by any data from the health department.

(#3115) Tom Perry stated they looked at it not with respect to failures but the suitability of the area for septic systems. We collaborated with DOE and the State Health Department and the County Health Department to establish the criteria that lead to that evaluation and to defining those areas.

(#3175) Jay Hupp inquired if the existing septic systems in those particular red areas are in a technical state of failure right now.

(#3190) Tom Perry responded that there is a high probability that they could be contributing to the water quality issues in the canal. This was an overview of the general conditions; not a site by site analysis.

(#3200) Molly Adolphson reiterated that the no action doesn't mean 'no action' because there are new upgraded state regulations for onsite systems so those will need to be complied with in some capacity. In many of the areas that the suitability for septics will be the land use determinate as opposed to your adopted land use plan. Another important consideration is that it's not going to be possible to let failing or nonfunctioning septic systems continue to do that. To upgrade or replace these systems is also going to be a significant financial hardship to people and that there aren't as many financial assistance programs available for individuals as there are for those like Mason County.

(#3275) Bill Dewey stated that to the contrary that in this past year we have been very successful with homeowners to fix onsite septic systems particularly in the canal. Last year it was over six million dollars appropriated by the legislature and the Governor's budget coming out tomorrow has

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

another three million dollars in the program specific to that.

(#3300) Steve Goins summarized that this is a public hearing and this also coincides with the final date for comments on the Programmatic EIS. We do have people in the audience who will wish to comment on these issues. We're not prepared to respond to those comments tonight but we want to take those as part of the public record.

(#3375) Jay Hupp inquired what was the driving argument to use a LAMIRD. When the LAMIRD concept was added to the GMA it was primarily intended to accommodate commercial and industrial in rural areas, not a discussion of residential at all. In this particular case it's totally oriented towards residential to the point that it specifically excludes commercial and industrial.

(#3410) Steve Goins explained that establishing a LAMIRD such as this one is a recognition of the GMA to address built environments that were in place prior to the GMA being in existence. In a case like this there is a number of very small parcels here that were developed in a suburban type setting without any urban services. The GMA has a mechanism like this so that jurisdictions can take care of what might be urban services needs for an area like this that we couldn't plan around the GMA. This will be a residential RAC (Rural Activity Center) technically. We anticipate that as the policy stated that the commercial needs that are there now will be able to exist and even expand if they meet the criteria that is part of the underlying zoning.

(#3495) Jay Hupp inquired if we're going to create this LAMIRD in order to facilitate residential development in this area based upon a water quality consideration why are we excluding commercial.

(#3500) Steve Goins responded that we're not developing this to facilitate residential at all; we're developing it in recognition of an existing development pattern.

(#3522) Jay Hupp further inquired you're excluding commercial because it doesn't currently exist.

(#3555) Steve Goins explained that we're not making this an urban center so there's no consideration for trying to develop at urban levels; we're just trying to accommodate the existing parcel configuration.

(#3575) Jay Hupp further stated that if you're going to allow development, you're going to allow a pattern that currently exists; there is some commercial there, and he inquired why are we excluding commercial from future development and allowing residential.

(#3588) Steve Goins stated this is not in any way an attempt to create something that simulates a UGA. It is a rural residential area that will remain rural residential. The existing businesses are there because they support the limited amount of residences that are in the community. It's not intended to expand either the residences or the businesses. It's not intended to encourage growth in the area.

(#3650) Bill Dewey stated he has been confused as he has read the materials and listened to the presentation tonight about whether we're going to allow additional new development in this North Shore LAMIRD or not. It's presented both ways in the written materials given to us tonight. On page ES-2, under Population Projections, it says 'Therefore, no future development within the North Shore service area will be allowed to connect to the sewer and there will be no growth component associated with the Lynch Cove / North Shore population forecast'. In the Summary, on page 1-7, it says 'Some level of increased development could occur within the LAMIRD, however, because this area is already developed to urban densities, most of this growth would be expected to be redevelopment'. Bill inquired why we're changing it to RR 2.5.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

(#3750) Steve Goins explained that right now there is a predominant zoning of RR 5. There's also some parcels that are within the matrix of the plan that recognizes existing commercial entities that were there prior to Mason County development our Comprehensive Plan and those are zoned RC 1, RC 2, or industrial depending on what's there now. The LAMIRD would establish, instead of an RR 5 zone, a RR 2.5 so these parcels would change in their zoning designation but from a realistic standpoint that really wouldn't change the growth pattern because these parcels are so small already. We would propose that those commercial businesses retain whatever commercial designation they have at this time. The additional development that would likely occur, particularly on the nearshore, which would be sewered. We're changing it to RR 2.5 because in a RAC, that is the land use density the county has adopted.

(#0165) Bill Dewey inquired why it has to be a RAC and not just a LAMIRD.

(#0170) Steve Goins responded we considered what our different options were. There was some consideration of how, from a legal standpoint, do you extend sewer outside a UGA. CTED suggested that this would be a good tool to facilitate that process. A RAC is a type of LAMIRD.

(#0200) Linda Hoffman stated that was a good question in can you have a LAMIRD or RAC that is a RR 5 densities. I think that's something we need to come back to.

(#0210) Steve Goins stated from a practical standpoint it doesn't change any of the lots from being able to be improved.

(#0240) Jay Hupp inquired about the logic behind the attempt to decommission all septic systems within the red zones once the sewer is in place.

(#0250) Steve Goins responded that the plan is built upon the systems being part of the service and the whole idea is to decommission these areas where the probability is high that these systems are contributing to the water quality conditions there.

(#0260) Jay Hupp stated that if this is being based on suppositions and probabilities that these systems are inadequate and if you're going to force people to abandon a substantial investment in an operating septic system, that there would be some caveat in the language that would say that if you can prove your system is operating in an adequate capacity, you don't have to abandon it. We're saying that if someone has a \$30,000 to \$40,000 investment in an operating septic system that's perfectly good someone is going to have to give it up and hook up to the sewer system. I just don't think the public is going to buy that. Is the argument saying this is all intended to deal with nitrogen?

(#0300) Emmett Dobey responded it has both to do with nitrogen and fecal contamination. There are mostly older systems there. I personally don't know of any \$30,000 to \$40,000 investments anyone has made in septic systems in that area. There's older systems and that would indicate in these conditions that you have failures.

(#0333) Wendy Ervin talked about the people in Allyn who were being charged \$1,800 to hook up because they had a failing system. The sewer was known to be coming into Allyn and they were forced by the county to put in a pressure system that cost them \$10,000 and then they were complaining because they put in the pressure system, making payments on it, and then a year later they were being forced to hook up to the sewer and abandon this brand new pressure system that was working perfectly. Wendy inquired if we need to arrange things so people are not abused by their government.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

(#0350) Jay Hupp stated he thinks the language needs to be softened up to the point that when we do find out that if there's a perfectly good system that we haven't locked us into a situation where you have to shut it down anyway because it's going to go right to court.

(#0360) Emmett Dobeay stated that we need to evaluate onsite systems that seem to be working.

(#0365) Wendy Ervin stated that could be on a time table where if it fails they can hook up later.

(#0370) Bill Dewey stated it's a challenging issue. He stated he has seen this in other communities where he's dealt with folks going through the same situation Belfair is and typically we've heard with small communities it's hard to get it where it's cost effective for a sewer system to work so that means everyone has to play. If you start letting a few people out suddenly the cost gets further out of range for everybody that's left. Jay's point is also duly noted. Let's open it up for public testimony.

(#0400) Gary Parrott from Lynch Cove testified first. He stated he will talk about the blue zone. I think too much of this has been based on supposition and probability. We're at a cross roads right now and that for me is when this sewer starts going in. Every piece of information I read or every meeting I go to starts where it says this proposal is based on a 2002 declaration of severe public health hazard. When I researched it I couldn't find that there's such a thing as a declaration of severe public health hazard. I searched all the websites and finally found it on the DOE website. It tells you how to apply for water quality funding grants. If you get declared a public health hazard, you can get 170 points on your water quality funding application. The declaration doesn't mean you have to do anything or prove any water quality issues, you just declare. That's what happened in 2002 and it got us a lot of money. We did a lot of good things with that money. We repaired the main polluter, which was Belfair State Park. We made people replace systems and the two RV parks are no longer in business. We did get wonderful results. We have been doing a survey since 1992 in which we take oyster meat samples all up and down the canal and we send it to a laboratory and we get the results back. The level of fecal chloroform in oyster meat is 230 fecals/10 grams of oyster meat. When we started out in the early 90's we were getting 1500 here and in front of the Belfair State Park it was 4900. The improvements can be tied to the efforts that were made from the money from that 2002 declaration. It's interesting to look at the declaration. I've included that in the materials I've presented to you. You can see how out of date and how out of touch that is. The declaration cites on data at all. It just says 'Onsite sewer systems at 52 of 102 homes evaluated were either failing or suspect'. It doesn't tell us if the failing systems were repaired or even taken out of the data. We don't even know if those systems were in the red zone. That's a huge statistic. I just talked to DOH shellfish division and in all of 2006 there are no failing readings taken in here. We're talking about reading in the single digit numbers all through here. Swimming beaches only have to be under 200. What you don't see in this plan is any revelation of the kind of water quality we have now. You have statements that lead us to believe the Lynch Cove is completely unfit for human recreation. In 2002, when the declaration was given, there wasn't a no-swimming sign at Belfair State Park. So this declaration does not apply today. The Hood Canal Coordinating Council and Salmon Enhancement Group are doing photo imaging to see where all the impervious places are. When you get imperviousness beyond 20% to 25% the community starts to really suffer because you're getting stormwater runoff from that developed area and it upsets the biochemistry and the microbiology of your saltwater communities. What you're going to get beyond the 20% of new homes is all the places that you abandon the septic tanks and you can put in tennis courts, parking areas, walkway because you no longer need the drainfields. That has all got to be figured in. Property will change hands. Right now there are a lot of these little lots that have one bedroom cabin on them and they're limited by regulations. Once that sewer comes out the developers and the realtors will be out there and they'll want to buy that property, resell it, and put up a three bedroom home with a garage and there goes the permeability and there goes the water quality. Nobody pays any attention to the stormwater runoff. That's what is impacting our water quality. I

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

think we're rushing the situation here as far as nitrogen is concerned. We need to wait on that information before we start building the sewer as a nitrogen reduction system. The potential sewerage of Zone 2 calls for doing Zone 1 first and then taking measurements to see how well our levels are and then, if needed, sewer Zone 2. That's a great idea but why don't we apply that to Zone A. If you stop and think right now we've got single and double digit levels so how much more can we possibly improve it? It just seems to me that there's a disconnect between data we have now that I presented to you and the suppositions that the planners are putting out.

(#0975) Ken VanBuskirk of Belfair spoke next. He stated he would like to second Mr. Parrot's comments. He stated he lives at the north end of the proposed sewer service area. He stated he has commented on the EIS. Urban services in the UGA are supposed to be efficient and I don't know that putting the sewer in before anything else is really efficient. I think putting the Bypass in before anything else would be more efficient. The 10% growth rate that Tom mentioned is unrealistic. He looked at the zoning and the population allocations but I don't think that he looked at the unsuitability of the land in regards to wetlands, critical areas and the buffers that are in that northern area. It has been talked about that the fees will be between \$155.00 to \$225.00 a month but I haven't heard anything about the hookup fees and that was \$12,300.00 just to hook up. Land values have skyrocketed in the Belfair UGA and part of that is due to the talk of this sewer. Along the same lines it is an economic hardship for people in the Sand Hill School area. I look back at the history of the Allyn sewer system and they had a declaration of health hazard in 1990. DOE approved the plan in 1994 for a sewer treatment facility. Sewer there began construction in 2000. The project was completed in 2002. The cost of that system was 22 million dollars. I just heard their rates went up again. The interesting thing I noticed about that Allyn system was that Allyn wasn't declared a UGA until after the sewer was put in. You have a tough decision to make for a recommendation.

(#1135) Bruce Landram from Belfair spoke next. He is co-owner of 38 acres of commercial shellfish and clams. There's quite a division in the blue zone here with the river. (*Bruce shows areas on map*). One side has always been cleaner than the other. On page 1-1 of the summary it mentions twice addressing the declaration of a severe public health hazard. On page 1-11 of the summary it says 'because of the designation as a public health hazard in 2002'. On page 201 of the summary it says 'the severe public health hazard remains in effect at this time'. It also says 'The shellfish areas adjacent to Belfair State Park and Lynch Cove have been closed since 1990'. That is an incorrect statement. The beaches have been opened because of what Gary talked about. Under the plan of no option that was explained. Bruce inquired about the no action alternative.

(#1230) Molly Adolphson reiterated that the no action alternative would cover both no action in the LAMIRD as well as the UGA.

(#1250) Bruce Landram stated that we have to do something because of the GMA requirements. So we don't have a 'no option' option.

(#1265) Steve Goins explained that a plan of no action or a determination there's no desire to have a sewer system in Belfair would probably result in the county being remanded to change the land use designations in the area and remove the UGA.

(#1300) Bruce Landram stated he hopes we don't sewer things where we don't need the sewer. When we get to actually get to digging up the road, I would ask this board to consider trying to capture that six or eight or twelve feet for a bike trail that's in addition to however we widen Highway 3. Bruce inquired if anyone lives north of Mason County, where they would go through Belfair every day. He strongly begged the committee to recommend doing the Bypass first. It's already chaos right now without the disruption of the construction.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

(#1365) Bill Dewey closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#1400) Terri Jeffreys inquired what the status of the stormwater policies was.

(#1425) Steve Goins stated that they are about to commence a stormwater management plan for the Belfair UGA. That plan will be brought to you mid 2007. We have a plan for the Allyn UGA that is in its final stages and that will probably be brought to you prior to the Belfair plan. This is onsite and collection systems. At the last meeting we considered policy changes to our Comp Plan to address stormwater and water resources. Collectively there is a lot of focus on stormwater countywide.

(#1475) Wendy Ervin inquired if in the LAMIRD we decide not to sewer it that does not affect our GMA compliance.

(#1500) Steve Goins stated we are not mandated by GMA to sewer the LAMIRD. We are, however, mandated to sewer the Belfair UGA.

(#1515) Wendy Ervin inquired if it was possible to create the LAMIRD and not sewer it.

(#1520) Steve Goins responded that it is possible to create it and not sewer it.

(#1525) Wendy Ervin inquired if we could just draw the lines on the map and leave it for another day.

(#1530) Steve Goins replied that is an option that is available.

(#1540) Jay Hupp inquired about the earlier discussion about the hookup fees.

(#1550) Tom Perry stated they have calculated a hookup fee but the hookup fee is associated with new development coming in. So the rate that we've identified as a potential rate given the level of financing today is based on total costs for existing residents in Belfair. There's not a hookup fee in addition to that for existing. The hookup fee was calculated because as you develop a system like this it will accommodate growth. So as a new developer comes in, if he develops five homes, he will be charged a certain amount to pay his fair share of the system capacity. There is a connection fee that was estimated in the plan of around \$13,000.00 per connection fee for new development. For existing there's no connection fee calculated into that. That is built into that rate component. The range of \$155.00 to \$225.00 is the range given the current level of funding and different approaches on how to finance the project. There's a whole range of options on how to finance this. That figure also include the cost of digging the trench and physically hooking up the sewer.

(#1650) Emmett Dobej added that they are trying to give up front the worst possible case scenario.

(#1700) Wendy Ervin inquired if anyone had a response on the findings Mr. Parrott was quoting on the fecal chloroform.

(#1715) Steve Goins responded that we are preparing a response to all the comments that have come in on the EIS and they will be made available as part of the final EIS.

(#1725) Molly Adolphson stated they are anticipating getting the final EIS completed by the end of January.

(#1740) Bill Dewey added that we're continuing our hearing until January 8th so we won't have the input of those responses for the meeting. Bill inquired if there was a reason we had to continue this until January 8th, or could we postpone it until we had that input.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, December 18, 2006

(#1765) Emmett Dobey responded that the review of this is really fairly limited to the LAMIRD issues and the policies associated with the Comp Plan. There's nothing that would prevent you from making a recommendation before those comments have been reviewed, but we are on a fairly tight schedule. The county really is trying to make some progress on improving the water quality in Hood Canal.

(#1800) Bill Dewey stated in response to that if one of the rationales for recognizing this LAMIRD is founded in the public health declaration I would be interested in hearing some specific responses to that issue before we make a decision.

(#1815) Emmett Dobey responded that we will be in the process of trying to contact DOH to respond directly to those questions.

(#1850) Bill Dewey stated when you're sewerage a LAMIRD, his understanding is that only the existing development can have sewer. You can't accommodate growth. Bill stated his concern is when you expand a development, you can fix your problems as far as septic concerns but you can't accommodate the new growth. I appreciate Mr. Parrott's comments regarding the redevelopment issues with impervious and pervious surfaces. We could be reversing all the good we think we're trying to do out there.

(#2000) Motion made and seconded to continue this hearing until January 8, 2007.

(#2050) Emmett Dobey made an announcement that Steve Goins has accepted an outside position with the City of Shelton as their Community Development Director. This will give us an opportunity to open some new doors and also continue our professional relationship with them.

(#2100) Steve Goins noted that it has been a pleasure to work so directly with the PAC. I'd like you to continue the good work that you do.

Meeting adjourned.