10/21/10 - Navy Meeting
11/9/10 - Stakeholder Workshop
Dec ‘10 - Community Interviews
12/6/10 - Public Meeting
1/13/11 - Council Workshop
1/20/11 - Press Release
3/9/11 - Council Workshop
3/22/11 - Council Meeting
4/12/11 - Public Meeting
5/2/11 - Survey Report
6/1/11 - Ch 10 TV Broadcast
7/13/11 - Navy Meeting
7/27/11 - Council Workshop
8/10/11 - Press Release
8/24/11 - Public Meeting
9/20/11 - Council Meeting
9/28/11 - Council Meeting
2/7/12 - Council Meeting
3/30/12 - Rotary Meeting
4/11/12 - Council Workshop
4/17/12 - Council Meeting
June ‘12 - Charrette Invitations
7/2/12 - Press Release
7/12/12 - Council Workshop
7/31/12 - Council Workshop
8/14/12 - Council Meeting
8/15/12 - Press Release
10/16/12 - Council Meeting
11/20/12 - Council Meeting
Additional Public Input
3/6/2013 – Public Meeting
Agenda

- Introductions
- Project Goals and Objectives
- Facilities Planning Process
- Identification of Potential Sites
- Environmental Process for Potential Sites
- Summary/Next Steps
Project Goals and Objectives

Recognizing that the City of Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City’s goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements.

- Meet treatment goals identified in the Puget Sound Action Plan developed by the Puget Sound Partnership
- Use a sustainable process to select a sustainable treatment alternative
- Implement the alternative according to the City’s schedule (Startup/Commissioning in 2017)

Facilities Planning Process
City of Oak Harbor Team

Key Team Member                     Project Role
Eric Johnston                       City Engineer/Project Manager
Paul Schmidt                        City Administrator
Cathy Rosen                         Public Works Director
Steve Beebe                         Operations Manager
Larry Michaels                     Wastewater Treatment Plant
Mayor, City Council                Decision Making and Policy
Project Scope is Divided into 9 tasks

Task 100 - Project Management
Task 200 - Prelim. Alts. Development and Screening
Task 300 - Final Alts. Development and Screening
Task 400 - Outfall Evaluation
Task 500 - Reuse Opportunities
Task 600 - Facilities Plan
Task 700 - Environmental Review and Documentation
Task 800 - Public Process Support
Task 900 - Management Reserve

Overall Project Schedule
Alternative Development and Decision Making Process

Initial site identification considers all potentially viable sites...
Alternative Development Matches Viable Sites and Processes

- Alternative components
  - WWTP Process Option
  - Candidate Site
  - Outfall/discharge Option

Triple Bottom Line Principles Guide Decision Making

- Social Impact
- Economic Impact
- Environmental Impact

U.S. EPA P3: People, Prosperity and the Planet
**Triple Bottom Line + Technical (TBL+) Framework for City of Oak Harbor**

**Technical**
- Reliability
- Flexibility
- Safety

**Financial**
- Capital $ NPW

**Social**
- Noise/ Odor Issues
- Visual Impacts
- Community Assets

**Environmental**
- Water Quality
- Habitat Protection
- GHG Emissions

**Step 1: Define City of Oak Harbor Objectives and Criteria**

### Financial
- **F1:** Low capital cost
- **F2:** Low life-cycle cost
- **F3:** No tax revenue loss

### Technical
- **T1:** High level of constructability
- **T2:** Reliable access for long-term O&M
- **T3:** Minimal reliance on need for pumping

### Environmental
- **E1:** Provides highest water quality
- **E2:** Protects environmentally sensitive areas
- **E3:** Maximizes reuse opportunities

### Social
- **S1:** Protects public/operator health and safety
- **S2:** Preserves/enhances local public access
- **S3:** Minimizes local neighborhood impact

**Note:**
NPW = Net present worth
GHG = Greenhouse gas
Step 2: Compare Alternatives Using Qualitative Illustration of Results

Major Technical Activities Marked by Workshops
**Technical Evaluation Integrates with Public Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Step 1: Develop/Evaluate Alternatives</th>
<th>Step 2: Refine/Select Proposed Alternative</th>
<th>Step 3: Complete Facilities Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Project Start</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>Review Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1st Workshops</td>
<td>2nd Workshops</td>
<td>3rd Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4th Workshops</td>
<td>5th Workshops</td>
<td>6th Workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Level of US Navy Coordination is Planned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Step 1: Develop/Evaluate Alternatives</th>
<th>Step 2: Refine/Select Proposed Alternative</th>
<th>Step 3: Complete Facilities Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Project Start</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>Review Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1st Workshops</td>
<td>2nd Workshops</td>
<td>3rd Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4th Workshops</td>
<td>5th Workshops</td>
<td>6th Workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oak Harbor Facility Plan
Stakeholder Workshop

November 9, 2010

Agenda

• Introductions
• Project Background/Overview
  – Project Need
  – Goals and Objectives
  – Schedule Overview
• Facilities Planning Scope and Schedule
  – Project Team
  – Scope Elements
  – Alternative Development and Evaluation
  – Major Milestones and Coordination
• Question/Response
Project Need

- The capacity of existing treatment facilities will be exceeded within the next 10 years
- Components of the existing treatment system are nearing the end of their useful service life and must be replaced to provide continued, reliable service
- Future effluent limits will likely drive significant improvements to existing facilities

Project Goals and Objectives

Recognizing that the City of Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City’s goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements.

- Meet treatment goals identified in the Puget Sound Action Plan developed by the Puget Sound Partnership
- Use a sustainable process to select a sustainable treatment alternative
- Implement the alternative according to the City’s schedule (Startup/Commissioning in 2017)
### Overall Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning / Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction / Startup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Facilities

![Existing Facilities Image](image1)

![Existing Facilities Image](image2)

![Existing Facilities Image](image3)
Oak Harbor Wastewater Utility Background

- Currently serves approximately 24,000 users
  - City limits plus Seaplane Base population
- City owns/operates collection system serving customers outside of Navy base
- Navy owns/operates collection system on Seaplane Base property
- Current maximum monthly flow is ± 2.6 million gallons per day (mgd)
  - 81% of existing rated capacity (3.2 mgd)

Existing Rotating Biological Contactor (RBC) Treatment Facility (0.7 mgd)

- Located adjacent to Windjammer Park
- Initially constructed in 1978
- Components date back to 1950s
- Currently treats ± 22% of flow
- Outfall is no longer in service
- Treated effluent and biosolids now pumped to lagoon plant
Existing Seaplane Lagoon Treatment Facility (2.5 mgd)

- Located on US Navy property
- Long-term lease secured in 1990
- Treats flow in excess of RBC plant capacity (± 78% of flow)
- Includes anaerobic cell for solids stabilization
- Outfall into Crescent Harbor (all flow from RBC and Lagoon)

Existing Facility Challenges

- RBC plant is nearing end of useful service life
  - Difficult to operate and maintain in reliable service
  - Outfall has failed, no longer used
- Lagoon site is located in environmentally sensitive area
  - Recent flooding has caused erosion and accessibility concerns
- Both facilities will be at capacity within a 10 year period
  - Recent RBC outfall failure has further reduced wet weather reliability
- Neither facility able to meet likely future permit requirements
Facilities Planning Process

City of Oak Harbor Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Team Member</th>
<th>Project Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Johnston</td>
<td>City Engineer/Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Schmidt</td>
<td>City Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Rosen</td>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bebee</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Michaels</td>
<td>Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City Council</td>
<td>Decision Making and Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Team

Project Scope is Divided into 9 tasks

Task 100 - Project Management
Task 200 - Prelim. Alts. Development and Screening
Task 300 - Final Alts. Development and Screening
Task 400 - Outfall Evaluation
Task 500 - Reuse Opportunities
Task 600 - Facilities Plan
Task 700 - Environmental Review and Documentation
Task 800 - Public Process Support
Task 900 - Management Reserve
Overall Project Schedule

Alternative Development and Decision Making Process
Initial site identification considers all potentially viable sites...

Alternative Development Matches Viable Sites and Processes

- Alternative components
  - WWTP Process Option
  - Candidate Site
  - Outfall/discharge Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WWTP Process</th>
<th>Candidate Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Triple Bottom Line Principles Guide Decision Making

Optimize

Social Impact
Economic Impact
Environmental Impact

U.S. EPA P3: People, Prosperity and the Planet

Triple Bottom Line + Technical (TBL+) Framework for City of Oak Harbor

**Technical**
- Reliability
- Flexibility
- Safety

**Financial**
- Capital $
- NPW

**Social**
- Noise/Odor Issues
- Visual Impacts
- Community Assets

**Environmental**
- Water Quality
- Habitat Protection
- GHG Emissions

Note:
NPW = Net present worth
GHG = Greenhouse gas
**Step 1: Define City of Oak Harbor Objectives and Criteria**

**Financial**
- F1: Low capital cost
- F2: Low life-cycle cost
- F3: No tax revenue loss

**Environmental**
- E1: Provides highest water quality
- E2: Protects environmentally sensitive areas
- E3: Maximizes reuse opportunities

**Technical**
- T1: High level of constructability
- T2: Reliable access for long-term O&M
- T3: Minimal reliance on need for pumping

**Social**
- S1: Protects public/operator health and safety
- S2: Preserves/enhances local public access
- S3: Minimizes local neighborhood impact

**Step 2: Compare Alternatives Using Qualitative Illustration of Results**

![Qualitative Illustration of Results](image-url)
Major Technical Activities Marked by Workshops

Technical Evaluation Integrates with Public Process
Your early input helps to shape the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>DEVELOP/EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>REVIEW/SELECT PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
<th>COMPLETE FACILITIES PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sep 10/12/10</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jan 22/2/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Jun 7/5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Nov 11/9/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 11/15/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 1/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROCESS**
- SUPPORT
  - TECHNICAL
  - NAVY
  - COORDINATION

**STAKEHOLDER**
- COORDINATION

**TASK**
- PUBLIC MEETINGS
  - CITY COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

**SUBTASK**
- 800 - PUBLIC
- 830 - C1 Council Committee 1 11/4/10
- 840 - C2 Council Workshop 12/2/10
- 850 - C? Council Committee (?) 3/3/11
- 860 - C3 Council Committee 2 5/3/11
- 870 - C4 Council Meeting 1 8/16/11
- 880 - C5 Council Meeting 2 1/19/12
- 890 - C6 Council Committee 3 7/26/11

**GQ**
- General Questions?
Specific Questions for Discussion

• What do you hope to see accomplished with this project?
• Are there particular concerns about what is being proposed?
• How do you envision being involved in the planning phase?
• How can we best keep you informed of our progress?
• Do you have additional comments or suggestions?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Contact</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Mailing List?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/22/2011</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Virginia B. Brown</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vbbrown1@comcast.net">vbbrown1@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Coupeville WA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am very late on weighing in on this project but here it is. My husband and I live in Coupeville but own 20 rental units in Oak Harbor so I feel justified in voicing an opinion. I will not say what I feel is best but only what is not best. Please do not put a new treatment facility by Windjammer Park. Why would anyone put a smelly, unpleasant facility next to the crown gem of the city? People come from everywhere to enjoy the park, picnic and play ball. Why on earth would this happen? Money. Please do what is best for the city not just the budget. Virginia B. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Forum 3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>What are your thoughts about the three short listed sites? Windjammer Park is the best site to build a state-of-the-art sewage treatment facility that will be an asset to the community if designed and landscaped properly. What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site? 1. Clean water in Oak Harbor. 2. Avoid unnecessary costs such as long-distance pumping. What other questions and concerns do you have about wastewater planning for Oak Harbor? Do all of us use low-volume shower heads, toilets, etc.? If not, this is the first place to make changes to optimize our current system. Has the city inventoried individual households?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Annette Trujillo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jannette.bryant@gmail.com">jannette.bryant@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>250 NW Calista Ct</td>
<td>Oak Harbor WA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>As Tax paying permanent residents of Oak Harbor, my husband and I would like to see the water treatment plant moved out of Wind Jammer Park. We were under the impression that the goal of the public works projects (example: Pioneer Avenue) was to beautify the city. Building a water treatment plant in Wind Jammer Park would defeat the purpose of beautifying Oak Harbor. Who wants to take their children to the park to play and enjoy the spectacular view, and have to be next to a treatment plant? The council should be ashamed of even considering this as an option. Sincerely, Annette Trujillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2011</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>George Anne Sherry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GanneS@co.island.wa.us">GanneS@co.island.wa.us</a></td>
<td>490 SE Pasek St.</td>
<td>Oak Harbor WA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>I will not be able to attend the forum tonight but did want to comment on the current proposal. First, I want to thank you that the previous considered area of ‘Beach Drive Farm (Fakkema) Family’ land is no longer in consideration. To the three proposed sites: 1. Crescent Harbor and Windjammer Park……..the biggest question I would have relates to requirements that DOE might have and/or any HPRA requirements from DFW due to the close proximity to the water. If there are extensive requirements they may add costs not anticipated. There always seems to be a ‘surprise’ once a project has begun. And, with all the challenges the city is currently facing with the archeological challenges on Pioneer Way, I can only guess there would also be that type of consideration for the Crescent Harbor area. In today’s economic climate and the budget challenges we are all facing (private and public) I would believe the last thing that government would want to do is add more financial burden to the taxpayer. In my opinion these two sites would not be financially viable. 2. Old City Shops – Using a site that has already been developed for city use may be a little more cost effective. Depending on the past use of the city shop area there may be some cleanup requirements imposed by DOE but perhaps not as severe as what may be imposed by DOE or DFW for construction in and around a shoreline. I am not sure how big an area would be needed but would think that no new impervious surfaces would be created and drainage would already be in place. In my opinion use of the old city shops would be a much use of existing resources – both financially and structurally. As it is apparent that all the residents of the City of Oak Harbor will be assessed additional charge in some form to assist in the payment of this upgrade it is hoped that the City of Oak Harbor is extremely prudent in examining all potential costs and even considering those costs that have not yet been uncovered. It would also be hoped that once the cost of the upgraded facility has been paid for that the extra assessment could be removed from our utility bills. Thank you for taking the time to read and add this to the public comment record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2011</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>George Anne Sherry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GanneS@co.island.wa.us">GanneS@co.island.wa.us</a></td>
<td>490 SE Pasek St.</td>
<td>Oak Harbor WA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>I will not be able to attend the forum tonight but did want to comment on the current proposal. First, I want to thank you that the previous considered area of ‘Beach Drive Farm (Fakkema) Family’ land is no longer in consideration. To the three proposed sites: 1. Crescent Harbor and Windjammer Park……..the biggest question I would have relates to requirements that DOE might have and/or any HPRA requirements from DFW due to the close proximity to the water. If there are extensive requirements they may add costs not anticipated. There always seems to be a ‘surprise’ once a project has begun. And, with all the challenges the city is currently facing with the archeological challenges on Pioneer Way, I can only guess there would also be that type of consideration for the Crescent Harbor area. In today’s economic climate and the budget challenges we are all facing (private and public) I would believe the last thing that government would want to do is add more financial burden to the taxpayer. In my opinion these two sites would not be financially viable. 2. Old City Shops – Using a site that has already been developed for city use may be a little more cost effective. Depending on the past use of the city shop area there may be some cleanup requirements imposed by DOE but perhaps not as severe as what may be imposed by DOE or DFW for construction in and around a shoreline. I am not sure how big an area would be needed but would think that no new impervious surfaces would be created and drainage would already be in place. In my opinion use of the old city shops would be a much use of existing resources – both financially and structurally. As it is apparent that all the residents of the City of Oak Harbor will be assessed additional charge in some form to assist in the payment of this upgrade it is hoped that the City of Oak Harbor is extremely prudent in examining all potential costs and even considering those costs that have not yet been uncovered. It would also be hoped that once the cost of the upgraded facility has been paid for that the extra assessment could be removed from our utility bills. Thank you for taking the time to read and add this to the public comment record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2011</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Doris and Al Peters</td>
<td><a href="mailto:awpeters7@verizon.net">awpeters7@verizon.net</a></td>
<td>310 Trail Of The Flowers Georgetown TX 78633 n/a</td>
<td>Thank you for providing the information and slide shows regarding site location. From your presentations it appears that the Old City Shops location is almost as economical as the Windjammer Park location and certainly the Old City Shops appear to be a better choice. The public beach and camping area is limited in space as it is and should be improved as a recreational area and not diminished. The Windjammer Park is prime city property for public use and should not have been used for sewage treatment in the original planning years ago. Also, should there be a high-water situation, Tsunami, or whatever, the treatment facility could be compromised. The minimal extra expense to use the Old City Shops area will be well worth it to preserve the prime tourist and recreational area at Windjammer Park for our use and the use of our children and their children in the future. Thank you for your consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Steve Mansfield</td>
<td><a href="mailto:searl6@comcast.net">searl6@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>1719 6th Street Anacortes WA 98221</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Scott Hubbard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shubbard@oakharbor.org">shubbard@oakharbor.org</a></td>
<td>1880 SW Waterside CT Oak Harbor WA 98277</td>
<td>Sign me up!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Phil Matthews</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmatthews@oakharbor.org">pmatthews@oakharbor.org</a></td>
<td>1501 SE City Beach St Oak Harbor WA 98277</td>
<td>I look forward to being part of the facility planning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Jeff Trumbore</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHTrumbore@hotmail.com">JHTrumbore@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>455 SW Kirk LN Oak Harbor WA 98277</td>
<td>Enjoyed the meeting last night, well done by Eric and the team. Key thoughts on site location: 1. Use existing city or federal property. Avoid cost of land purchase. 2. I would not locate it along city beach or the downtown waterfront area. 3. Make sure the new plant(s) are build for at least 50 years of service and the site can accommodate growth or upgrade...we never want to look for another site. 4. A location East of current lagoon site on the seaplane base appears to make good sense. Trade existing space (2lbs) for something small and located on higher ground with room to expand. Run new outfall along existing lagoon outfall, should reduce permit requirements. Construction at this location on the seaplane base will be less disruptive to the community. Can make access from Crescent Harbor RD and run additional piping along Crescent Harbor Rd or E Pioneer Way (on the seaplane base).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Cecil Pierce</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vfwmgalaska@gmail.com">vfwmgalaska@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>871 NW Haslo Place Oak Harbor WA 98277</td>
<td>I would like to know which type of MBR system that is being considered: Tubular Membranes, Hollow Fiber Membranes, or Flat Plate Membranes. Then what are the advantages and disadvantages for each of these systems as they compare to us. Sincerely, Cecil Pierce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Mike Randall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mrandall@bbiius.com">mrandall@bbiius.com</a></td>
<td>5050 Business Cewnter Drive, Suite 250 Fairfield CA 94534</td>
<td>Design Bid Build with low bids will result in the best value for the City.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/23/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Steve Mansfield</td>
<td><a href="mailto:searl6@comcast.net">searl6@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>1719 6th Street Anacortes WA 98221</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Scott Hubbard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shubbard@oakharbor.org">shubbard@oakharbor.org</a></td>
<td>1880 SW Waterside CT Oak Harbor WA 98277</td>
<td>Sign me up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Phil Matthews</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmatthews@oakharbor.org">pmatthews@oakharbor.org</a></td>
<td>1501 SE City Beach St Oak Harbor WA 98277</td>
<td>I look forward to being part of the facility planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Jeff Trumbore</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHTrumbore@hotmail.com">JHTrumbore@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>455 SW Kirk LN Oak Harbor WA 98277</td>
<td>Enjoyed the meeting last night, well done by Eric and the team. Key thoughts on site location: 1. Use existing city or federal property. Avoid cost of land purchase. 2. I would not locate it along city beach or the downtown waterfront area. 3. Make sure the new plant(s) are build for at least 50 years of service and the site can accommodate growth or upgrade...we never want to look for another site. 4. A location East of current lagoon site on the seaplane base appears to make good sense. Trade existing space (2lbs) for something small and located on higher ground with room to expand. Run new outfall along existing lagoon outfall, should reduce permit requirements. Construction at this location on the seaplane base will be less disruptive to the community. Can make access from Crescent Harbor RD and run additional piping along Crescent Harbor Rd or E Pioneer Way (on the seaplane base).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2011</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Cecil Pierce</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vfwmgalaska@gmail.com">vfwmgalaska@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>871 NW Haslo Place Oak Harbor WA 98277</td>
<td>I would like to know which type of MBR system that is being considered: Tubular Membranes, Hollow Fiber Membranes, or Flat Plate Membranes. Then what are the advantages and disadvantages for each of these systems as they compare to us. Sincerely, Cecil Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Mike Randall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mrandall@bbiius.com">mrandall@bbiius.com</a></td>
<td>5050 Business Cewnter Drive, Suite 250 Fairfield CA 94534</td>
<td>Design Bid Build with low bids will result in the best value for the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2
Stakeholder Interview Recap

Triangle Associates, as part of the consultant project team, conducted phone interviews with area residents in the fall of 2010. The purpose of the interviews was to gauge awareness of Oak Harbor’s wastewater treatment system and anticipate questions and concerns in advance of the first Public Forum.

In the course of the interviews, certain themes emerged:
- For the most part, interviewees had little knowledge of planning efforts underway to revamp Oak Harbor’s wastewater treatment.
- Interviewees were pleased with the quality of sewer service they have been receiving.
- Interviewees held common values about living in Oak Harbor – proximity to the water, good place to raise a family, benefits of smaller community (low traffic, low crime rates, easy to navigate, quiet).
- People kept informed by reading Whidbey News Times, watching Channel 10, and word of mouth.
- Primary considerations for building a new facility are that it protects the environment, be cost-effective, and can be easily expanded to serve future needs.
- The area adjacent to Windjammer Park was frequently cited as a poor location for a new wastewater treatment facility.
- A number of interviewees volunteered that they had noticed and appreciated City-sponsored infrastructure improvements.

Below is a recap of those interviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you most value about living in Oak Harbor?</td>
<td>Close to water. Convenience of city</td>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>Low crime. Been here forever. We used to have pristine water but not now. Pollution has really impacted fishing and watersheds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe the current economic conditions of Oak Harbor?</td>
<td>Challenging. Not a lot of economic opportunity for young people</td>
<td>These are tough times</td>
<td>Seems okay, but old downtown (SE Pioneer Way) is not doing very well except bars and saloon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you consider the next 5 -10 years, what sort of city do you envision Oak Harbor to be?</td>
<td>It will continue to be commercial center for island. More strip mall sprawl. Would like to see revitalized downtown.</td>
<td>No answer.</td>
<td>I don’t think it will change too much. I don’t expect much population growth. The people who come here are looking for serenity. I have concerns about continued deterioration of the beaches because of pollution. We need another exit off the island/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Person 1</td>
<td>Person 2</td>
<td>Person 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What impression do you have of current sewer service?</td>
<td>No problem with current service but I understand we’re at capacity.</td>
<td>The service is adequate.</td>
<td>I am worried that old sewer lines are cracked or broken and so there is seepage going directly in bay. There are odor issues with the treatment plant and with pollution in the bay. Effluent quality is not good and it is causing pollution problems. You used to be able to play in the bay. Not anymore. My dog died because of a sewer leak in the bay that nobody was warned about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How closely have you followed the discussion of Oak Harbor’s wastewater treatment?</td>
<td>Fairly closely. I have seen City Council meetings on the Oak Harbor public access channel. Certainly not an expert.</td>
<td>Not closely</td>
<td>Somewhat closely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your primary sources for information?</td>
<td>City Council meetings</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Channel 10. Newspapers do a little coverage but not much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the issue have a direct, indirect, or no impact on you?</td>
<td>indirect</td>
<td>direct</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the term “wastewater treatment” have positive, negative, or neutral connotation?</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most important considerations in developing a plan?</td>
<td>Environmental considerations - protection of the Puget Sound.</td>
<td>Do it as inexpensively as possible</td>
<td>Controlling pollution. Deal with storm water. Outfall should be drained into Chambers Bay because there is better water circulation there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site considerations?</td>
<td>Not in the middle of a city park! Odor control.</td>
<td>Do not know.</td>
<td>Do not put it in Windjammer Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything else?</td>
<td>I spend time walking on the seaplane base. There are issues with an open marsh and salt-water incursions and leakage into the bay.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>People are jaded because they think just a few people in the city are making decisions without there being any real consensus or public input. Some people have a pretty negative feeling about the direction the city is going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on current rates?</td>
<td>Rates are reasonable. I would be willing to pay more for a good system.</td>
<td>They seem fair.</td>
<td>Rates are fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How best to pay for the system?</td>
<td>No idea. Probably a bond or tax increase but people are tax averse.</td>
<td>Do not know.</td>
<td>The Navy should share in the planning and the costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Person 1</td>
<td>Person 2</td>
<td>Person 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How involved do you want to be in planning?</td>
<td>Kept informed. I want the process to be transparent and info openly shared.</td>
<td>No need to be involved.</td>
<td>I would like to be kept informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How best to inform citizens?</td>
<td>A good website that can be updated with new information and can be used to track comments and respond to people's questions. It should be well publicized. Also public meetings.</td>
<td>Website. Email me information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have you typically registered your comments?</td>
<td>Write or email my representative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>There are miles and miles of old and probably crumbling sewer line – what is being done about that?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Person #4</th>
<th>Person #5</th>
<th>Person #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe the current economic conditions of Oak Harbor?</td>
<td>Businesses, at least along Pioneer Way are struggling. But I think it will get better. The City has creative ideas about beautifying the area and changing traffic patterns. Oak Harbor is like a house, it needs to be maintained and renovated. It's been neglected but I see a lot of effort being made by the City to fix things up.</td>
<td>It seems okay, especially in the outer part of town.</td>
<td>Hard to say. I do see a lot of maintenance being done by the city and I'm pretty happy with how they're doing. I worry that there is really only one way to get off the island and I think that limits growth. The city is investing too much into downtown. I don't think the tax revenues from downtown merchants justifies it. I'm tired of the squabbling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you consider the next 5-10 years, what sort of city do you envision Oak Harbor to be?</td>
<td>I hope we don’t see just a growth in big box stores. I would like to see more pedestrian traffic downtown.</td>
<td>I think the city will expand somewhat but within it’s current boundaries. The city's future is tied with the Navy.</td>
<td>I think the Naval Air Station should be within Oak Harbor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What impression do you have of current sewer service?</td>
<td>It seems fine.</td>
<td>I've heard it isn't really adequate.</td>
<td>I'm fine with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How closely have you followed the discussion of Oak Harbor's wastewater treatment?</td>
<td>Not at all closely.</td>
<td>Not closely.</td>
<td>Not closely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Person #4</td>
<td>Person #5</td>
<td>Person #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your primary sources for information?</td>
<td>I watch the city council meetings on Channel 10 and I talk to customers who come into my store.</td>
<td>Local newspapers.</td>
<td>Newspaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the issue have a direct, indirect, or no impact on you?</td>
<td>Direct.</td>
<td>No impact (Lives in county).</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the term “wastewater treatment” have positive, negative, or neutral connotation?</td>
<td>Neutral.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>For a lot of folks it’s a negative because of odor issues in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most important considerations in developing a plan?</td>
<td>That it be efficient and have a long life span. Do it right. Don’t cut financial corners.</td>
<td>Keep the costs down.</td>
<td>It needs to be built so it can be expanded without a lot of cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site considerations?</td>
<td>Isolate it. Don’t put it in Windjammer Park.</td>
<td>The location within a park is wrong. I would expand the lagoon plant. It’s close to water and would help keep costs down.</td>
<td>Best option is to pipe it to Ault Field so the effluent can go into the San Juan De Fuca. Plus it’s isolated there…no one will build near a airfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything else?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on current rates?</td>
<td>Rates have to be what they have to be.</td>
<td>No problem.</td>
<td>They’re fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How best to pay for the system?</td>
<td>I wouldn’t know.</td>
<td>Seems like the Navy should help with costs.</td>
<td>I think the hook-up fees are supposed to pay for system development charges. I’m hoping there won’t be a big spike in sewer rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How involved do you want to be in planning?</td>
<td>I’d like to be kept informed. (Provided email address)</td>
<td>I’m interested—particularly around how much it will cost and how they’ll pay for it.</td>
<td>Not involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How best to inform citizens?</td>
<td>Website. Email me information.</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Newspaper. Suggest that the City write the article though because the paper usually screws it up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have you typically registered your comments?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>By directly dealing with the department involved and sometimes the mayor.</td>
<td>Talking with the people directly involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td>There are miles and miles of old and probably crumbing sewer line – what’s being done about that?</td>
<td>Provided email address for updates.</td>
<td>Did not want to provide email updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Person #7</td>
<td>Person #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you most value about living in Oak Harbor?</td>
<td>The water, view, small community feeling. Good place for raising a family.</td>
<td>Close, open community. Waterfront. Being by the sea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe the current economic conditions of Oak Harbor?</td>
<td>This last year and a half have been bad. Lots of homes going into trustee sales (about 30 per month). OH may not be as hard hit as other areas but it's certainly hurting.</td>
<td>Pretty good. The presence of the Navy provides good stability. We're doing much better than a lot of other places in the country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you consider the next 5 -10 years, what sort of city do you envision Oak Harbor to be?</td>
<td>I do think things will get better. The city has great plans for the future. We have a lot of aging infrastructure but it looks like an effort is being made to address it.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What impression do you have of current sewer service?</td>
<td>It's expensive. And reliable. I've never had a service interruption.</td>
<td>The service seems fine and reliable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How closely have you followed the discussion of Oak Harbor’s wastewater treatment?</td>
<td>Not closely.</td>
<td>Pretty closely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your primary sources for information?</td>
<td>I’m active in the Chamber and that’s where I get most of my information about what's going on in the community.</td>
<td>I read the newspaper and talk to city council members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the issue have a direct, indirect, or no impact on you?</td>
<td>Direct impact.</td>
<td>Direct impact. I live outside the city but have properties within the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the term “wastewater treatment” have positive, negative, or neutral connotation?</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most important considerations in developing a plan?</td>
<td>Site location and cost effectiveness.</td>
<td>Long-term reliability and expandability. Cost efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site considerations?</td>
<td>The city absolutely should not have a sewer plant in the middle of town. That plant is a stone’s throw away from a kiddie pool. It makes no sense whatsoever.</td>
<td>The City should partner with the Navy to expand the Ault Field facility. Turn OH’s two current facilities into pumping stations. The plant should be on the west side of the island because of the better flushing capacity of the Sound there. From what I’ve heard, the Ault facility is expandable and uses current technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Person #7</td>
<td>Person #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything else?</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have concerns about how the City handled communications with NAS over the Seaplane lagoon plant—particularly in regards to opening up the wetland for tidal flows. The City maintains that now the Seaplane lagoon can’t be expanded and is in danger of flooding, but I’d like to know how they reached that conclusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on current rates?</td>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>They seem fair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How best to pay for the system?</td>
<td>Don’t know.</td>
<td>I like a pay as you go system. Much better than getting a big hit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How involved do you want to be in planning?</td>
<td>I will be interested in attending a public meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How best to inform citizens?</td>
<td>Work with the service organizations in town. Also there are a number of good locations for posting information: banks, the post office door, the new Whidbey Coffee Shop; Thrive Gym.</td>
<td>Newspapers. Word of mouth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have you typically registered your comments?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Call up a council member.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like the City to thoroughly examine the potential to cooperate with the Navy. And if that’s not possible, explain what the issues are and why isn’t an arrangement contractible? Also, I’d like the City to talk with the contractors and operations people who actually work on the plants. They shouldn’t just listen to engineers. They need to hear from folks who have practical knowledge of the issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is a New Wastewater Treatment Facility Needed?

The City of Oak Harbor is planning for the future by moving forward with plans to site a new wastewater treatment facility.

A new facility will be designed to:

• Replace existing aging facilities
• Meet the State’s changing standards for protection of the Puget Sound
• Keep pace with City’s projected population growth
Oak Harbor’s Current Wastewater Facilities

Rotating Biological Contactor (RBC) facility
- Located next to Windjammer Park
- Currently functions as a pre-treatment plant for up to 20% of City’s wastewater
- Aging facility that is starting to fail
- RBC process is outdated and will not meet future water quality standards

Lagoon facility
- Located on Seaplane Base
- Currently handles 100% of City’s wastewater with outfall to Crescent Harbor
- Facility is nearing system capacity
- Existing system will not meet future water quality standards
- Expansion/improvements limited due to sensitive environment (wetlands)
## Project Schedule

### Overall Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Startup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning and Preliminary Engineering Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Evaluate Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement Milestones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Decision Points (City Council)

1. Confirm short-listed alternatives (up to 4)
2. Confirm proposed alternative (1)
3. Approve Facilities Plan

### Community Involvement Milestones

- **Public Forum No. 1**
  - Learn about project objectives, cost and schedule
  - Provide input to help shape evaluation of preliminary alternatives
- **Public Forum No. 2**
  - Hear more about alternatives identified for further consideration
  - Provide input to help shape evaluation of final alternatives
- **Public Forum No. 3**
  - Provide input on proposed alternative layouts and renderings
  - Get additional information on the next steps for the project
Two treatment technologies are initially being considered in Oak Harbor:

**Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Treatment Process**
- **Features**
  - Produces very clean water
  - Requires the smallest site
  - Has been installed in areas that are highly visible to the public

**Activated Sludge (AS) Treatment Process**
- **Features**
  - Takes more space (about twice the size of an MBR)
  - Requires multiple processes to produce water that is similar to an MBR
  - Is more energy efficient than an MBR

Membrane Bioreactor Schematic:
- Membranes filter nearly all solids from the wastewater.
- Ultraviolet (UV) light can be used to disinfect water cleaned by the MBR process.
- The administration building at Carnation, WA hides the MBR process equipment from public view.

Activated Sludge Schematic:
- Most equipment in the Blaine, WA AS treatment facility is enclosed in an attractive building.
- Although AS takes up more space, buildings around plant edges can be designed to hide the tanks.

The City’s existing rotating biological contactor (RBC) facility near Windjammer Park occupies approximately 1.2 acres.

The City’s existing rotating biological contactor (RBC) facility near Windjammer Park occupies approximately 1.2 acres.

An AS facility sized for future flows would occupy approximately 6 acres.

An MBR facility sized for future flows would occupy approximately 3 acres.
Considerations for Selecting the Best Alternative

A sustainable decision-making process is being used to select the best wastewater facility. In the months ahead, several alternatives will be identified and evaluated to determine if they meet the community’s long-term objectives. Examples are shown below. Your input will help refine these objectives.

**Technical**
- Reliable Performance
- Ease of Construction
- Overall System Efficiency

**Financial**
- Low Capital Cost
- Low Operations and Maintenance Cost
- Low Life-Cycle Cost

**Social**
- Protect Public Health and Safety
- Preserve/Enhance Local Public Amenities*
- Minimize Local Neighborhood Impact

**Environmental**
- Produce Best Water Quality
- Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- Minimize Carbon Footprint

*Parks, Open Space, Community Access, Education*
Technical factors can include performance, reliability, and efficiency of the operating system. What do you think are the most important technical aspects of a new facility?
Financial Considerations

Financial factors can include the total initial cost (capital cost), the long-term costs to maintain and operate the system, and the costs to rate payers. What do you think are the most important financial aspects of a new facility?
Social Considerations

Social factors can include visual impacts of a facility, noise generated, smell or other community effects. What do you think are the most important social aspects of a new facility?
Environmental factors can include preservation of surrounding water quality, protection of environmentally sensitive areas, and minimizing greenhouse gas emissions (carbon footprint). What do you think are the most important environmental aspects of a new facility?
Tell Us What You Think!
Where should future facilities be located?
Your input will help us plan.

City of Oak Harbor
Seaplane Base Peninsula Area
Seaplane Base Lagoon Area
Clean Water Facility Planning Public Forum

Monday, December 6, 2010
Why You Are Here

• Learn about the existing wastewater system and the planning process for siting a new wastewater facility

• Provide your ideas for future facility locations

• Give feedback about the upcoming decision-making process and factors used to select an alternative
Oak Harbor’s Current Wastewater Facilities
Rotating Biological Contactor (RBC) Facility

- Located next to Windjammer Park
- Currently functions as a pre-treatment plant for up to 20% of City’s wastewater
- Aging facility that is starting to fail
- RBC process is outdated and will not meet future water quality standards
Lagoon Facility

- Located on Seaplane Base
- Currently handles 100% of City’s wastewater with outfall to Crescent Harbor
- Facility is nearing system capacity
- Existing system will not meet future water quality standards
- Expansion/improvements limited due to sensitive environment (wetlands)
Why is a New Facility Needed?

A new facility will be designed to:

• Replace existing aging facilities

• Protect Puget Sound water quality

• Keep pace with City’s projected population growth

• Goal is a new facility by 2017
How Do You Site a Facility in Washington?

- A project of this magnitude requires a Facilities Plan according to federal and state law.

- The plan must be developed and approved by the Department of Ecology.

- The plan must consider a range of alternatives before making a recommendation.

- It typically takes 5 - 7 years from initial planning to facility completion.
What Is An “Alternative”?  

- Site: Where will a new facility go?  
- Process: What technology will it use?  
- Discharge: Where will clean water go, or what will it be used for?
How Will We Select a Long-term, Sustainable Alternative?

Optimize

Social Cost/Benefit

Financial Cost/Benefit

Environmental Cost/Benefit
How Will We Pick the Best Alternative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Performance</td>
<td>Low Capital Cost</td>
<td>Protect Public Health and Safety</td>
<td>Produce Best Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Construction</td>
<td>Low Operations and Maintenance Cost</td>
<td>Preserve/Enhance Local Public Amenities*</td>
<td>Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall System Efficiency</td>
<td>Low Life-Cycle Cost</td>
<td>Minimize Local Neighborhood Impact</td>
<td>Minimize Carbon Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Should a New Facility Be Sited?

City of Oak Harbor
What Treatment Process Should We Use?

**Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Treatment Process**

**Features**
- Produces very clean water
- Requires the smallest site
- Has been installed in areas that are highly visible to the public

- UV light can be used to disinfect water clarified by the MBR process.
- Membranes filter nearly all solids from the wastewater.
- Most equipment in the Blaine, WA MBR treatment facility is enclosed in an attractive building.

The City's existing rotating biological contactor (RBC) facility near Windjammer Park occupies approximately 1.2 acres.

An MBR facility sized for future flows would occupy approximately 3 acres.
What Treatment Process Should We Use?

**Activated Sludge (AS) Treatment Process**

- **Features**
  - Takes more space (about twice the size of an MBR)
  - Is more energy efficient than an MBR
  - Requires multiple processes to produce water that is similar to an MBR

- **Solids settle out by gravity in AS tanks, so the water is not as clean as MBR effluent.**

- **The larger tanks in an AS process can be covered to control odors.**

- **Although AS takes up more space, buildings around plant edges can be designed to hide the tanks.**

The City’s existing rotating biological contactor (RBC) facility near Windjammer Park occupies approximately 1.2 acres.

An AS facility sized for future flows would occupy approximately 6 acres.
Decision-Making Process

• A proposed alternative will be identified after a number of potentially viable alternatives are studied and input from the Oak Harbor community has been solicited and considered.

• All proposed sites will be carefully evaluated and considered and the alternative selected will best meet the City’s project objectives.
Project Schedule

Overall Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Startup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning and Preliminary Engineering Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Evaluate Alternatives</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine/Select Proposed Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement Milestones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Decision Points (City Council)

1. Confirm short-listed alternatives (up to 4)
2. Confirm proposed alternative (1)
3. Approve Facilities Plan

Community Involvement Milestones

- Public Forum No. 1
  - Learn about project objectives, cost and schedule
- Public Forum No. 2
  - Hear more about alternatives identified for further consideration
- Public Forum No. 3
  - Provide input to help shape evaluation of final alternatives
  - Provide input on proposed alternative layouts and renderings
  - Get additional information on the next steps for the project
Questions?

To learn more, visit: http://www.oakharborcleanwater.org/
Background and Event Format

On December 6, 2010 the City of Oak Harbor hosted a public forum to introduce information about the wastewater facility planning process, including location for a new treatment plant. This forum served as an opportunity for the Oak Harbor community to receive information about Oak Harbor’s current and aging system, treatment process options, potential facility size implications, and other factors under consideration and provide feedback on possible site locations.

The forum was organized as a participatory event, intended to be an informative session for both the community and the City. When meeting attendees arrived, they were greeted by a staff member and asked to sign in. Meeting attendees were encouraged to ask questions and write down their comments on either comment cards or boards provided and were given a set of green dots that they could use to mark places on large maps representing the locations they’d like to be used for the new facility.

A total of 12 community members attended the public forum, in addition to elected officials and City staff. The meeting began with a presentation to provide background information on current facilities, why a new facility is needed, different treatment types and the current planning schedule. Following the presentation, the City welcomed questions. Once all questions had been addressed, the attendees were invited to view the displays set up around the room and provide feedback about factors they’d like the City to consider when selecting a location and treatment type for the new facility. They were asked to place green dot stickers on large area maps of Oak Harbor to designate where they’d like the new facility considered (see Appendix A, page 5). Members of the project team were available throughout the forum to answer questions.

Themes heard in public comments and questions

In general, three questions were posed to meeting participants:
Q1: What factors do you think should be used to compare alternatives?
Q2: What sites do you think should be considered for the future facilities?
Q3: What other questions and concerns do you have about wastewater planning for Oak Harbor?

The public forum offered three ways to provide comments:
1. Comment form;
2. Dot/map exercise to indicate areas where facilities should be considered;
3. Displays to add information about potential criteria/factors for consideration for decision making.

The following themes in questions, comments and feedback were noted:

- Location of the new facility – suggestions were equal between areas called out (downtown Oak Harbor and Seaplane base) versus those locations in the surrounding community.
- Generally, people understood the types of criteria and factors being proposed for planning and screening purposes. No additions were noted, however consideration of cost (capital and life-cycle) was a highlight.
• Potential costs involved in developing and locating a facility and treating the wastewater: especially thinking long-term for potential upgrades.
• How Navy handles wastewater.
• State and Federal regulations surrounding planning and locating a new facility, including clarification of when planning needs to occur, and what is include in a potential plan.

Questions recorded during the Question and Answer session

Below is the list of questions from the public forum attendees. The City’s response to each question/comment is also included.

1. **Question:** What is the projected life cycle of the new plant and what are the projected demographics of Oak Harbor? What is the plant being designed to do and what flexibility will we have to accommodate tightening regulations and expansion?
   **Response:** Oak Harbor is targeting a lifecycle for the new treatment facility of approximately 40 – 50 years. A site for a new facility will be sized to handle future (50-year) flows upwards of six million gallons of wastewater a day (maximum monthly basis). The initial facility needed by 2017 will treat approximately three million gallons a day, and will be designed for future scale-up. The key to the new facility will be finding a location that can accommodate growth and future regulations.

2. **Question:** Does the City have sites in mind already? If so what are they?
   **Response:** The City is considering upgrading the existing facilities as well as other locations for new construction in and around Oak Harbor. Currently no location is off the table, all suggestions will be considered. The City is also considering managing liquids and solids together as well as managing them separately.

3. **Question:** Is it possible to upgrade the lagoon site?
   **Response:** The lagoon site will initially be included in the list of possible locations, but it is likely that it will be eliminated early in the vetting process. Expanding the lagoon will very difficult for a number of technical and environmental reasons.

4. **Question:** Are there regulations about how close outfall can be to the shoreline?
   **Response:** There are restrictions about outfall locations, but we do not have the exact figures here tonight. New outfall locations and design requirements will be considered during the planning process.

5. **Question:** When is the Navy plant at Ault field going to fail?
   **Response:** The Navy recently upgraded their facility which is a sequencing batch reactor (SBR). The City is not aware of any Navy plan to expand their facility, as they do not need to accommodate future growth.

6. **Question:** If the air station capacity is reduced in the future can we send Oak Harbor’s wastewater to the Navy’s facility?
Response: We can certainly consider that. Please put that on the list. We don’t know the answer at this time but will consider that option.

7. Question: Does Oak Harbor handle all of the Navy housing’s wastewater?  
Response: Anything on the base from Crescent Harbor Road and Regatta east is treated by the City. The area at Ault Field Road and north is treated by the Navy facility. There is a natural break in topography that allows flows to go north of Ault Field.

8. Question: Why is Oak Harbor not considering the same type of treatment process the Navy uses?  
Response: The size of the Navy flows are less than Oak Harbor’s flows. The advantages of the SBR process are most evident in smaller treatment facilities.

9. Question: How carved in stone is the city’s growth toward Swanton Road? If that is firm wouldn’t it make more sense to build two plants due to gravity?  
Response: Please write your comment down and we will consider that suggestion. We are not taking anything off the table.

10. Question: What are the consequences if Oak Harbor does not plan for future growth and regulation changes?  
Response: Oak Harbor’s comprehensive plan identifies 2017 as the date that we will reach capacity. Once a facility reaches 85% of its rated capacity, the City must begin a plan to add capacity. The bigger risk is the aging condition of the plants. Components of the existing facilities are nearing the end of their useful life.

11. Question: If you don’t meet the Ecology requirement for capacity, can Ecology place a moratorium on construction?  
Response: If the City is not able to provide capacity and begins to violate its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, Ecology can place a moratorium on construction.

12. Question: The Town of Coupeville shuttles their wastewater over the hill. Is Oak Harbor looking at reclaiming or using the wastewater in anyway?  
Response: Yes, the City will be evaluating if treated effluent can be reclaimed and reused, and what that process would entail.

Public Forum Materials

After the presentation, meeting attendees could view displays around the room and comment on treatment types, locations and other factors under consideration. Meeting attendees were asked to place green dots on large area maps to represent where they’d like the new facility be considered as part of the process. The following displays were set up around the room:

General Displays
• Why a New Wastewater Treatment Facility is Needed
• Oak Harbor’s Current Wastewater Facilities
• Project Schedule
SUMMARY

- Considerations for Selecting the Best Alternative
- Proposed Future Technologies

Aerial Maps
- Large map of Oak Harbor
- Detail of Oak Harbor
- Seaplane Base Peninsula Area
- Seaplane Base Lagoon Area

Considerations Boards
Each of the following displays contained blank space allowing attendees to provide input on criteria for consideration:
- Technical Considerations
- Financial Considerations
- Social Considerations
- Environmental Considerations

Handouts
- Clean Water Facility Planning Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
- Comment form for questions/comments about construction

Notification
The Oak Harbor community was notified of the public forum in the following ways:

- Display ad posted in the print edition of the Whidbey News-Times (Saturday, November 20 and Wednesday, December 1)
- Online display ad posted from Saturday November 20 through December 6, linking directly to the project website.
- Announcement of the workshop shown on the City TV station (Channel 10).
- Flyers posted at gathering locations throughout the community.

Next Steps
Additional comments were encouraged following the forum via email, phone and/or mail in the week following the workshop. The public forum was videotaped, and will be provided for further dissemination via Public Access Channel 10. Input received will be considered in the future plans for the Oak Harbor Clean Water Facility Planning Project. The City of Oak Harbor will continue to define potential locations and treatment process options into alternatives. A second public forum will be held in the spring of 2011 to gather feedback on alternatives.
Appendix A: Map Exercise

During the dot exercise, participants suggested locations for a new wastewater treatment facility. Below is a map showing all of the locations identified:
Appendix B: Public Comments Received

The following public comments were received via comment card:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Contact info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patti Carter</td>
<td>Q1: How the public &quot;votes, what they want, THEN efficiency, cost, how &quot;green&quot; it is. Q2: Crescent Harbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Q1: The two main concerns for me: cost/efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Trumbore</td>
<td>Q1: Like what you are using. Q2: Seaplane base --&gt; return lagoon to wetlands and trade for another site on higher ground. Plan for future small facility west of current town limits. Q3: 1. Need to have expansion capability built in. 2. Must be able to accommodate future more restrictive regulations. 3. Cost effective with multiple benefit. 4. Do not be shortsighted!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:
Q1: What factors do you think should be used to compare alternatives?
Q2: What sites do you think should be considered for the future facilities?
Q3: What other questions and concerns do you have about wastewater planning for Oak Harbor?
Agenda

- Project Goal/Schedule
- Summary of Input to Date
- Basis of Planning Highlights
- Preliminary Alternative Development Status
- Summary/Next Steps
Existing RBC Facility

Blaine, WA MBR Facility
Project Goal and Objectives

Recognizing that Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City’s goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements.

• Meet treatment goals identified in the Puget Sound Action Plan developed by the Puget Sound Partnership
• Use a sustainable process to select a sustainable treatment alternative
• Implement the alternative according to the City’s schedule (Startup/Commissioning in 2017)
Overall Project Schedule

Planning and Preliminary Engineering Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK 100 - PROJECT MGMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 200 - PRELIM ALTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 300 - FINAL ALTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 400 - OUTFALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 500 - REUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 600 - FACILITIES PLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 700 - ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 800 - PUBLIC PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 900 - MGMT. RESERVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Short List 4 Alts
- Identify Proposed Alt
- Approval to Submit Plan
Summary of U.S. Navy Feedback
Kickoff Meeting, S1 Workshop

• Candidate sites exist on Seaplane Base
  – Areas South of Train Wreck, North of Lagoon, and near Capehart Housing were proposed
  – “Train Wreck” site not favored by NAS Whidbey staff
• Stepwise process starts with local offices and continues through US Sec. of Navy
• Cultural resources are a potential issue, particularly near the shoreline
• Close coordination with local/regional planning and real estate staff is required

Summary of U.S. Navy Feedback
Kickoff Meeting, S1 Workshop (cont.)

• Options to site a facility on U.S. Navy property
  – Long-term Lease *(preferred by Navy)*
    • Requires approval from Sec. of Navy
    • 2 to 3 year process
    • Terms similar to current lagoon site agreement
  – Acquisition through surplus
    • Extensive process includes NEPA process by Navy
    • 3 to 4 year process
    • Other federal, non-governmental entities may pursue property
  – Congressional Action
Summary of Stakeholder Feedback
S2 Workshop

• Invitations went out to over a dozen agencies / individuals

• Stakeholder Workshop attendance:
  – U.S. Navy (NAS Whidbey)
  – Department of Ecology
    • NPDES/planning; reclaimed water; biosolids
  – Department of Health
    • Outfall/shellfish harvesting; reclaimed water
  – WA Senator Haugen’s staff

Summary of Stakeholder Feedback
S2 Workshop (cont)

• Dept. of Ecology Feedback
  – New reclaimed water standards due mid-2011
    • Be aware of water rights issues
  – Favor regional biosolids solution
  – Existing lagoon not viable long-term option

• Dept. of Health Feedback
  – Potential impact on shellfish will be evaluated
    • Penn Cove is particular concern

• Sen. Haugen Feedback
  – Public education/awareness key to planning effort
Summary of Public Feedback
 Interviews, Website, 12/6/10 Public Forum

• Interviews
  – 8 interviews conducted over past 2 months

• Project Website Feedback
  – Comments welcomed online

• Public Forum
  – Summary document completed following meeting

• Feedback has been consistent:
  – Existing service is good
  – Need to control costs and implement long-term fix
  – Avoid open space/public impact
  – Evaluation process/criteria are appropriate

Potential Treatment Plant Sites Proposed by Public December 6, 2010 Public Forum

Legend

- Sites Proposed by Public
- City Limits
- Lake - County Approved
- Lake - City Approved
### Basis of Planning Highlights

### Total Population Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City Comprehensive Plan, 2009</th>
<th>Comprehensive Sewer Plan, 2008</th>
<th>Facility Plan, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19,795</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>19,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,249</td>
<td>24,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>24,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,704</td>
<td>29,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,700</td>
<td>32,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumed a straight line growth rate from 2020 through 2060 for facilities plan population projections.
Basis for Alternative Analysis, Site Selection, and Project Phasing

Basis for Alternative Analysis
Basis for Site Selection

Basis for Project Phasing
Effluent Quality Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RBC Plant NPDES Permit Limit</th>
<th>Lagoon Plant NPDES Permit Limit</th>
<th>New Facility, Target/Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>30 mg/L 85% removal</td>
<td>75 mg/L 85% removal</td>
<td>10 mg/L 95% removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOD5</td>
<td>25 mg/L 85% removal</td>
<td>25 mg/L 85% removal</td>
<td>10 mg/L 95% removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1 NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorine Residual</td>
<td>0.114 mg/L</td>
<td>0.5 mg/L</td>
<td>No discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>200/100 mL (monthly)</td>
<td>200/100 mL (monthly)</td>
<td>&lt;100/100 mL (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>8 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathogen Barrier</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Treatment Process**

**Process Option 1**

**MBR**
**MBR Solids Treatment Options**

- **Option 1A: Treat solids on-site with a dryer**
  - Local use of Class A product
  - Small footprint (<.25 Acre)
  - High operating cost
    - Natural gas consumption

- **Option 1B: Treat solids off-site at a composting facility**
  - Local use of Class A product
  - Large footprint (± 2 Acres)
  - Moderate operating cost
    - Bulking materials
    - Materials handling
AS Solids Treatment Options

- Option 2A: Treat solids on-site with a dryer
- Option 2B: Treat solids on-site with anaerobic digesters
  - Trucked disposal of Class B product
  - Moderate footprint (± 1.5 Acres)
  - Energy recovery (Methane)
- Option 2C: Treat solids on or off-site at a composting facility
  - Local use of Class A product
  - Follows anaerobic digestion

Summary of Potential Treatment Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solids Process</th>
<th>Liquid Stream Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drying (Class A)</td>
<td>MBR 1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting (Class A) (1)</td>
<td>AS 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digestion (Class B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digestion + Composting (Class A) (2)</td>
<td>2C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1. Solids processed at off-site composting facility
2. Solids processed at on or off-site composting facility
Collection System Considerations

- 100% of City flow currently reaches RBC plant
  - Sites near RBC are most efficient
    - Reduce/eliminate pump station and forcemain
- ± 50% of City flow passes by Old City Shops site
- Sites further from the RBC site will require extensive (expensive) conveyance improvements
- Treating flow from Navy Housing with a small, satellite facility may reduce conveyance costs
Outfall/Discharge Considerations

• Existing outfall to Oak Harbor no longer useable
• Existing outfall to Crescent Harbor requires improvements for long-term use
• Oak Harbor, Crescent Harbor, West Beach are options (depending on treatment plant location)
• All locations provide adequate mixing
• Shellfish harvesting evaluated by Dept. of Health and Dept. of Natural Resources
  – Several agencies have moved outfall to avoid mitigation payments for lost resources

Shellfish Harvest Classifications Impact Future Diffuser Placement
Opportunities for Beneficial Reuse

- In addition to these outfall locations, team will evaluate beneficial reuse opportunities, including:
  - Landscape/open space irrigation
  - Groundwater recharge
  - Habitat creation/improvement
Objectives for Evaluating Alternatives

**Technical**
- Reliable Performance
- Ease of Construction
- Overall System Efficiency

**Financial**
- Low Capital $
- Low O&M Cost
- Low Life-Cycle Cost

**Social**
- Protect Public Health & Safety
- Preserve/Enhance Local Public Amenities
- Minimize Local Neighborhood Impact

**Environmental**
- Produce Best Water Quality
- Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- Minimize Carbon Footprint

December 14 Workshop Goal:
Matrix of up to Eight (8) Preliminary Alternatives

- Alternative components
  - WWTP Process Option
  - Candidate Site
  - Outfall/discharge Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Sites</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Treatment Options for Preliminary Alternatives Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solids Process</th>
<th>Liquid Stream Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drying (Class A)</td>
<td>MBR 1A AS 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting (Class A) (1)</td>
<td>MBR 1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digestion (Class B)</td>
<td>MBR 2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digestion + Composting (Class A) (2)</td>
<td>MBR 2C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES:
(1) Solids processed at off-site composting facility  
(2) Solids processed at on or off-site composting facility

---

## Potential Treatment Plant Sites Proposed by Public December 6, 2010 Public Forum

![Map of Potential Treatment Plant Sites](attachment:image.png)
Land Use Considerations (OHMC 19.20)

• Prohibited in CBD Zoning
• Principally Permitted in PF Zoning
• Conditionally Permitted in Most Zonings
• Some Areas not Specifically Addressed

Technical Considerations

• Avoid the following:
  – Earthquake Faults
  – On-site Toxic Releases/Hazards
  – Landfill Sites
  – Slopes > 10%
• Design for:
  – Poor soils/Liquefaction
  – 5% < Slopes < 10%
Environmental Considerations
(Critical Areas per OHMC 20)

- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas
- Wetlands/Wetland Buffer
- Streams
- Shoreline
- Estuarine Zone
- 100-yr Floodplain

Initial December 14, 2010 Alternatives Matrix
### Suggested Refinements to Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Option</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MBR with Regional Collection</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MBR with Sludge Drying</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MBR with Anaerobic Digestion</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. AS with Anaerobic Digestion</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Separate Bank</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Required biosolids</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Preliminary Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available area (acres)</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>0.2'</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>0.6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>Commercial (C-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Considerations</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
<td>Design for High liquefiable soil (P-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Considerations</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
<td>Shoreline permit required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Oak Harbor
Facilities Plan and Preliminary Engineering
Draft Preliminary Alternatives

Date: 1/14/2013
Proposed Sites Blend Public Input with Technical Requirements

Summary and Next Steps
Oak Harbor, WA – Exploring options for locating a new wastewater treatment facility was the focus of special workshop of the Oak Harbor City Council meeting on January 13. The Clean Water Facility Planning team presented eleven site alternatives. Selecting an appropriate facility site is a key step in developing a wastewater treatment facility that will serve Oak Harbor’s growing population and protect Puget Sound water quality – specifically Crescent and Oak Harbors.

The eleven sites currently being considered range from the location of the current treatment facility at Windjammer Park, to sites on the Navy Seaplane Base as well as other surrounding areas.(see attached map).

The project team presented a brief summary of information gathered at meetings with the U.S. Navy and permitting agencies; and from the December 6 public forum for interested citizens (the first of three planned public forums). The team also presented a summary of individual interviews conducted with existing sewer customers to better understand opportunities and concerns.

“The feedback we’ve received has been tremendously helpful in developing a list of possible site locations,” said Eric Johnston, Oak Harbor City Engineer. “As project planning progresses, we hope people will continue to follow the project and offer their input.”

During the workshop, the team outlined a framework for a sustainable decision-making process that compares alternatives based on technical, financial, social, and environmental considerations. The eleven preliminary alternatives were selected to blend the technical requirements with the input gathered from the public and stakeholders. In the months ahead, these preliminary alternatives will be narrowed to four, and refined to determine which ones best meet the community’s long-term objectives. A public forum to present status of this evaluation is scheduled for the spring of 2011.

A key part of the Clean Water Facility Planning process is to ensure clear communication between the public and planners. Toward that end, City staff is coordinating with City of Oak Harbor’s Channel 10 to air the January 13 workshop through the end of February. DVDs of the workshop are also available upon request. For a DVD, contact City Engineer Eric Johnston at ejohnston@oakharbor.org or at 279-4522.

Those interested in learning more about developing a sustainable approach to Oak Harbor’s wastewater management are encouraged to visit the Oak Harbor Clean Water Facility Planning website at: http://www.oakharborcleanwater.org. Project-related questions and comments can also be submitted to the City via the project website.

###
Oak Harbor Facilities Plan
City Council Workshop
March 9, 2011

Agenda

- Project Schedule Update
- Brief Review of Preliminary Alternatives
- Overview of Evaluation Process
- Proposed Alternatives and Sites
- Summary/Next Steps
Project Schedule Update

Overall Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Project Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Start up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Preliminary Engineering Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Evaluate Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine/Select Proposed Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement Milestones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Decision Points (City Council)
- Confirm shortlisted alternatives (up to 4)
- Confirm proposed alternative (1)
- Approve Facilities Plan

Community Involvement Milestones
- Public Forum No. 1
  - Learn about project objectives, need and schedule
  - Provide input for preliminary evaluation of preliminary alternatives
- Public Forum No. 2
  - More input on alternatives identified for further consideration
  - Provides input to help shape evaluation of final alternatives
- Public Forum No. 3
  - Public input on proposed alternative layouts and renderings
  - See additional information on the next steps for the project
Planning and Preliminary Engineering Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 100 - PROJECT MGMT</th>
<th>TASK 200 - PRELIM ALTS</th>
<th>TASK 300 - FINAL ALTS</th>
<th>TASK 400 - OUTFALL</th>
<th>TASK 500 - REUSE</th>
<th>TASK 600 - FACILITIES PLAN</th>
<th>TASK 700 - ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>TASK 800 - PUBLIC PROCESS</th>
<th>TASK 900 - MGMT. RESERVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan</td>
<td>Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of Preliminary Alternatives

Short List 4 Alts
Identify Proposed Alt
Approval to Submit Plan
2 WWTP Process Options

Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Treatment Process

- Membrane Bioreactor
  - Produces very clear water
  - Requires the smallest footprint among the candidate processes
  - Onsite operation
  - Requires pretreatment of the water

Activated Sludge (AS) Treatment Process

- Activated Sludge
  - Takes longer than MBR to produce water
  - Requires sludge processing
  - Produces water that is similar to an MBR

8 Candidate Sites
(Public/US Navy Input + Technical Requirements)
3 Candidate Outfall Locations

- Crescent Harbor
  - Mitigate Shellfish Impact With Deep Diffuser
- West Beach
  - Mitigate Shellfish Impact With Deep Diffuser
- Oak Harbor
  - Limited Shellfish Impact

Matrix of Preliminary Alternatives
13 Alternatives, 8 Potential Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2A/B</th>
<th>3A/B</th>
<th>4A/B</th>
<th>5A/B</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7A/B</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B/E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>MBR</td>
<td>MBR/AS</td>
<td>MBR/AS</td>
<td>MBR/AS</td>
<td>MBR/AS</td>
<td>MBR</td>
<td>MBR/AS</td>
<td>MBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfall</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical and community objectives drive alternative selection

- **Technical considerations:**
  - Reliable, safe, efficient treatment facility to meet current and future regulations
- **Community feedback:**
  - Continue existing level of service
  - Control costs
  - Avoid open space/public impact
  - Implement a long-term solution
## TBL+ objectives developed to match input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E1 Produce Best Water Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Produce the best effluent quality (NTU, TSS, BOD) within a reasonable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Produce &quot;Class A&quot; reclaimed water for beneficial reuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E2 Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Protect wetlands, streams, wildlife habitat, forests, and other critical areas *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: Critical areas defined by OHMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E3 Minimize Carbon Footprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pursue alternatives that emit the lowest levels of Greehouse Gases (GHG) (or alternatives that are “reasonably close” to lowest GHG levels)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Social Objectives

Protect Public Health & Safety
- Minimize public and City staff exposure to toxics and chemicals
- Reliably meet NPDES permit requirements; provide for safe water quality

Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities
- Preserve existing undeveloped open spaces for public use *
- Protect important view corridors in the community *

Minimize Neighborhood Impacts
- Construct facilities to match the character of surrounding areas *
- Minimize public exposure to noise, odor, and truck traffic

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Technical Objectives

Reliable Performance
- Select treatment processes with many years of proven service
- Design for adequate redundancy

Ease of Construction
- Avoid steeply sloped sites and/or sites with difficult access
- Avoid sites where acquisition/construction could cause excessive, costly delays *

Overall System Efficiency
- Maximize the amount of gravity flow to/from the new WWTP
- Minimize the amount of new conveyance infrastructure

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Financial Objectives

Low Capital Cost
- Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or "reasonably close" to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers WWTP, conveyance, and outfall costs

Low Life Cycle Cost
- Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or "reasonably close" to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers capital cost and annual O&M cost for 20-year period

Protect Assets for Future Economic Development
- Avoid areas zoned for commercial/business use within downtown urban core *

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Financial analysis focused on comparing relative cost of alternatives

- "Conceptual level"* costs developed for 3 major components:

  Conveyance
  3% - 20% of total

  Outfall
  3% - 5% of total

  Treatment Plant
  80% - 90% of total

* Expected accuracy is -50% to +30%
“Unit cost” of treatment compared with multiple local MBR* projects as check

* AS facilities typically cost 8% to 10% less than MBR

Other cost factors considered in comparative analysis

- Project Contingency: 30%
  - Accounts for planning level uncertainty
- Washington State Sales Tax: 8.7%
- Allied Costs (Engineering, Legal, Admin): 25%
  - “Soft” project costs not related to construction
- Escalation to Mid-point of Construction: 3% per yr
  - Assumes bidding in 2014
6 Alternatives are within 10% of lowest cost Alternative (3B)

Proposed Alternatives & Sites
Windjammer Park Site
Alternative 1: MBR with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Low relative cost (~6% above lowest cost)
- Most efficient use of infrastructure

**Challenges**
- Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park

---

Marina Site
Alternative 2A/B: MBR/AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Low relative cost (3% to 9% above lowest cost)
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park

**Challenges**
- Inefficient use of infrastructure
- Marina impact (MBR) or US Navy property (AS)
Old City Shops Site
Alternative 3A/B: MBR/AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Low relative cost (0% to 6% above lowest cost)
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park
- Relatively efficient use of infrastructure

**Challenges**
- Places facilities in neighborhood area

---

Beachview Farm Site
Alternative 4B: AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Low relative cost (~3% above lowest cost)
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas
- Opportunity for beneficial reuse of effluent

**Challenges**
- Inefficient use of infrastructure
Sites Proposed For Further Evaluation

Summary and Next Steps
Public Process Schematic

Full TBL+ Summary of Preliminary Alternatives
**Project Need:** The City of Oak Harbor’s wastewater utility provides service to approximately 24,000 people within its City limits, including approximately 4,000 people located on the US Navy’s Seaplane Base. The City currently operates two wastewater treatment plants: a Rotating Biological Contactor (RBC) plant adjacent to a public park (Windjammer Park); and a lagoon plant on the Seaplane Base. For many years these two plants have reliably handled Oak Harbor’s wastewater. While both plants meet current permit requirements, they are now nearing the end of their useful life. They also lack the technology to meet increasingly stringent water quality standards and the capacity to keep pace with anticipated population growth. The City is currently evaluating alternatives to replace these two aging plants with a modern wastewater facility that will provide reliable, cost effective wastewater service for its customers.

**Project Objectives:** In September 2010, the City initiated a planning process to meet the following objectives:

1. Provide continued reliable wastewater treatment service.
3. Allow phased expansion to meet future demands.
4. Deliver construction and operation of a new facility in a cost effective manner.

**Alternatives Being Considered:** Following a series of meetings with the community and key stakeholders, the project team prepared a list of 13 preliminary alternatives located on eight potential sites. Potential sites were selected considering public and stakeholder input, plus technical requirements (e.g. environmentally sensitive areas, geotechnical considerations, land use planning, etc). Two treatment processes are considered: membrane bioreactor (MBR), and activated sludge (AS). Preliminary alternatives were developed and evaluated based on their ability to meet a range of specific objectives in four categories: Technical, Social, Environmental, and Financial. Based on this evaluation, the following sites are proposed for further consideration:

1. **Windjammer Park:** This site is public open space owned by the City and located adjacent to the existing RBC treatment plant.
2. **Old City Shops:** This site is near Windjammer Park, and is comprised of approximately 2 acres owned by the City plus adjacent private property.
3. **Marina/Seaplane Base:** This site includes approximately 3 acres of private property next to the existing marina, plus adjacent property on the Seaplane Base owned by the US Navy.
4. **Beachview Farm:** This site is located on a privately owned farm near the City limits, approximately 2.5 miles from the existing RBC plant.

**Planning Level Costs:** Conceptual level costs have been developed for each preliminary alternative, and used for comparing alternatives on a financial basis. Cost estimates will be refined throughout the planning process. Even the lowest cost alternatives will represent a significant investment for the City. Total project costs for treatment, conveyance, and outfall improvements may be in the range of $70M to $90M.

**Project Schedule:** The current Facilities Planning effort represents the first step in the project development process. The planning team will propose a final alternative in the summer of 2011. Following Council approval, engineering and environmental documents will be submitted for agency review in 2012. After design and construction phases the City desires to place a new wastewater facility into service in 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Alternative</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer MBR</td>
<td>• Low relative cost</td>
<td>• Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficient use of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina MBR/AS</td>
<td>• Low relative cost</td>
<td>• Inefficient use of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park</td>
<td>• Marina impact (MBR) or US Navy property (AS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops MBR/AS</td>
<td>• Low relative cost</td>
<td>• Facilities located in neighborhood area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficient use of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachview Farm AS</td>
<td>• Low relative cost</td>
<td>• Inefficient use of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for beneficial reuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM: Cathy Rosen, Public Works Director
      Eric Johnston, City Engineer

INITIALED AS APPROVED FOR SUBMITTAL TO THE COUNCIL BY:

      Jim Slowik, Mayor
      Paul Schmidt, City Administrator
      Doug Merriman, Finance Director
      Margery Hite, City Attorney, as to form

PURPOSE
This agenda bill proposes adoption of a resolution related to five candidate sites for a new wastewater treatment facility.

AUTHORITY
The City has authority under RCW 35A.11.020 to render governmental services including operating and supplying of utilities and municipal services commonly or conveniently rendered by cities or towns. Planning for those services as may be required under RCW 90.48.110 and Chapter 173-240 WAC is included in this authority.

SUMMARY STATEMENT
On March 9, 2011, a workshop with the City Council was held to present and discuss the status of the wastewater facility planning process and to present four sites for further consideration. As discussed during the workshop, a resolution would be presented for consideration and adoption by the Council. Following the workshop, additional information became available allowing for further consideration of a fifth site. The resolution authorizing and directing the project team to proceed with the five candidate sites is attached.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT
This item was presented to the entire City Council at a workshop held on March 9, 2011.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Adopt Resolution No. 11-07 directing the evaluation of five potential sites for a future wastewater treatment facility.
ATTACHMENTS
Resolution
Workshop presentation slides
Briefing document
Crescent Harbor site ranking

MAYOR'S COMMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 11-07

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF OAK HARBOR DIRECTING THE EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL SITES FOR A FUTURE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY.

WHEREAS, the 2008 City of Oak Harbor Comprehensive Sewer Plan identifies the need for a new wastewater treatment facility to meet future growth needs and to replace aging and at-risk infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, recognizing that the City of Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor Bay and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City's goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements; and

WHEREAS, the City of Oak Harbor Capital Improvement Plan of 2010-2015 specifically lists the Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan as a prioritized public project to be undertaken within the capital improvement plan time period; and

WHEREAS, on August 4, 2010 the City Council authorized the Mayor to enter into a contract with Carollo, Inc. for development of the aforementioned Facilities Plan required by RCW 90.48.110 and Chapter 173-240 WAC for a new wastewater treatment facility; and

WHEREAS, public input was sought, received and considered on potential wastewater treatment plant locations resulting in the identification of 13 potential locations; and

WHEREAS, input from the U.S. NAVY was sought, received and considered on potential wastewater treatment plant locations; and

WHEREAS, public input was sought, received and considered on the evaluation criteria to be used; and

WHEREAS, input from various stakeholder groups including the U.S. Navy, the Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Health, was sought and incorporated into the evaluation criteria; and

WHEREAS, based on input from the public, various stakeholder groups, technical staff, engineering professionals and City staff, four equally weighted categories, being Social, Technical, Environmental and Financial, were developed for the evaluation of all potential site locations, and

WHEREAS, the Social criteria are as follows: 1) Protect Public Health and Safety, 2) Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities, and 3) Minimize Neighborhood Impacts; and

WHEREAS, the Environmental criteria are as follows: 1) Produce Best Water Quality, 2) Protect Environmental Sensitive Areas, and 3) Minimize Carbon Footprint; and

WHEREAS, the Technical criteria are as follows: 1) Reliable Performance, 2) Ease of Construction, and 3) Overall System Efficiency; and
WHEREAS, the Financial criteria are as follows: 1) Low Capital Cost, 2) Low Life Cycle Cost, and 3) Protect Assets for Future Development; and

WHEREAS, in order to efficiently and cost effectively study alternatives it is necessary to narrow the options to five candidate locations; and

WHEREAS, in order to efficiently and cost effectively study alternatives it is necessary to narrow the options to two treatment processes, being membrane bioreactor and conventional activated sludge; and

WHEREAS, after applying the aforementioned criteria to the 13 potential sites there are five candidate locations that best meet the City’s goal and objectives;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Oak Harbor as follows:

1. That Carollo, Inc., acting on behalf of the City and under the management of the City Engineer, is directed to evaluate five locations for further consideration as part of the wastewater treatment facility planning process.
2. That the five locations to be evaluated further are generally shown on Exhibit A and are referred to as:
   a. Windjammer Park
   b. Marina/Seaplane Base
   c. Old City Shops
   d. Beachview Farm
   e. Crescent Harbor
3. That both Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) and Activate Sludge (AS) treatment processes will be considered at all sites except for Windjammer Park where only MBR technology will be considered.
4. That outfalls to Oak Harbor Bay will be considered for all sites.
5. That an outfall to West Beach for the Beachview Farm site will be considered in addition to an Oak Harbor Bay outfall.
6. That additional public input will be sought and incorporated in the analysis and development of all alternatives.
7. That a report will be provided to the City Council comparing the five candidate sites.
8. That, as appropriate, additional sites and process may be considered as may be directed.

PASSED and approved by the City Council this 5th day of April, 2011.

THE CITY OF OAK HARBOR

Attest:

_____________________________, Mayor

City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

_____________________________, City Attorney
Agenda

- Project Schedule Update
- Brief Review of Preliminary Alternatives
- Overview of Evaluation Process
- Proposed Alternatives and Sites
- Summary/Next Steps
Matrix of Preliminary Alternatives
13 Alternatives, 8 Potential Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2/5/12</th>
<th>T4-R1</th>
<th>T4-R2</th>
<th>T4-R3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>T4-R4</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>MBR</td>
<td>MBR/MBR</td>
<td>MBR/MBR</td>
<td>MBR/MBR</td>
<td>MBR/MBR</td>
<td>MBR</td>
<td>MBR/MBR</td>
<td>MBR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TBL+ Comparison of Alternatives

Technical and community objectives drive alternative selection
- Technical considerations:
  - Reliable, safe, efficient treatment facility to meet current and future regulations
- Community feedback:
  - Continue existing level of service
  - Control costs
  - Avoid open space/public impact
  - Implement a long-term solution
TBL+ objectives developed to match input

**Technical**
- T1
- T2
- T3

**Financial**
- F1
- F2
- F3

**Social**
- S1
- S2
- S3

**Environmental**
- E1
- E2
- E3

### Environmental Objectives

- **E1**: Produce best water quality
  - Produce the best water quality with TBL + NRW within reasonable cost
  - Produce "clean" reclaimed water for beneficial reuse

- **E2**: Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas
  - Protect wetlands, streams, wetlands, forests, and other critical areas
  - NRW Critical Areas defined by NRW

- **E3**: Minimize Carbon Footprint
  - Pursue alternatives that meet the current level of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) or alternatives that are "reasonably close" to current (ASU) levels

*Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan*

### Social Objectives

- **S1**: Protect Public Health & Safety
  - Maintain public and city wetland planning and clean air
  - NRW uses WQOS (water quality operational standards) on safe water quality

- **S2**: Preserve/Improve Public Amenities
  - Preserve existing undeveloped open spaces for public use
  - Protect important view areas in the community

- **S3**: Minimize neighborhood impacts
  - Maintain public safety, social, noise, and traffic

*Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan*
Technical Objectives

T1
- Select treatment processes with many years of proven record
- Design for adequate redundancy

T2
- Avoid areas where acquisition/construction could cause excessive, costly delays

T3
- Overall system efficiency
- Maintain the support of present stakeholders for the new WWTP
- Achieve the amount of any permitted nutrient reductions

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Financial Objectives

F1
- Low Capital Cost
  - Minimize expenditures that are lower in cost (or "reasonable" above the line)
  - Includes WWTP, conveyance, and capital costs

F2
- Low Life-Cycle Cost
  - Minimize alternatives that are cheaper in cost (or "reasonable" above the line)
  - Includes capital costs and annual O&M costs for 50-year period

F3
- Protect Assets for Future Economic Development
  - Avoid areas needed for commercial/industrial use within 20-year horizon

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Financial analysis focused on comparing relative cost of alternatives

- "Conceptual level" costs developed for 3 major components:
  - Conveyance: 3% - 20% of total
  - Treatment Plant: 60% - 80% of total
  - Outfall: 3% - 8% of total

* Expected accuracy is ±50% to ±30%
"Unit cost" of treatment compared with multiple local MBR projects as check

* AS facilities typically cost 8% to 10% less than MBR

Other cost factors considered in comparative analysis

- Project Contingency: 30%
  - Accounts for planning level uncertainty
- Washington State Sales Tax: 8.7%
- Allied Costs (Engineering, Legal, Admin): 25%
  - "Soft" project costs not related to construction
- Escalation to Mid-point of Construction: 3% per yr
  - Assumes bidding in 2014

6 Alternatives are within 10% of lowest cost Alternative (3B)
Windjammer Park Site
Alternative 1: MBR with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Low relative cost (~ 6% above lowest cost)
- Most efficient use of infrastructure

**Challenges**
- Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park

---

Marina Site
Alternative 2A/B: MBR/AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Low relative cost (3% to 9% above lowest cost)
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park

**Challenges**
- Inefficient use of infrastructure
- Marina impact (MBR) or US Navy property (AS)
Old City Shops Site
Alternative 3/2/3 B: MBR/AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Low relative cost (0% to 8% above lowest cost)
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park
- Reliably efficient use of infrastructure

**Challenges**
- Places facilities in neighborhood area

---

Beachview Farm Site
Alternative 4/2 B: AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Low relative cost (~3% above lowest cost)
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas
- Opportunity for beneficial reuse of effluent

**Challenges**
- Inefficient use of infrastructure

---

Sites Proposed For Further Evaluation

---
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Project Need: The City of Oak Harbor’s wastewater utility provides service to approximately 24,000 people within its City limits, including approximately 4,000 people located on the US Navy’s Seaplane Base. The City currently operates two wastewater treatment plants: a Rotating Biological Contactor (RBC) plant adjacent to a public park (Windjammer Park); and a lagoon plant on the Seaplane Base. For many years these two plants have reliably handled Oak Harbor’s wastewater. While both plants meet current permit requirements, they are now nearing the end of their useful life. They also lack the technology to meet increasingly stringent water quality standards and the capacity to keep pace with anticipated population growth. The City is currently evaluating alternatives to replace these two aging plants with a modern wastewater facility that will provide reliable, cost effective wastewater service for its customers.

Project Objectives: In September 2010, the City initiated a planning process to meet the following objectives:

1. Provide continued reliable wastewater treatment service.
3. Allow phased expansion to meet future demands.
4. Deliver construction and operation of a new facility in a cost effective manner.

Alternatives Being Considered: Following a series of meetings with the community and key stakeholders, the project team prepared a list of 13 preliminary alternatives located on eight potential sites. Potential sites were selected considering public and stakeholder input, plus technical requirements (e.g. environmentally sensitive areas, geotechnical considerations, land use planning, etc). Two treatment processes are considered: membrane bioreactor (MBR), and activated sludge (AS). Preliminary alternatives were developed and evaluated based on their ability to meet a range of specific objectives in four categories: Technical, Social, Environmental, and Financial. Based on this evaluation, the following sites are proposed for further consideration:

1. **Windjammer Park**: This site is public open space owned by the City and located adjacent to the existing RBC treatment plant.
2. **Old City Shops**: This site is near Windjammer Park, and is comprised of approximately 2 acres owned by the City plus adjacent private property.
3. **Marina**: This site includes approximately 3 acres of City-owned property next to the existing marina, plus adjacent property on the Seaplane Base owned by the US Navy.
4. **Beachview Farm**: This site is located on a privately owned farm near the City limits, approximately 2.5 miles from the existing RBC plant.

Planning Level Costs: Conceptual level costs have been developed for each preliminary alternative, and used for comparing alternatives on a financial basis. Cost estimates will be refined throughout the planning process. Even the lowest cost alternatives will represent a significant investment for the City. Total project costs for treatment, conveyance, and outfall improvements may be in the range of $70M to $90M.

Project Schedule: The current Facilities Planning effort represents the first step in the project development process. The planning team will propose a final alternative in the summer of 2011. Following Council approval, engineering and environmental documents will be submitted for agency review in 2012. After design and construction phases the City desires to place a new wastewater facility into service in 2017.
Figure 1 – Potential Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Alternative</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer MBR</td>
<td>• Low relative cost</td>
<td>• Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficient use of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina MBR/AS</td>
<td>• Low relative cost</td>
<td>• Inefficient use of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park</td>
<td>• Marina impact (MBR) or US Navy property (AS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops MBR/AS</td>
<td>• Low relative cost</td>
<td>• Facilities located in neighborhood area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficient use of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachview Farm AS</td>
<td>• Low relative cost</td>
<td>• Inefficient use of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for beneficial reuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No. of TBL+ Objectives Met

Ideal Alt
T1  T2  T3  F1  F2  F3  S1  S2  S3  E1  E2  E3

Navy MBR
T1  F3  S1  S2  S3  E1  E2

Navy AS
T1  F1  F2  F3  S1  S2  S3  E2  E3
Purpose of Tonight’s Public Forum

• Provide information to the community
  – Project overview and schedule summary
  – Review process for narrowing alternatives and sites
  – Summarize alternatives and sites being considered

• Gather your feedback to help refine alternatives and select a site
  – Are we using the right decision making criteria?
  – What can be done to make alternatives and/or sites more appealing?
Project Schedule Update

Potential Sites: Input from the Community
Potential Sites: Public, Stakeholder, Technical Input

Proposed Sites: TBL+ Evaluation Results
How Will We Pick the Best Alternative?

Triple Bottom Line + Technical (TBL+) Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Performance</td>
<td>Low Capital Cost</td>
<td>Protect Public Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Produce Best Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Construction</td>
<td>Low Life Cycle Cost</td>
<td>Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities</td>
<td>Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall System Efficiency</td>
<td>Protect Assets for Future Economic Development</td>
<td>Minimize Neighborhood Impact</td>
<td>Minimize Carbon Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Objectives**

- **Reliable Performance**
  - Select treatment processes with many years of proven service
  - Design for adequate redundancy

- **Ease of Construction**
  - Avoid steeply sloped sites and/or sites with difficult access
  - Avoid sites where acquisition/construction could cause excessive, costly delays *

- **Overall System Efficiency**
  - Maximize the amount of gravity flow to/from the new WWTP
  - Minimize the amount of new conveyance infrastructure

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Financial Objectives

F1 Low Capital Cost
- Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or “reasonably close” to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers WWTP, conveyance, and outfall costs

F2 Low Life Cycle Cost
- Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or “reasonably close” to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers capital cost and annual O&M cost for 20-year period

F3 Protect Assets for Future Economic Development
- Avoid areas zoned for commercial/business use within downtown urban core *

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Social Objectives

S1 Protect Public Health & Safety
- Minimize public and City staff exposure to toxics and chemicals
- Reliably meet NPDES permit requirements; provide for safe water quality

S2 Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities
- Preserve existing undeveloped open spaces for public use *
- Protect important view corridors in the community *

S3 Minimize Neighborhood Impacts
- Construct facilities to match the character of surrounding areas *
- Minimize public exposure to noise, odor, and truck traffic

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Environmental Objectives

**E1 - Produce Best Water Quality**
- Produce the best effluent quality (NTU, TSS, BOD) within a reasonable cost
- Produce "Class A" reclaimed water for beneficial reuse

**E2 - Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas**
- Protect wetlands, streams, wildlife habitat, forests, and other critical areas *
  NOTE: Critical areas defined by OHMC

**E3 - Minimize Carbon Footprint**
- Pursue alternatives that emit the lowest levels of Greenhouse Gases (GHG)
  (or alternatives that are "reasonably close" to lowest GHG levels)

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Windjammer Park Site
MBR with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Most efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

**Challenges**
- Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park
Marina / Seaplane Base Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park

**Challenges**
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Impacts to Marina and US Navy Property
- Land acquisition and permitting

Old City Shops Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park
- Relatively efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

**Challenges**
- Places facilities in neighborhood area
Beachview Farm Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas
- Opportunity for beneficial reuse of effluent

**Challenges**
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Land acquisition and permitting

---

Crescent Harbor Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas

**Challenges**
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Land acquisition and permitting
1. **Context**

2. **Regional Design**

3. **Community Integration**

4. **Educational Opportunities**

---

**1. History**

- Original Inhabitants: Lower Skagit and other tribes
- Exploration: Mapped by Captain Vancouver in 1792
- Immigration
  - European Settlers in 1850
  - Irish immigration in the late 1850s
  - Dutch arrive in 1890s
- Milestones
  - Incorporated 1915
  - Deception Pass Bridge 1935
  - Navy base operational 1942
Demographics

- Population
  - 19,795 in 2000
  - 22,075 in 2010
- Under 18
  - 31% in 2000
  - 28% in 2010
- In 2000
  - Median age = 28 years
- Navy
  - 7500 Military personnel
  - 1200 civilian
  - 1200 contractor

Context

- Native Influence
- Navy
- Natural Beauty
- Rural
- Culture
- Maritime
- Community
- Commerce and Tourism
2  Regional Design

Regional Design

3  Community Integration

Community Integration
4 Educational Opportunities

Old City Shops Site

Commercial/Residential Neighbors
Flat Site
Diverse building styles
Old City Shops Site

Conceptual View from Northeast

Beachview Farm Site

- Agriculture
- Farm buildings
- Rolling hills/horizontality
- Views to beach
Beachview Farm Site

Conceptual View from North

Beachview Farm Site

Conceptual View from Northeast
Windjammer Park Site

Oak Harbor “Centerpiece”
Flexible Community Space
Close to Historic Downtown
Waterfront and Public Use

Windjammer Park Site

Site
Windjammer Park Site

Conceptual Plant Layout

Windjammer Park Site

Conceptual View from Northeast
Next Steps

• Provide your feedback tonight
• Summary of public feedback will be available on our web site
• Additional technical analysis in coming months, including site analysis
• Site recommendation to be presented to City Council and available for public input in Fall 2011
• City Council site decision in early 2012

Questions?

To learn more, visit: http://www.oakharborcleanwater.org/
Background and Event Format

The City of Oak Harbor hosted a public forum on April 12, 2011 to inform the public about five possible sites for a new wastewater facility and collect public feedback. Public Forum 2 followed on information presented and input gathered at a similar event in December 2010 to solicit ideas on potential project sites and criteria for evaluation of all sites. A total of 59 community members attended the public forum, more than double the first public forum held in December of 2010. City Elected officials were also in attendance. This public forum was tightly focused on site selection considerations and amenities that could be included with any site selected. Feedback collected from the forum will enable the City to refine their selection based on the values of the community members present.

The forum was organized as a participatory event, intended to be an informative session for both the community and the City. When meeting attendees arrived, they were greeted by a staff member and asked to sign in. The forum began with an overview presentation focused on the project status, schedule, a review of the process for narrowing the alternatives and sites and a high level descriptions of the possible sites and treatment types. A question and answer session followed. The presentation was filmed and will air on Channel 10 through the month of April/early May.

The remainder of the forum was an open house that allowed the public to view the five possible sites in detail, ask one-on-one questions, and provide input. People provided input related to how each site could be best designed for a wastewater facility, what amenities should be included in any site, and what criteria should be used when selecting the final site.

Following the question period, the open house began where attendees could ask staff questions, view displays, take the survey (online or writing), write down comments on Post-Its and place them on the maps, and provide feedback about factors they’d like the City to consider when selecting a location and treatment type for the new facility.

Themes heard in public comments and questions

The City of Oak Harbor is seeking public opinion about what amenities should be included in any potential site selected and what considerations are most important to the public in locating and designing a new wastewater facility.

The public forum offered three ways to provide comments:
1. Comment form;
2. Complete a survey, either online or in writing (which could be completed post-meeting);
3. Post-It exercise to indicate comments or concerns when selecting a preferred site;

The following questions were posed at a high level:

- What potential features in a new treatment facility would be important to you?
• For each of the sites: My suggestion to make a new facility located at [site] more appealing would be…

The following themes in questions, comments and feedback were noted (see comment table in Appendix A for a transcription of all comments):

• **Keep cost considerations in mind**, both capital and operations/maintenance for a new facility - the potential for potential for high costs, and their effect on rates to build and maintain a facility was identified as one of the most important factors when locating and building a new facility.

• **Consider “best fit” with a site’s surroundings.** Participants noted that wastewater treatment facilities have the potential to negatively affect the surrounding area. A building should blend with its surroundings and should not emit any odors.

• **Interest in long-term use and impact on Windjammer Park.** Through questions and comparisons, attendees were inquisitive about Windjammer Park, size of future facilities, and what will remain should the site be moved (e.g., pump station need).

• **Beachview Farm received the most comments**, five positive, three negative and two neutral. One main thread is reflected in the Beachview Farm comments: location as a pro and a con. Participants noted the location as positive since it’s sited away from most neighborhoods, but also negative because costs for infrastructure could increase.

**Questions recorded during the Question and Answer session**

Below is the list of questions from the public forum attendees. The City’s response to each question/comment is also included.

1. **Question:** What will be done with existing facility when the new facility is built?
   **Response:** The existing plant will either be remodeled in phases if it’s selected for the new facility or it will be removed.

2. **Question:** Will any of the options require a pump house (pump station) to be built on the old Windjammer site?
   **Response:** Yes, the Windjammer site may be used as a pump station if one of the other sites is selected.

3. **Question:** Are there theoretical site plans developed for all sites yet?
   **Response:** Not at this time. Once a preferred site is selected, designs for the facility will begin. Images shown this evening were for illustrative purposes.

4. **Question:** Will all five sites be reviewed using the referenced criteria?
   **Response:** Yes. All sites will be reviewed using the same criteria.

5. **Statement:** It seems more environmental analysis is required at each site.
   **Response:** Those are the types of comments the City is seeking. Please provide that input in writing, and submit to the City either tonight or in the next few weeks.

6. **Question:** Will the public see the results of the comments and survey?
Response: Yes. The City will share that information and will post the raw data results from the survey.

7. Question: When will a cost for each site be announced?
Response: In the next steps the City will refine costs associated with each option.

8. Question: Which properties are owned by the City of Oak Harbor?
Response: The City owns Windjammer Park, a portion of the City Shops site and a portion of the Marina site.

9. Question: Is the Navy aware that the City is considering sites that are located on Navy property?
Response: Yes. The City has been working with a group of stakeholders and the Navy is included in that group.

10. Question: What happens to the existing Windjammer Park site if it is excluded or not selected?
Response: Since all of the wastewater arrives at Windjammer now, there will be a pump station there that sends the wastewater to the new facility, but the footprint will be much smaller than what is there now.

11. Question: If the City selects a site located on Navy property how does the process work? What kind of contracts would the City enter into with the Navy?
Response: There are several options the City would explore. The City could offer reduced rates for a reduced land charge, the government could just give the property to the City or the City would buy the land and the Navy would pay the same rate as any other customer.

12. Question: If the Beachview Farm site is selected, would the outfall location be West Beach?
Response: Outfall locations will be evaluated depending on the site selected. There are challenges and benefits with each location.

13. Question: What would the odor levels be for an MBR process versus an AS process - how does that compare to the odor control in place now at Windjammer Park?
Response: The odor levels with the new facility will be lower than existing levels. Currently there is no odor treatment with the existing facility. All future sites and treatment types will treat for odors.

14. Question: Can Crescent Harbor be used as an outfall location?
Response: From technical analysis and input from stakeholders outfall will likely stay in Oak Harbor Bay because of the surrounding urban environment.

Public Forum Materials

Following the presentation, meeting attendees could view displays around the room. They could also comment on amenities they’d like to see at a new facility, concerns they might have about selection criteria, site locations under consideration and other factors they’d like the City to
consider when selecting a preferred site. Meeting attendees were encouraged to write their comments on Post-It notes and attach to site maps, complete a survey or comment card and ask questions of staff. The following displays were set up around the room:

**General Displays**
- Why a New Wastewater Treatment Facility is Needed
- Project Schedule
- Considerations for Selecting the Best Alternative
- Proposed Future Technologies

**Aerial Maps**
- Large map of Oak Harbor with five sites and existing facilities
- Detail of the five site:
  - Beachview Farm
  - Crescent Harbor
  - Marina/Seaplane Base
  - Old City Shops
  - Windjammer Park

**Handouts**
- Clean Water Facility Planning Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
- Comment form for questions/comments about construction
- Site selection criteria “cheat sheet”
- Written survey

**Notification**

The Oak Harbor community was notified of the public forum in the following ways:

- **Display ad** posted in the print edition of the Whidbey News-Times (Saturday, April 2 and Wednesday, April 6, 2011)
- **Online display ad** posted from Tuesday, March 14 through Thursday, April 21, 2011, linking directly to the project website.
- Announcement on City of Oak Harbor website: [http://www.oakharbor.org/](http://www.oakharbor.org/) as well as the project website: [www.oakharborcleanwater.org](http://www.oakharborcleanwater.org)
- Online survey available on the website.
- Announcement of the workshop shown on the City TV station (Channel 10).
- **Flyers** posted at gathering locations throughout the community.

**Next Steps**

Additional comments were encouraged following the forum via email, online survey, phone and/or mail in the weeks following the workshop. The public forum was videotaped, and will be provided for further dissemination via Public Access Channel 10.
Input received at this public forum, combined with input received through an ongoing online survey, will be considered in the future plans for the Oak Harbor Clean Water Facility Planning Project. The City of Oak Harbor will continue to narrow the potential locations, gather feedback about considerations and amenities, and will refine designs into a recommended preferred alternative in late 2011. A third public forum will be held in the fall of 2011 to inform the public about the selected preferred alternative and continue to gather feedback from the public. A final decision about site selection is anticipated from City Council in early 2012.
**Appendix A: Specific Comments from Comment Card and Post-It Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-It Note comments</th>
<th>Beachview Farm Site</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor</th>
<th>Marina/Seaplane Base</th>
<th>Old City Shops</th>
<th>Windjammer Park</th>
<th>Treatment Type board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old City Shops is not a good idea, too centrally located, should be sold and money used to fund another location.</td>
<td>Only using effluent for irrigation three month out of the year.</td>
<td>How willing is the Navy to part with property?</td>
<td>Not here, no way.</td>
<td>Let's use land that the city owns, not buy new.</td>
<td>Not here, no way.</td>
<td>I'm concerned about open tanks of water/solids, etc. because of safety reasons. Children will be attracted to these open tanks (AS treatment type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think locating it at Windjammer or Old City Shops site are the best options. Tourists and school kids will visit these two sites and the Marina more than Beachview Farm or Crescent Harbor, both of which are too expensive.</td>
<td>Not in urban growth area (city limits)</td>
<td>Seems to have less impact except for two surrounding neighborhoods</td>
<td>Not here, preserve this area.</td>
<td>Bad site too centrally located - potential odors. Keep this area residential.</td>
<td>Not here, preserve this area.</td>
<td>I think treatment process should be chosen first then choose the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems to me that cost and efficiency of the Old City Shops site would be far less than Beachview Farm would be.</td>
<td>Beachview is a terrible site. It's too far outside the city. Too far to pump and pump back. Would not be used by tourists or casual strollers. We would lose too much habitat.</td>
<td>Best use of the area!</td>
<td>Should be out of the city limits. This park is for the community and should be kept for the use of the community. We don't want a treatment plant taking up our park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor best spot</td>
<td>Didn't appreciate comment about less treatment for odor control. I live nearby!</td>
<td>Access to dental, medical, post office are key to preserve here at City Beach and Barrington.</td>
<td>Build new facility on ball fields and temp. Relocate ball fields to Nugent Park then demo the old facility and put the ball fields back on it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can use water for irrigation 4 - 5 months of the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great site to use water for irrigation and recharge aquifer great slope for discharging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great potential for future plant expansion if needed in next 40 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** (includes comments from the large aerial map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive = 5</th>
<th>Negative = 3</th>
<th>Neutral = 2</th>
<th>Positive = 2</th>
<th>Negative = 2</th>
<th>Neutral = 1</th>
<th>Positive = 1</th>
<th>Negative = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Oak Harbor Clean Water Facility Planning
Public Forum 2, April 12, 2011
SUMMARY
### Comment cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: What potential features in a new treatment facility would be important to you?</th>
<th>Q2: What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?</th>
<th>Q3: What other questions do you have about wastewater planning for Oak Harbor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Efficiency 2. Cost</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>The suggestions about having educational and interpretive centers are, etc. at the facility seems like fluff - an unnecessary expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located away from residential and business.</td>
<td>It should be out of the City limits. The City Shops area is the wrong location. The highest and best use is for R4 or R1. Sell the land to pay for another location.</td>
<td>Sell City Shops and pay for Crescent Harbor location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to operate long term - efficient. Cost to build</td>
<td>Effective use of all money to build and operate long term.</td>
<td>Idea: Build on City Beach ball fields. Temp. move ball fields to someplace else. After construction of new plant demo old plant and rebuild nice home game ball field on old site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Old City Shops Site
MBR/AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

Advantages
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer
- Relatively efficient use of infrastructure

Challenges
- Places facilities in neighborhood area
Crescent Harbor Site

MBR/AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

Advantages
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas

Challenges
- Requires more conveyance piping relative to other sites
- Potential property acquisition and permitting issues

Clean Water Facility Planning Project 1 Spring 2011
Windjammer Park Site

MBR with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

Advantages
- Most efficient use of infrastructure

Challenges
- Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park
Marina / Seaplane Site

MBR/AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

Advantages
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park

Challenges
- Requires more conveyance piping relative to other sites
- Impacts to Marina and/or U.S. Navy property
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Community input is an important component in the planning process for a new wastewater treatment facility for Oak Harbor.

A key decision in the planning process concerns where to locate a new treatment facility. Because the City Council expects to select a preferred alternative in the summer of 2011, a primary focus of community outreach has been to inform community members about the potential facility locations under consideration and solicit their thoughts and suggestions.

To date, community outreach has included hosting public forums; mailing informational brochures to area households and businesses; conducting media outreach; interviewing stakeholders by phone, and by posting timely and comprehensive information to the project website.

During the month of April 2011, community members were invited to complete an online survey on the project website. The survey logged responses from 109 individuals to questions asking about their awareness of the project and ideas about what amenities could help improve the project site. Additionally, the survey sought out suggestions and concerns the City should consider when selecting a location and developing a new wastewater treatment facility.

The report that follows is a summary of the survey questions and responses. Following the 47 page summary report are additional public comments posted on the project website or emailed to City Engineer Eric Johnston.
### 1. I am a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Oak Harbor resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Harbor business owner / operator / representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 81  
**skipped question** 30

### 2. During the past six months I recall hearing about plans to replace Oak Harbor’s two existing treatment plants with a modern new facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 109  
**skipped question** 2

### 3. If yes, where do you recall hearing about Oak Harbor’s wastewater treatment plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 94  
**skipped question** 17
4. In locating and designing a new wastewater treatment facility, the following considerations are most important to me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Matters some</th>
<th>Not a deal breaker</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserves existing public green space (e.g. park property)</td>
<td>47.4% (46)</td>
<td>36.1% (35)</td>
<td>11.3% (11)</td>
<td>5.2% (5)</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves views important to the community</td>
<td>43.9% (43)</td>
<td>36.7% (36)</td>
<td>11.2% (11)</td>
<td>8.2% (8)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built and operated at lowest cost</td>
<td>31.6% (31)</td>
<td>40.8% (40)</td>
<td>13.3% (13)</td>
<td>14.3% (14)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good neighbor (low noise, traffic, odor)</td>
<td>57.3% (55)</td>
<td>31.3% (30)</td>
<td>8.3% (8)</td>
<td>3.1% (3)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protects public health and environment</td>
<td>80.8% (80)</td>
<td>13.1% (13)</td>
<td>4.0% (4)</td>
<td>2.0% (2)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible enough to meet future needs</td>
<td>54.1% (53)</td>
<td>35.7% (35)</td>
<td>7.1% (7)</td>
<td>3.1% (3)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Not listed above, but an important consideration to me is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped question</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. To enhance the community value of the treatment facility, I think the City should consider incorporating the following amenities into the design (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community meeting spaces/public gathering rooms</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails/public access</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct building style fitting with the character of the surrounding area</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open green space or parks with landscaping</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive signs</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 36

answered question 77
skipped question 34

7. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 80
skipped question 31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Answered Questions</th>
<th>Skipped Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. My suggestion to make a new facility located at the Marina/Seaplane Base more appealing is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Old City Shops more appealing is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Crescent Harbor more appealing is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. The best way to keep me informed as this project moves forward is through (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project website</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 10 (City of Oak Harbor TV)</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailings</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Forums</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 92
skipped question 19

13. Please use this space to provide any additional comments or suggestions related to the planning and locating of a new wastewater treatment facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 56
skipped question 55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am a:</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Oak Harbor rental property owner (landlord)</td>
<td>Apr 26, 2011 12:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>county resident</td>
<td>Apr 25, 2011 1:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>resident of Coupeville</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2011 4:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Whidbey Island Resident, Freeland Wa concerned citizen</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 9:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freeland resident, chair of Whidbey Audubon conservation committee</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 10:14 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Island County resident-just outside city limits</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 9:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resident of Island County</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2011 12:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Concerned citizen of the Greater Oak Harbor area</td>
<td>Apr 18, 2011 9:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200 families Parkwood Manor</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 5:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Own R1 property adjacent to one proposed site</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>just outside city limits, county resident, school district employee</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>county resident</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 5:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Oak Harbor periphery resident</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Oak Harbor peripheral resident</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>resident of rural island county</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Farmland property owner near Oak Harbor</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>resident of Island county right at the Oak Harbor city Limits</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Resident of Island County just outside the city limits</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Live within City of Oak Harbor Urban Growth Area</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>live inside the City of Oak Harbor Urban Growth Area</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I live along West Beach Road about a mile south of Swantown Lake</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Live out Crescent Harbor Rd. and have Oak Harbor address and plan to move into Oak Harbor.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>owner of a downtown Commercial building</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>County resident</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 9:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>County resident</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 9:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Island County resident that cares about water quality in Crescent and Oak Harbors.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 8:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Home owner next to Beachview Farm.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 3:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>west beach resident</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 1:25 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Past Business Owner and (perhaps) Future Business Owner</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 3:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>City employee living in the county</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Retired....owned property and operated a business in Oak Harbor for 26 years</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 7:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>do not live in City limits</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:51 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 1, Q3. If yes, where do you recall hearing about Oak Harbor’s wastewater treatment plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 27, 2011 11:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 26, 2011 12:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Whidbey News-Times</td>
<td>Apr 25, 2011 1:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I know where the present plant is and have heard there are plans to relocate it at a distance from the city center above Swan Lake in the Swan Lake watershed.</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2011 4:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 9:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 8:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Letters and newspaper articles</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2011 12:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Whidbey News-Times</td>
<td>Apr 18, 2011 9:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Post card info/meeting date time</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 5:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Channel 10</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City Council meetings</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Channel 10 and newsletter</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>mailing</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whidbey News-Times</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 8:54 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 5:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>whidbey news times</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 2:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2011 8:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>channel 10</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2011 8:17 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Whidbey News-Times</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Whidbey News-Times</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>news-times</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 11:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A friend</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Online Whidbey News Times, mailer received at home</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Current plants are old, out of date and unable to meet future city growth.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:35 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 1, Q3. If yes, where do you recall hearing about Oak Harbor’s wastewater treatment plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>newspaper, word of mouth</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Newspaper and TV.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>person’s talking about it</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 11:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>City Council meetings. Brochures sent by the city</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>from friends</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 6:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mailings from City of OH, and Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 5:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>pamphlet in the mail</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 3:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Newspaper and mailings from the city</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>paper and other residents</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Paper, television, city meetings</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>In the paper and at the last city meeting on the wastewater.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Paper, television, city meetings</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>paper, television, city meetings</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 11:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>friends</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 10:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 9:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 9:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times &amp; Mailed brochure</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>local newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 7:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>News and mailed pamphlet</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:02 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 10:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>newspaper, recent mailing</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 9:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 12:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 8:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Newspaper, Council Meetings</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 4:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>city council meetings</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 11:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 8:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>In the City Hall, at the Public Works Dpt. and in the paper.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 8:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 3:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Council members</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 10:37 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>CH 10 city counsel meeting</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Newspaper and mailer</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 7:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>whidbey news times</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 4:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>A recent letter in the mail.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 4:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Whidbey News-Times</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 11:02 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Channel 10</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Whidbey News-Times</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 8:50 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>whidbey times</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 8:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>around town</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 8:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Whidbey Times</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 3:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>City Engineer discussed project during our staff meeting.</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 8:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>paper</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 9:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>I heard that it is why my utility bill has been going up and making life harder for us.</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 4:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>on television, newspaper, flyer</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 3:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>News, word of mouth,</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 3:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Whidbey news times</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Work, Whidbey News Times</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>city council meetings</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 12:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Channel 10 and the WNT</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 10:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>That we are trying to decide where to put the new site</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 10:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 9:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Council Meeting</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 9:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>WNT newspaper articles</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 7:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>newspaper,</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Source Description</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>At work (City)</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>My Interview ;)</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Newspaper, City Hall</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>At work</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>City Council Meeting</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Comcast #10</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 12:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td>Apr 2, 2011 12:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving it from Windjammer site - give this area to the public for park access!</td>
<td>Apr 26, 2011 12:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preserving the health of existing wetlands, and Puget Sound</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 9:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Location - should not drain into Swan Lake or its environs.</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 10:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is in the area annexed by the City of Oak Harbor according to the Growth Management Act</td>
<td>Apr 18, 2011 9:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preserve open space containing natural habitat and farmland. Do not expand Oak Harbor City/Urban growth boundaries.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not in a residential area</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does not interfere with salmon project at marina</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not ruining the atmosphere of an existing family/tourist gathering spot on the island</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NOT ON LAND OUTSIDE THE CITY</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 5:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Best science available for system and least damaging to environment.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>don't even think about putting it near Swan Lake are you people crazy !!!</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>This smells like an excuse to turn the Fakema Farm into a housing development</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Utilize existing waste water pipes, incorporates GREEN approach, provides for alternative treatment of grey water, stormwater and biosolids</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Is located closest to existing plant(s).</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 6:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Advanced technology. Small size for small footprint on community.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 5:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Removing the existing facility at Windjammer Park</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Energy efficient-solr and wind important. Bay currently in use does not flush well. Look at Crescent Harbor site. Make state of the art like Vancouver WA.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Will be functional to house staff and city hall.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Outside of view of the public.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ECONOMICAL</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A new state-of-the-art facility should be an asset to the general community and provide opportunities for education of the public that there is &quot;no away&quot;. Everything put down the sewer goes somewhere and impacts the environment.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 7:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nature and habitat</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Aesthetically appealing to the community</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 10:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>City Growth Planning</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 12:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Crescent &amp; Oak Harbor’s water quality</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 8:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Input</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 4:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Making sure our rural environment and wild life are preserved for the future.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 3:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Appearance of the building housing the facility is extremely important.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 7:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>It should be an asset to the community ie. meeting areas, public art</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Get it off the Beach.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 8:50 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Don't waste money on consultants.</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 8:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>should be enclosed attractively</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 3:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>How and where it is built should be best for the entire community, not just a select few or select few areas/neighborhoods</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 3:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Out of site, away from the public and high traffic areas and low odors</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 10:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>get it away from City Beach, I do not go down there because I am not a fan of the smell of shit.</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 10:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Cannot overstate &quot;lowest cost&quot;...we already are paying more for our utilities</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 8:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>type of facility</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 7:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Building aesthetics if constructed in a visible location</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Uses existing facilities and city owned property to greatest extent possible.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:01 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To enhance the community value of the treatment facility, I think the City should consider incorporating the following amenities into the design (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>none of the above- -put this facility away from public view</td>
<td>Apr 26, 2011 12:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>none of these things - it should be as utilitarian and simple as possible</td>
<td>Apr 25, 2011 1:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>most important is to keep it low profile and returning water to the puget Sound is a clean, nontoxic state compatible with the need to maintain a healthy Sound.</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2011 4:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No odor</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>None of the above, just treat the effluent waste</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Huh? It's a sewer treatment plant! It isn't a library!</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2011 8:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Compatible with ecology without negative impact</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>use the existing site</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Keep it inside the current city limits!</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Disguised ; avoids runoff into our pristine water in preparing the site</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Make it look like it isn't a humongous industrial complex, if in a farm setting make it look like a barn, doesn't need to be a park but should have nice native landscaping. Materials used in construction should be low maintenance not requiring regular painting. Make it a combination water treatment/brewery. Just kidding.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Make an educational opportunity for community and schools</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lowest possible profile. Maybe even put it underground.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 6:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Enhancements would depend on the final location.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 5:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I will leave this up to the Mayor and the City Council, but I would suggest including as many of the amenities as possible, money-wise.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>It should not be a town focal point; locate out of public eye.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MAKE IT FUNCTIONAL</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SHOULD HOUSE CITY STAFF, MAYBE BECOME CITY HALL</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A public tour of the facility with explanations of how the processing of sewage works.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 7:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Game area for hunters</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Treated water use and sludge recycle/compost</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 12:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Eliminating odor</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 11:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>None, save your money</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 8:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The engineering department should be located within</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 4:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Make it a treatment plant, it does not need to be an arts center.</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 11:46 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Keep the cost down and don't spend a bunch of $$$ on things that are not important like the $$ million restroom across from the bus depot.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 8:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Guess I covered this on previous question</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>whatever costs the least</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 4:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>It would be nice to a 2 story building that would cover the plant and house City Hall upstairs. Maybe even have some shops or condos incorporated into it.</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 10:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>What the hell is an interpretive sign?</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 10:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Amenities are not a necessary cost....We already have trails, parks..do not charge us for more.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 9:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Let's do all we can to make it more community-friendly within budgetary constraints!</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 8:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Commercial spaces, restaurants, merchandise</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>answers to the questions above depend on the facility location</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Depending on location my answers may change....but in general, I think it should look nice, be useful, and remember its a sewer plant</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Trails and open space are important if built at Windjammer Park.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Green belt and a design that is develop in a manner of a park. Buildings and the grounds should be as attractive as possible.</td>
<td>Apr 27, 2011 11:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>do not locate it here!</td>
<td>Apr 26, 2011 12:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do not site any new facility at Windjammer Park. It was a foolish idea originally and is even more foolhardy to consider this time.</td>
<td>Apr 25, 2011 1:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shield it with native vegetation compatible with the surroundings. The best method would be to create a wetland system to clean the water with the techniques currently available. Then it would be appropriate to have a path or walkway system with story boards and an informational kiosk or two.</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2011 4:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>protect the ground water and Oak Harbor</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 9:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Do not allow untreated water to flow into the harbor.</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 10:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Use cleaner water techniques</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 9:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>First choice. Build new facility on ball fields. Temp relocate ball fields to Ft Nuget Park. After construction completed demo old facility &amp; rebuild one nice ball field. Benefit construction finished just turn off light on old plant and walk across street to new plant.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 5:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I think we should build a nice looking building to house the facility.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>odor control</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Plant more and more and more trees</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 5:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Use attractive architecture and a small footprint. Due to the costs of altering the collection system, I feel this site should be the city’s first option. A sizeable pumping station will remain on the site even if the treatment process is moved so rebuild the plant here and save millions of dollars.</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2011 8:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Improved technology for cleaner effluent meeting state standards for outfall to the harbor.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>prefer that it NOT be at windjammer park!</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 11:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>expand and improve the facility</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Playground, skateboard park, dog park.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Creating a design that fits the landscape and obscures the fact that it is a treatment facility</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Not a good idea.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Keep it adjacent to the existing facility.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Esthetically pleasing and odor reduction</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I cannot imagine that a new waste facility located at Winjammer Park would somehow make the Park more appealing. NO,</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 12:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I would Like to not even consider our beautiful Wind Jammer Park area for the new facility. The outfall plant remaining would be less intrusive and more favorable for the general Public.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Enclose the facility in a beautiful building or surround it with a &quot;green&quot; wall.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 6:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Don't locate new facility at Windjammer Park. It will take up to 3x the size of the existing site. Get the facility out of the premier water front park in OH and let that area go back to the public park. It's always been disconcerting to see kids swimming in the lagoon right next door to the treatment facility, even though the facility does not impact the lagoon water (except those rare times), but the next door site leaves a negative impression for visitors (and even long time residents) visiting Windjammer Park.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 5:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>make the treated water as clean as possible</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 3:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Please completely remove the existing facility from Windjammer Park</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Keep the ball fields and make it totally odor free and NO pollution in bay. Like the one in Vancouver WA... can put city hall on top of it = state of the art</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Not an option - move to another location</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Do not place at Windjammer(City Beach) Park! This location has been the butt of jokes for long enough!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Please do not place it here!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>DO NOT USE.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>DO NOT LOCATE AT WINDJAMMER(CITY BEACH) PARK! LOCATION HAS BEEN THE BUTT OF JOKES LONG ENOUGH!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 10:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>More attractive plant, landscaping and less odor.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 9:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Have an upscale building with fountains of the reclaimed water. A charming village in Switzerland has fountains throughout town that the horses that pull the horse-drawn carriages drink out of. The people are very proud of their water treatment and it is a tourist attraction.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 7:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Don't put it there</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>To incorporate the appearance of the facility into the overall aesthetic of the surrounding neighborhood and to guarantee the elimination of odor and noise.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 10:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Place designed walls and use berms to landscape around the plant. Since this plant exists, it should not be taken out of operation. It should be brought up to current standards.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Make it look like it fits. Added cost not favorable</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 12:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4, Q7. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41     Make it safe, odorless, a design that fits the surrounding area and is appealing to look at. Perhaps some educational opportunities for kids or the public. I'd prefer the treatment facility not be located in Windjammer Park.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 11:53 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42     Don't do it.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 8:45 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43     Don't even consider the option</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 4:35 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44     Why not put it out on crescent harbor rd, it is a low point, and close to the current water treatment pond.</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 11:47 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45     not locate it there. It's our city's central park!</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 8:20 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46     Don't put it here!</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 8:44 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47     Build a treatment plant in an attractive building like in Blaine, WA MBR treatment facility.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 3:16 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48     Small footprint, effective landscaping, location that leaves unimpeded park space (put it off to the side).</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 10:38 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49     not to put it there</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:26 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50     It should not block water views and be an attractive design that blends with the surroundings.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 7:58 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51     Nothing. Don't do it at Windjammer.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 11:03 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52     Cover process areas and provide odor control. Make the building design blend with the area.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:37 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53     Do not put it here.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 8:51 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54     Do not build there. Us it as a park.</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55     Don't build it there.</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 8:31 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56     Return it to the public. Play area, picnic areas.</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 3:54 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57     This is the most logical site in my opinion and care could be taken to incorporate the design and styling to make it a part of the park, through interpretive signage or attractions..... Like a water playground....</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 8:52 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58     To not put it near our park and put it where the other plant is. Keep it away from our kids</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 4:15 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59     Not sure. Sounds silly, but how about inside a windmill?</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 4:14 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60     Nothing, this is right in the center of town, who wants to go to City Beach and see a water treatment plant... Not me, we need to think about the future, and moving the plant would allow more room to improve the waterfront and create more attractive areas Nothing will make this appealing to me, I have been here since 1984 and the current facilities are an eyesore when we have gone to city beach to enjoy the waterfront/4th of July/Holland Happening</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 3:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61     Make it look like it belong there</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 12:26 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I do not support this idea. If it does end up there, then it must be concealed and not look like a treatment plant and have zero odors. Me and my daughter love going to the park, but avoid the end where the treatment plant is because of the odors. If we want to have a state of the art park, that draws people, then the plant cannot be relocated there.</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 10:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Don't put it there you idiots!</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 10:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Not to relocate there unless an MBR.</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2011 7:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>event center and lots of public art</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 9:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>I think it's the wrong location.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 9:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Absolutely not!!! Have you not learned from the current plant. Most people I know who live here or visit, can not figure out why we have a treatment facility located at one of the cities center of attractions.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 9:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Obviously, I would prefer to not see big cement buildings or structures and I would prefer to not smell it. The more hidden the actual facility is, the better!</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 8:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Not do it there</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 7:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Not put it there</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Include rentable office or large scale meeting space that faces the water that could serve as a community center type room,... Deal with the smell. Design a building that looks like a community use facility....not a sewer. Deal with the smell</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Set the facility as far back from the beach as possible. Purchase adjacent property so that the facility does not reduce available park space. Architecture and landscaping must be compatible with the park. The facility must be quiet and odor free.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Fitting building Architecture No odor Low Noise Preserve as much park/green space as possible. Consider building a plaza on top or using a &quot;green roof&quot; for aesthetics</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>No suggestion----move it</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Place the new facilities where the two northern most baseball fields are located. Move all three ball fields to a new location. Push the site as far north as is reasonable. Provide parking and entrance to the facility on the west side. Provide a new public hall for weddings, partys, meetings, etc... on the beach side of the building. Provide park improvements to focus on the facility such as a gazebo. The community room should be high enough in elevation to see the harbor. Kitchen facilities should also be included. Once the new plant is constructed, convert the existing facility to more park.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Design so it fits the park. Include interpretive areas so kids, families visiting the park can walk through and see how the treatment plant works.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Attractive exterior building design</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Don't put it there.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Do not locate the entire treatment facility in the park. A pumping station may be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>reduce the smell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apr 4, 2011 12:45 PM

Apr 2, 2011 12:56 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Using the Marina/Seaplane Base site is almost as bad as using Windjammer Park. Go further afield.</td>
<td>Apr 25, 2011 1:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not allow untreated water to flow into the harbor.</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 10:17 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sounds complicated to acquire property rights. Still require pump station at old plant.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 5:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I think we should build a nice looking building to house the facility.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>this is a good option</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DON'T PUT IT THERE!!!!!!</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 8:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Plant more trees</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 5:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>This is an easy site to blend architecture with the surroundings but there will a substantial cost to alter the collection system. The outfall will be easy however.</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2011 8:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Avoid legal entanglements with the military.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>This is better than windjammer. However, it should be located as far south of the marina as possible. As this is a more &quot;industrial&quot; area, screening could be minimal.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 11:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Walking paths</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>same as above</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Not a good idea.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Good location for the plant as it is away from users of the park and adjacent to existing development. Should blend in with the existing landscape.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>same as previous</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>This is more appealing to me than Windjammer Park. Possibly one of the better choices, as it effects less homeowners.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 12:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Depending on cost and other factors this site would still encroach on the Marina area or at the very least take away additional waterfront that could be used for other related businesses to the Marina</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Enclose it in a beautiful building or surround it with a &quot;green&quot; wall.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 6:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not my favorite choice (maybe my second choice) but only if it is the MBR treatment process. Still leaves a negative impression to have waste water treatment right next to the water we play in (Yacht Club).</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 5:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Please do not put the treatment plant by the water, if possible.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>NO smell or pollution... empty into other bay..not oak harbor</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Use MBR process with attractive building</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Do not locate here!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Must be the smallest footprint possible and hidden from view by trees. Ensure space remains for future expansion.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>DO NOT USE!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Build it here where the populus is low and any odors generated will impact the least amount of people.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 10:33 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Not sure about using non-City-owned property for this facility.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poor Choice. Limited space, Marina, like Windjammer Park is the most important water-oriented space the city owns.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Have an upscale building with fountains of the reclaimed water. A charming village in Switzerland has fountains throughout town that the horses that pull the horse-drawn carriages drink out of. The people are very proud of their water treatment and it is a tourist attraction.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 7:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Great spot if they maintain the public boat ramp</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>...to not consider this site</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 10:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>This site is not acceptable.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Make it fit - added cost a negative</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 12:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>An attractive building with educational opportunities for the public. Safe for the environment.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 11:54 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Don't put it here.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 8:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Don't even consider the option</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 4:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Build it low, and with attractive northwest themed architecture.</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 8:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>If you want to screw up the Marina this is right where you'd put it...... Don't site it here!</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 8:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Same suggestion as #7.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 3:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Transfer ownership from the navy to the City. It's not a good idea to locate this on federal property.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 10:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>don't put it there either</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>It shouldn't take up too much space in an already crowded area. Apr 7, 2011 7:59 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Somehow I feel it's on Federal land it will be more properly maintained. Apr 7, 2011 4:15 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nothing. Apr 7, 2011 11:04 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Very easy to design a nautical themed building. Apr 7, 2011 9:38 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Do not put it here. Apr 7, 2011 8:51 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>If it will be used as a park and Marina. Apr 6, 2011 9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Don't build it there. Apr 6, 2011 8:32 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Less concrete, more trees. Apr 6, 2011 3:55 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Not really a good site in my opinion. Apr 6, 2011 8:53 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I actually think this is the best site for the new facility. Maybe it should be disguised as something befitting a marina. Apr 5, 2011 4:14 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Do not like it, it is the marina and a spot where people sail into, this proposal in not appealing at all and nothing would make it appealing Apr 5, 2011 3:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Make it look like it belong there Apr 5, 2011 12:26 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>This is the best option and one that I support. Make the building 2 stories with the treatment plant downstairs and City Hall upstairs. Shops and condos could also be added. The key is that it cannot look like a treatment plant and must be a draw (thus the shops and condos) people not deter them. By doing this here with the shops we are fixing the treatment plant issue and also making the marina a destination for boaters. Apr 5, 2011 10:38 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Better than Windjammer. Apr 5, 2011 10:08 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Not to locate there unless an MBR. Apr 5, 2011 7:09 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>make it look like an old airplane hangar and move the PBY association plan and museum into the building Apr 4, 2011 9:29 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I think this is the wrong location. Apr 4, 2011 9:16 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Same reason not to use Windjammer park...why put a facility at one of the cities attractions....Oak Harbor's waterfront needs to become a world class waterfront. Get rid of the treatment facility, go with the development plan that was done a few years back.....I lived in San Diego for a few years and it is incredible what they have done with the whole downtown area and waterfront....now it is known as a center for tourism versus a Navy town. Nothing wrong with the Navy, I am a retired vet, but a Naval Air Station is just not an attraction to bring tourist in. Apr 4, 2011 9:13 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 5, Q8. My suggestion to make a new facility located at the Marina/Seaplane Base more appealing is:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>It seems like the area over by the marina is ugly anyway, so it almost doesn't matter what you do to make the new facility more appealing -- the rest of the area is concrete parking lot and buildings that look like they've just been set down there temporarily.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 8:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Its away from residences, a current facility is there</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 7:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Not put it there</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Who cares. It's way out there in undeveloped land owned by the navy. This seems like a space you would just make functional and keep it simple.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Obtain a long-term property lease or easement from the Navy prior to investing substantial community resources in this location. The facility should be odor free, quiet and visually blend into the surroundings.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Fitting Architecture Incorporate Plaza/Viewing Area (views from roof may be really nice)</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>You said in the past there would be an impact to the Marina. This site is not good because of that</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Incorporate the marina into the facility or move the marina closer to Windjammer Park. I think it makes sense to have the marina near the park so that people visiting Oak Harbor have easier access to our shops. If you plan on leaving the marina and adding the new treatment plant, I would try to maintain as much of the existing facilities as possible. Maybe the storage and boat yard could be moved on to Navy property?</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 4:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Unique, attractive exterior building design</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Build a MBR</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Not a good option!</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 12:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Again this area needs to be as attractive as possible for the surrounding area. Park like area.</td>
<td>Apr 27, 2011 11:23 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No suggestions</td>
<td>Apr 25, 2011 1:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don't.</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2011 4:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Again protection of the Sound and local waters is paramount</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 9:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do not locate the facility at Beachview Farm - it endangers the Swan Lake Habitat of Local Importance.</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 10:17 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Should not be an option! Too expensive Will ruin the pristine environment and wildlife habitat</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 9:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DON'T PLACE IT HERE!</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 8:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cost extra piping back and forth to discharge.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 5:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>This is a very bad site too far out of town which will cost too much to pump the sewage out there. And we don't want to lose the farmland or natural habitat.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>#2 Choice</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Incorporating the rolling hills into design possibly less farmy and more wetland like.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>This is the worst option as it seems to invade (or has the potential at least to be invasive) on the beauty and atmosphere enjoyed at various points at west beach</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ABSOLUTELY NOT</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 5:58 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>not use this site at all</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 2:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>If money were no object and the county was cooperative (doubtful) this would be the easy choice. But as a ratepayer I can't support a site that will raise the cost of the project by 20-30 million(?) more? With the county's recent refusal to annex the farmland property into the city a substantial delay could be expected if this site were chosen.</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2011 8:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Guarantee clean effluent to Swan Lake watershed without obnoxious odor emissions.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Probably not the best area. Costs are a concern.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 11:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>if you even try to do this you will face the biggest lawsuit you have ever seen -- get real you idiots!!! you will ruin Swan Lake and all the property around it - where do you people get your outrageous ideas</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Don't do it! This is a ploy by the good old boys and gals who run Oak Harbor to make the public pay for a sewage plant needed by the owners of this property to turn it into a housing development. It's corrupt to even consider it.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion or Reason</td>
<td>Date and Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>same as above; avoids impacting Swantown Lake, hopefully would be located closer to the Swantown Road in lieu of pasture and valley below. Preserve the wetland area</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Who owns this property? Beachview Farm and a colocated biosolid facility. Make treated waste water available to farms, parks (Ft Nugent) and golf courses.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>This is the worst possible location for the facility. It is currently undeveloped (other than for farming). It</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Do not discharge into Swan Lake without reconnecting the lake to Puget Sound.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>This location may not effect so many property owners, except for the beautiful view of the owners on the surrounding hills. I wonder though, how it would change my impression of the magnificent view each time I drive out that way?</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 12:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>This site would obviously be the less intrusive for neighbors and the surrounding residential areas. The cost factor needs to be the biggest concern for this site. Cost of piping the water outfall either Back to Windjammer Park? Or to West Beach!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Don't build it here. We can't afford to lose more farm land or natural habitat. It's too far out of town and will require too much unnecessary infrastructure. The environmental impact alone will not allow this site to work.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 6:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Seems way out of the way... seems too small an area... seems like there’d be extra costs involved for the out of the way location and that it’s private property. But I’d need to learn more.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 5:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>This site would be okay, but I will leave it to the designers and city to plan the amenities to make it more appealing.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>have extra land to plan for expansion</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Not an option - keep effluent lines away from Swantown lake and West Beach</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Do not locate here!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>DO NOT USE!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Will devalue property in the surrounding area. Westward winds will spread the odor over a greater populace of people.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 10:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Not sure about remote site.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Not a great choice. Expensive to plumb/pump. City will be expanding in that area in the future.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Have an upscale building with fountains of the reclaimed water. A charming village in Switzerland has fountains throughout town that the horses that pull the horse-drawn carriages drink out of. The people are very proud of their water treatment and it is a tourist attraction.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 7:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>It's the best spot in town for this waste site</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Use walls to reduce noise and landscape with berms that include mature trees.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Water and solid use and expansion possibility. Doesn't need to be pretty</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 12:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Same suggestions as others.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 11:54 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>This appears to be the best site. Water could be discharged to the west of the Island with much greater influx of water from the sea.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1$ extended lease of the property</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 4:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>that is a long way from the center of town... and a lot of uphill problems is it not?</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 11:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Drop this idea. Too expensive overall. Would threaten the beautiful Whidbey Golf and Country Club with summer wind smell from the facility.</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 8:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>This site could be OK. There is lots of space there and the facility could be blended into the farm. This is an area that was hotly contested when they attempted to annex a part of it. Maybe you can leave it in the County and change your ordinances to allow you to sell sewer hook-ups in the County. You'd get more hook-ups and more hook-ups mean more $$$$ which means the whole thing could be sustainable.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 8:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>This location should not be considered due to on going feasability study of Swan Lake to restore salmon habitat and has been designated a Habitat of Local Importance.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 3:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Just don't do it. This is the wrong place.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 10:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>This is the best location of the five, but with discharge out to the west into the sound. In spite of what the County Commissioners say, this is in the direction of growth for Oak Harbor over the next 50 years.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>It shouldn't be too close to neighboring residents' homes.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 8:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>With regard I prefer this site.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 4:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Use a system that produces the best possible water quality.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 11:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Municipal golf course watered with reuse water. Combine with a land conservency group to preserve the open space which could become a park or working display farm. This site is the most forward thinking and visionary option, also probably costly.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 9:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>MBR in an attractive building.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 8:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Build as far away from the water as possible. Use methods let the water be used to irrigate golf courses or the like. Keep the water moving. Don't make it look like a waste water holding pond.</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 8:35 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 6, Q9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>This site seems expensive to operate as the cost of infrastructure and distance to pump does not seem logical. I am also concerned on its impact to future annexation and potential residential growth. I may be wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>not to build it there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Since it is a farm, why not enclose the treatment plant in a barn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I thing this is the 2nd best option, need to ensure there is room for future growth/ capability to handle more should the city grow. Seems to be the most logical place. If it would initially cost more due to it being further away, need to explain the potential cost SAVINGS over the long run and the minimal impact on the waterfront/marina/seaplane base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>THIS IS BEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Make it look like it belong there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Somehow make it look like a farm so it blends into the rest of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>No thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>restore the old barn and have it look like a farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>A surrounding park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Probably not a good idea...have consideration for all of the local property owners out there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I'm not familiar with this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Not to even consider it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Not put it there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>The facility should be visually inconspicuous, odor or noise should not be noticeable off site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I don't like this option. It seems expensive to pump all that sewer stuff out there... But otherwise, I guess make it look like a barn...or something that fits with the natural surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Incorporate trails/green space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>I would like to see the design retain the farm like look. I suspect that over time this area will be developed. With that, I think the theme should be subtle enough to fit the current surroundings, but not so much that it looks out of place in a development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Nice idea but terribly expensive when compared to others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 6, Q9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Farm building look to exterior - blend in</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>surround it by parks, trails</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 3:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Not a good option.</td>
<td>Apr 4, 2011 12:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>reduce the smell. seems very far away from the city and most residents. seems like that would cost a lot for new piping? not a good choice.</td>
<td>Apr 2, 2011 12:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Why downtown?</td>
<td>Apr 27, 2011 11:23 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Don't put the new facility in the center of Old Town.</td>
<td>Apr 25, 2011 1:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Art. A city center compatible design.</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2011 4:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Second choice Old Shops. Taps old plumbing. Still requires pumping low area up hill.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Build a building to enclose the facility to make it look like a nice place or put a roof over it and put a ball field on top of it.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No. Sell this property to pay for another site. The highest and best use for this property is R1 and R4!</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>could hamper the hope for new activity downtown</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ARE YOU KIDDING?</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 5:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>In terms of reconfiguring the collection system this site is number 2. But you still have a pumping station in the park and a treatment plant in neighbors back yards; not a big improvement over the Windjammer Park site.</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2011 8:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ensure there are no negative effects to neighbors.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>not desirable, but with proper landscape work and screening, it could work.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 11:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dumb. Keep it near the water.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>same as above..... building compliments the setting and disguises the purpose of the structure</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Not good idea to have it in city core area.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes for this one. We're already used to it. More centrally located than the others and wouldn't require quite so much pumping up hill. I guess we're used to doing a lot of that too, but I think it would help.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 12:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>This location may prove the best as far as location to Outfall. The site may not be cost effective in relation to Crescent Harbor site because of additional land acquisition cost. But appears to be a location that could make the most sense. With the buffer's that were presented at the public meeting on the 12th seems as though there would be very little objections from the neighboring properties.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Enclose it in a beautiful building or surround it with a &quot;green&quot; wall.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 6:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ABSOLUTELY NOT! This is smack dab in the middle of OH downtown/uptown shopping and with businesses and residences on all sides. If there is smell involved, this would be a definite negative for visitors and residents. I think the location would leave visitors and residents with an overall negative impression of the city.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 5:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date and Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>If we can keep the treatment plant out of the city, that would be best.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not recommended due to being in town.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Might be good site as long as process can be covered and is not unattractive to neighbors</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 1:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Could be used. Use it to house staff and City Hall. Use solar, wind, and methane as power sources. Outflow to Crescent Harbor.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Smallest footprint possible, very low odor and screened by trees.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>COULD BE PLACED HERE. USE AS NEW STAFF OFFICES, IF LARGE ENOUGH, USE AS NEW CITY HALL. USE SOLAR, WIND, AND METHANE AS POWER SOURCES. OUTFLOW TO CRESCENT HARBOR.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Not here!</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 10:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>This may be a good site, but the cost for moving the plant from the existing site is a concern.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 10:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Not a great choice. Site seems too small. Poor location for future infilling/upgrading of public and private facilities within downtown proper</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 9:02 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>This would be in an industrial non-tourist area, so it would be a waste of money to do an upscale building with fountains. However, possibly more money would be available to do an interior education center about wastewater and conservation of this essential resource.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 7:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>It's another good site with low impact to the area as long as it's an enclosed facility</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:12 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Surround it with walls and berms with plantings to include mature trees.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Not in the gut of the city!!!</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 12:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I'd prefer not to have the water treatment facility in the city limits.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 11:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Not a good idea.</td>
<td>Apr 11, 2011 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Make it a dual use facility, for example - a new City Hall</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 4:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>get it out of the downtown.... geez, you want to make this place touristy, the smell of the treatment plant does not accommodate that..</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 11:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Hard to conceive we'd want a sewer plant near the center of the city...</td>
<td>Apr 10, 2011 8:23 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Not a good spot.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 8:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Enclose most MBR equipment in an attractive building.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 3:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Depends on cost, and on the acquisition of some current private property. Otherwise, seems like a good site. I'm not sure what it would take to pump sludge up hill to this location. Apr 8, 2011 10:41 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Still too close to down town Apr 7, 2011 9:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Put it somewhere else. This area is for people and businesses. Apr 7, 2011 8:02 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Save money by using city land. Build a facility that doesn't look or smell like a wastewater treatment facility. Apr 7, 2011 11:06 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Central location, good opportunity for combined public meeting facilities. Apr 7, 2011 9:43 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>House the facility in an appropriately styled building. Apr 7, 2011 8:54 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>MBR in an attractive building. Apr 7, 2011 8:52 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>If only (MRB) process Apr 6, 2011 9:01 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Put signs up that tell people what it is being used for and keep it looking taken care of. Apr 6, 2011 8:37 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Far enough away that tsunami would not harm it. Apr 6, 2011 3:56 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Third option in my opinion as its impact to future development in the surrounding area is limited. This does impact a few residential parcels including apartments but the likelihood of this area being further developed and improved in the future I don't see happening. Apr 6, 2011 8:59 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I'm really not in favor of this location Apr 5, 2011 4:14 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Nothing, do not think there is enough room for future growth and with it being in the middle of the city, a bad idea. Nothing would make this appealing to me except for scrapping this idea Apr 5, 2011 3:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Make it look like it belong there Apr 5, 2011 12:27 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>location and cost are best Apr 5, 2011 12:13 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>This site is a long way from the water and communities. It could essentially be built without any fancy buildings or landscaping. This would be my second choice of locations. Apr 5, 2011 10:41 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Perfect. Apr 5, 2011 10:09 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>No thoughts. Apr 5, 2011 7:10 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>dont know Apr 4, 2011 9:29 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Incorporate public art. Apr 4, 2011 9:17 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A MBR facility (like Blaines) would probably be okay, but not sure if local residents/businesses will resist. Apr 4, 2011 9:13 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## My suggestion to make a new facility located at Old City Shops more appealing is:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Old City Shops? I didn't know we had such a thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Very well hidden, out of the way….consider only if within a building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Not put it there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Must be inconspicuous in every respect. Odor and noise must not impact the surrounding neighborhood. Scale, architecture and color must be compatible with the surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Same as my thoughts for windjammer. Make sure the building can be designed to put office/community space in it and take advantage of the view of the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Incorporate meeting space and a plaza roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I know that part of this site would encumber the boy scout facility. I wonder if we can improve on what they currently have with the new treatment plant. An improved meeting area here may accomplish this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Best site so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Build a MBR with public meeting areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Design is important to make this site acceptable. Make it look like anything other than a treatment plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>not sure exactly where this location is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Needs to be outside the populated areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Any new facility doesn't really have to be too &quot;appealing.&quot; Make it blend it somewhat so it doesn't stick out like a sore thumb and be done with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a constructed wetland sewage treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Raise it up. When pipe work was recently done the construction crews were working in mud the whole time. Nice to make bigger more energy efficient plant but extra cost to build on soft soil and headache to get government land grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I think this location is too environmentally critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>#1 Choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>odor control in regards to homes and school out there, but seems like a decent option away from water that is used on a regular basis by local citizens and tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Descent landscaping around the facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FORGET ABOUT IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>this area is away from housing, close to treatment facility already in use. This site seems like the most obvious already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>This site makes little sense; it has all the problems with collection system reconfiguration and few advantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Avoid legal entanglements with the military. Make them assume responsibility for their own pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Best option, minimal screening, and a good fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Keep it closer to the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>There is some semblance of atreatment plant nearby, would probably make economical sense to provide a site in this area for that reason and proximtiy to Oka Harbor itslf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>This is a toss up with the Farm location. This site is near the current treatment ponds but the idea that the treated water would be pumped into Crescent Harbor not what I would like to see, but if the Navy is making it available at no charge I think that financially it is a good idea. Not likely to have as much development in this area and if there is, they will do so with the knowledge they might have a stinky neighbor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Do not locate it within the newly established wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion and Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>This seems most appealing for location, but has the drawback of pumping &quot;you know what&quot; back and forth for quite a substantial distance. If the more expensive system were used and we could convince the Navy that emptying the system water there would actually be better for the lagoon, then this would be the site that I would prefer. By all means, the higher priced system would, in my estimation, be the least expensive in the long run and the best for our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The cost of this location is really unknown but appears might be the least objective from a publics view. The cost of piping to the out fall area could be just as expensive as the other sites even if the Navy would work out some type of joint relationship with the city for sewage cost over a lease period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I believe this site to be too environmentally fragile and too far away from the closer sites to downtown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>My first choice since it is out of the way from downtown OH (but not to far), is a very large site, and not to close to residences. Also seems like a win-win for the Navy and the City of OH. Wouldn't have to build a building per se as you can do the nature trails etc. which would save costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>This site would be okay, as well. Again, I'll leave the appeal factor to the city and designers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Best choice… can plan for expansion for years to come…plenty of room… still needs to be state of the art and no odor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Probably best location for outfall and out of site to most the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Could be used if it can not be breached. It could allow room for future growth. The facility should be functional to house staff and City Hall. Use solar, wind, and methane as power sources. Outflow to Crescent Harbor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Good location as is, just add trees along road frontage. Still would go with smallest footprint and low odor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>COULD BE USED AS STAFF OFFICES AND NEW CITY HALL. DOESN'T NEED TO BE SHOWY! MAKE IT FUNCTIONAL! LOCATION SHOULD ALLOW MORE ROOM FOR FUTURE GROWTH. USE SOLAR, WIND, AND METHANE AS POWER SOURCES. OUTFLOW TO CRESCENT HARBOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Not sure about remote site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>By far the best choice. Out of city center. Located in an area not likely to be developed; also in AICUZ sound zone. Proximity to existing facility could be beneficial. Plenty of room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Have an upscale building with fountains of the reclaimed water. A charming village in Switzerland has fountains throughout town that the horses that pull the horse-drawn carriages drink out of. The people are very proud of their water treatment and it is a tourist attraction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 33 | By far the worst site of them all due to it’s a wet land area. It's also one of the few areas that is open around here for the public to hunt. It's shameful that the city would even consider would try to destroy a game area without opening up another public game area for the local sportsman. I'm contacting ducks unlimited and the navy about this issue of lost habitat.  
   | Apr 12, 2011 12:20 AM |
| 34 | This site is not acceptable since this area already has a treatment plant. It is my preference is that the city's sewage not be on Navy property rather than city owned or to be purchased property. The city households that will rely on the new plant are within city limits. So deal with it within the city boudaries or to be amended boundaries.  
   | Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM |
| 35 | Those poor people Wind , Noise and now a treatment plant. Not a direction of desirable growth for the city???
   | Apr 11, 2011 12:49 PM |
| 36 | This would discharge directly into a "new" wetland designed for salmon habitat. Bad idea. Accidents happen. Raw sewage would end up in this area.  
   | Apr 11, 2011 8:49 AM |
| 37 | If the water you are discharging is so clean, it shouldn't harm the shellfish and the effluent should be discharged to Crescent Harbor  
   | Apr 10, 2011 4:37 PM |
| 38 | Gee, I said that back at the beginning  
   | Apr 10, 2011 11:49 AM |
| 39 | Seems like the perfect location in terms of out of sight, out of mind. Probably the least smelly option, too, for downtown and our park areas?  
   | Apr 10, 2011 8:24 AM |
| 40 | It is out of town in a big open area that, like Fakkema's farm, the facility can be blended into the scenery. No need to spend money uselessly trying to make it some kind of meeting space or something like that either. Yes, this could work.....  
   | Apr 8, 2011 8:52 PM |
| 41 | This is an open area that could have walking trails and a park like setting.  
   | Apr 8, 2011 3:24 PM |
| 42 | No way. Not on federal property, and not so distant where sewage would have to be pumped a long distance.  
   | Apr 8, 2011 10:42 AM |
| 43 | It appears that this area is large enough to take us into the future. In order to transfer sewage to the facility; the elevation is not as high, there is less developed property to deal with, less traffic, we already have sewage piped close to this location, and this location appears to be more compatible for a future lift station on Whidbey Ave or north there of. The down side is the city's growth seems to be going to the west and it appears to be located on Navy property (which we should secure ownership of prior to).  
   | Apr 8, 2011 9:01 AM |
| 44 | this will create too much of a delay trying to get the lease from the NAVY on the Site. It is also away form the urban growth plan.  
   | Apr 7, 2011 9:32 PM |
| 45 | It should not block water view from Crescent Harbor Rd.  
   | Apr 7, 2011 8:02 PM |
| 46 | If not at the Seaplane Base this would be my second choice.  
   | Apr 7, 2011 4:16 PM |
| 47 | Get a definitive agreement with the Navy.  
   | Apr 7, 2011 11:07 AM |
| 48 | Since it would be built on/in a wetland, provide trails and public access areas.  
   | Apr 7, 2011 9:45 AM |
| 49 | MBR in an attractive building.  
<p>| Apr 7, 2011 8:53 AM |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My suggestion to make a new facility located at Crescent Harbor more appealing is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1st choice. Either MBR or AS process could be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Don't build it there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Make earthquake and tsunami resistant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Second option in my opinion as infrastructure currently exists to pump water from Windjammer Park to the existing Lagoons. This is also out past the area of future development and annexations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>This seems like the best place - no homes around in close proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>enclose the area with lots of shrubs, trees and flowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>This is my first choice, like Beachwood Farms, it has room to expand if and when the city grows. Not in the middle of the city, and some infrastructure already in place. Appeals to me already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>NOT HERE!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Make it look like it belong there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>This site would require that it be built to blend in. This site would be my third choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Actually this idea is better than perfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Excellent location perfect for either type of facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>rural architecture and low skyline don't block the view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Isolation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Perfect location!!!! It is out of the way and will not bother anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Would anyone even see it at Crescent Harbor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Same as marina site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>not put it there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Secure long-term lease or easement from the Navy before investing significant community resources in this location. Facility should not emit odor or noise that is noticable off site. Visually inconspicuous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I thought I already answered this...so maybe I was confused. But I don't think much needs to be done with this site...it's out of the way, not near people, and should just be a functional sewer plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Include a wetland viewing area and/or boardwalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Probably the best overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Farmhouse exterior look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Parks and trails.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 8, Q11. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Crescent Harbor more appealing is:

| 74 | This is the best site. Treated water would not be entering Oak Harbor, and I believe that the tidal action of Crescent Harbor would be better. | Apr 4, 2011 12:49 PM |

Page 9, Q12. The best way to keep me informed as this project moves forward is through (check all that apply):

<p>| 1  | There should have been a Public Forum prior to determining a final five | Apr 10, 2011 4:38 PM |
| 2  | Include information with my utility bill. | Apr 8, 2011 10:42 AM |
| 3  | mail with utility bills | Apr 6, 2011 8:38 PM |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Water quality outflow should be EXTREMELY clean. Puget Sound deserves more protection than we currently give it. Do not go cheap like every other Oak Harbor project does.</td>
<td>Apr 26, 2011 12:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Refrain from having this become another public boondoggle Taj Mahal. Site the thing out in Crescent Harbor and be done with it.</td>
<td>Apr 25, 2011 1:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To avoid unnecessary costs, expanding existing facilities close to the present urbanized areas seems prudent.</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2011 4:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DO NOT PLACE THIS FACILITY ANYWHERE NEAR SWAN LAKE!</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2011 8:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My comments have been included in the survey. In conclusion I will say that cost should not be the main concern when you are discussing something that can have such an impact on the surroundings and atmosphere. Thanks.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>By using the Crescent Harbor site, everything could be built into one area.</td>
<td>Apr 17, 2011 9:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do not damage the Swan Lake ecosystem or Puget Sound</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2011 6:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I agree that it is less than ideal to have a treatment plant in our city’s most used public park. I also think that a new treatment plant in Windjammer Park, properly designed, could be an asset to the community. Even if we move the treatment plant a pumping station will remain in the park. If it fails, wastewater will have no where to go but into the bay. I would rather spend a little extra money in architecture and odor control than a tremendous amount to relocate the treatment plant.</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2011 8:54 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Fakkama Farm is not off the table for consideration IF the best available technology for clean effluent is incorporated and used to prevent pollution of Swan Lake &amp; its watershed, odor emissions to surrounding area are reliably prevented, and good asthetic landscaping is maintained. To Hap &amp; Dick’s surprise, we see some positive potential that needs more information to confirm Al &amp; Barbara Williams</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 12:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I really prefer the Crescent harbor site. I’m sure, however, that costs would be much higher.</td>
<td>Apr 14, 2011 11:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>use what you already have</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 7:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The city of Bellingham has a much larger population than Oak Harbor yet it's treatment facility does not take up very much space. The city did not have to grab new land to upgrade the plant. I’m sure that Oak Harbor can build a plant within it's current city limits that will provide all the capacity it needs for the future. Don’t use this as an excuse to fund developers who don’t want to pay their own way.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 6:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Really serious about the biosolids. Saw online that King County provides biosolids to several companies who then turn it into excellent fertilizer/compost. King County also is involved with providing the biosolids to farmers on the East side of the mountains. This could be a good industry to add to the island--more jobs, low pollution. Also would like to see a bigger push for smaller, decentralized grey water systems. Diverting grey water from the treatment facility would allow the facility to remain below capacity for a longer time. Would also like to see some sort of septic tank/RV dump facility added as well. I think Island County is the only authorized dump site on the island and there needs to be more options/competitive pricing.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 5:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>as stated in my comments ref. Crescent Harbor</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The plant should not be located in environmentally sensitive areas, Crescent Harbor, and Fakema farm.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 4:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My sincere thanks for including all of us, regardless of whether or not we live in the Oak Harbor city limits or not.</td>
<td>Apr 13, 2011 1:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I think the city staff and our city council will look out for our best interest and choose the location that is the most cost effective and allow for other options for public facility's whether it is for educational purposes or for additional meeting places for city functions. The existing City Hall building is very limited for public meetings. Would be nice to be able to provide better facilities and could be incorporated into the water treatment center.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 8:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Please keep urban development within the current boundaries of the city. We live on an island and we can't afford to lose more farmland, forests, meadows, and natural habitat. Tourists come to Whidbey Island to see nature, to camp and boat, fish and hike and enjoy the views. They don't want to see urban sprawl.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 6:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Perhaps the City should look into installing solar panels on the roof of the facility to help with energy efficiency. It may cost more now but it can pay for itself over time (depending on the energy needs and size of solar array). My house in OH is the first in OH to install an all Washington State parts solar system and we will recoup the cost in 7 years, all while PSE pays me for producing energy. Check out the WA State Renewable Energy Investment Recovery Initiative.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 5:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Keep the new facility at the original site with the MBR treatment process. Thank you.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 3:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The appeal of Oak Harbor is our beaches, park, marina, and refaced downtown area (when completed). Please do not put a waste water treatment plant near our beaches, marina, or downtown area. Thank you for the opportunity to give my input.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>We really need this new facility.... it's worth paying extra to get it right, modern, and ready for growth for decades to come. Current one is the joke of Washington.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 2:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>THIS FACILITY DOES NOT NEED TO BE A SHOW CASE. IT SHOULD BE FUNCTIONAL! HOUSE THE STAFF AND CITY HALL THERE. ALLOW FOR FUTURE GROWTH. USE SOLAR, WIND, AND METHANE AS POWER SOURCES. OUTFLOW TO CRESCENT HARBOR. USE THAT TIDAL FLOW.</td>
<td>Apr 12, 2011 12:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Crescent Harbor location is the best in my opinion for long list of reasons. I sure hope the city has the same list in mind...assume I'll find out tonight. Crescent Harbor location will require hard work with the Navy but it can and should be done. As a recently retired CAPT with lots of beltway experience I would be happy to help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>JUST START LISTENING TO ALL CITIZENS. MAKE THE FACILITY FUNCTIONAL FOR HOUSING STAFF AND CITY HALL. USE SOLAR, WIND, AND METHANE AS POWER SOURCES. OUTFLOW TO CRESCENT HARBOR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lowest cost is important to me, so using the existing site may be the best. However, it would be great if the structure(s) are more attractive, as well as the landscaping, and odor eliminated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>THE opportunity for public input on this project is appreciated. It seems that this particular project has been better handled than some others in the past.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The most important thing is to clean the water as thoroughly as possible so that the environment and public health is protected. This should be done at the lowest possible cost. It makes the most fiscal sense to use property already owned by the public and not have to invest in additional real estate. Some of the waste water treatment facilities around Puget Sound are really beautiful. For example, brides go and have their wedding pictures taken at the Edmonds water facility. It is truly beautiful. A well designed facility at Windjammer Park would be a tourist attraction and a draw to the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I'm totally opposed of a tax hike for this project and loss of any public game areas without a plan to make a new game area open for the Whidbey sportsman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Correct a major mistake: Stop the flooding of the current Crescent Harbor sewage plant location. Once this area is returned to 100% functionality of the current plant, expansion could be considered. This would cost less and not impact other pristine land owned by the Navy. It would also mitigate impacts on property owners for the other proposed sites not currently in use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Consider each site as if you picked it. Now think out 50 years. Where do you wish you would of placed it and why. Did you consider growth, many cities wish they had decided differently after their city grew exponentially. Long term cost (rate payer investment), expandability and sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I understand that this is Oak Harbors's plant. But it impact all of us on the Island. Broaden your horizons a little and ask for input from the rest of us. After all we do shop and pay sales tax etc. to Oak Harbor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lets go back to thirteen sites, have a public forum and discussion on all thirteen sites and from there determine which five or four sites we should be looking at. We shouldn't be wasting a single more penny looking at The park or the Marina. I don't care how low-odor, etc these new plants are supposed to be, we DO NOT WANT THEM ON OUR COMMUNITY WATERFRONT PROPERTIES!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Take advantage of the Navy's generous Crescent Harbor land use offer before they change their mind :)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Page 10, Q13. Please use this space to provide any additional comments or suggestions related to the planning and locating of a new wastewater treatment facility.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Why don't you locate this facility out in the Goldie Road area? The area is industrial, there are wooded areas to screen it, you're not screwing up anyone's view or property values. And YES, locating a sewer treatment plant near people's homes will screw up their property values. Put the thing away from people and their homes, parks, marinas, shopping areas, etc. Do it economically and don't blow a bunch of money on trying to make it something it isn't. And I wouldn't spend a bunch of $$$ on some piece of art like a brass killer whale out in a sewer lagoon. Make it functional, expandable and at a reasonable cost....... That's my two cents worth!</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 8:8 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The site north of 7th Avenue at the end of Ellis Drive should be considered. This would be closer to the center of the city and would make more efficient use of the infrastructure, which would bring down the cost.</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 3:8 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Page #3 has nothing to do with a Sewage Treatment Plant, with the exception of a meeting room for tours/training. The rest has to do with the General Fund. The Windjammer Park facility should be used for a low profile lift station only. We have already had expensive studies performed, to tell us how this should be developed. The old City Shop and Marina are prime property. Neither location is conducive to treatment plant operations or future growth. Also, was the old Shop property originally purchased from General funds or Enterprise funds? The Beachview Farm appears to be more practical than either of the &quot;center of town&quot; locations, since the majority of growth seems to be in that area. The outfall could go to farmlands/golf course or to West Beach. I expect a new outfall permit would be cost prohibitive. In order to put transfer lines to this location, we would be going through developed lands for the most part. The Crescent Harbor location is in undeveloped lands, already in the general area of our present facility. Transfer lines would be less expensive, dewatering would be more. As I see it, the big hurdle to cross is securing property. I guess it's too late to ask why property to the north of Crescent Harbor Rd. was not considered?</td>
<td>Apr 8, 2011 10:8 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I want to thank you for the mailer which clearly showed where the project-planning is at and photos of what the facilities might look like and descriptions of how they work. I like the idea of getting the facility away from the Pioneer waterfront altogether, an already crowded area with little space as it is just to enjoy the water. Beachview Farm and Crescent Harbor probably have the most space available.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 8:8 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>With regard to the type of process I would prefer to see built, my preference is the Activated Sludge (AS) treatment process</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 4:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I hope that the new facility is not located at Windjammer Park or the Marina. Maybe then Oak Harbor can finally beautify its waterfront and make it a place we are all proud to call home.</td>
<td>Apr 7, 2011 8:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Have the professional staff work with state and local government departments to come up with the most modern technology that is available and build the thing on the least valuable land available. Try to make it look nice and clean, but it is a waste water treatment facility and not a meeting hall or necessarily a playground area.</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 8:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cost and public safety must be on the high end of consideration when discussing this project. Do not agree to something that is going to be bogged down in studies and debate for the next ten years.</td>
<td>Apr 6, 2011 3:59 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
43 We live right behind the trees of Beachview Farms. Lots of trees have just been removed and we wonder if all of them would be, leaving us with a view of the plant. Also we do not relish the smell from the plant. It seems like the Crescent Harbor location would be the best as there doesn't appear to have homes closeby. Apr 5, 2011 9:27 PM

44 I am happy to see that we all get a chance to have some input. I do believe the Membrane Bioreactor is the best choice for Oak Harbor as the Activated Sludge Process takes up too much space. Hopefully, when the project is completed it will be pleasing to the eye no matter where it is located. Apr 5, 2011 4:14 PM

45 The long term use/needs/ need to be considered. Sometimes there may be an initial cost that is more expensive, however, over the long term the initial cost turn out to be a savings when compared to going the easiest/least expensive route initially then having to spend much more because there was no room to expand or the facilities were not able to meet the demand. Apr 5, 2011 3:37 PM

46 After the witnessing the open hearing fiasco about considering whether to institute a one-way street, I feel my input is a waste of time. Even though the majority of the input was against the one-way idea, one council member stated that [he had not heard anything that would make him change his mind.] The council approved it against the wishes of the majority. In this situation I feel that my input would be of no value to the decision makers. Apr 5, 2011 3:24 PM

47 This is a good project that will help to improve the city. If done correctly it could be an attraction and not a distraction. My biggest concern is that it will remain at the park and this is a bad idea. It is time that we move to the next level and make our park a premier destination free of odors and the plant. Apr 5, 2011 10:43 AM

48 Please DO NOT put this crap plant at city beach Eric! Apr 5, 2011 10:10 AM

49 Utility bills cannot keep going up, up, up. A plant design should lower costs of construction and operation. The idea of continually increasing utility costs is destructive. Apr 4, 2011 9:19 PM

50 I think I covered it all....but whatever is decided, pls keep the costs down, and focus on just the treatment facility. I think the amenities and nice to have things can be shelved. The rates for all of our utilities have gone up more than any military or civilian COLA this year...not to mention what we are paying at the gas pumps. Apr 4, 2011 9:17 PM

51 Least environmental impact possible Apr 4, 2011 7:53 PM

52 Put it in the Marina and invest in upland improvements. Move City Hall to completed facility to generate trips. Connect Marina to Downtown with this investment and allow commercial uses along Pioneer Way east of Midway. Build the facility with commercial spaces to lease. Tie the development in with Skagit College and Navy commercial. Make a campus out of it. Apr 4, 2011 4:55 PM

53 Pay close attention to the long-term costs and benefits of the processes and sites under consideration. Apr 4, 2011 4:50 PM

54 Energy costs are going up. Keep pumping to a minimum. Apr 4, 2011 4:23 PM

55 Plan for the long run, not just the cheap fix. Apr 4, 2011 12:50 PM
Page 10, Q13. Please use this space to provide any additional comments or suggestions related to the planning and locating of a new wastewater treatment facility.

<p>| 56 | my biggest concern is the odor. | Apr 2, 2011 12:59 PM |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I did review the document that I received and applaud the forward thinking the City of Oak Harbor is tackling. Achieving such a goal at just the right cost will be a good goal to seek. Having said that my question would be to the cost actually being passed onto the residents of the City of Oak Harbor. This will be a benefit to them, obviously, but at what cost to their already strained budgets? Actually the question doesn’t, at this point in time, probably have an answer. I fully understand there isn’t any plausible way to project a cost that the residents will yet have to bear. Looking at the five current proposed areas under consideration I would believe the City would also need to consider the additional costs involved in using land that is not theirs or the potential cost of easements onto/ across private property versus utilizing property they already have ownership in or perhaps an existing lease in place. 1. Beachview Farm is the furthest site and would require much more in the way of lines, cost of purchasing or leasing property, etc. And, unless the lines were routed through the city (which would be very disruptive) there would be the permitting cost of working in any County right-of-way. And, if the lines exceed 500 LF in County r/w and this area in not within the UGA there would be another cost of a possible franchise and the process through the BOCC. 2. Marina/Seaplane Base – my thought here would be to the concern for any saltwater intrusion or other factor that would be disruptive to the eco-system. 3-4. Windjammer Park &amp; Old City Shops….I do not know how much more property would be involved but these areas are already in place for use by the City – updating/renovating may be a little less costly and ultimately less costly to the residents of Oak Harbor. 5 Crescent Harbor – a viable area that might be possible through a lease with the Navy and permitting could be done through them. I appreciate your taking the time to read this. I would like to believe that ultimately the goal is to have the best service for residents at a cost that is fair. With all government under scrutiny it does become challenging to stay on budget and within budget. So, to consider sites that would not necessarily be a good use of the public’s resources is not the best way to go. I am sure you and staff are diligently working to ensure that money is spent wisely and still obtain the best service. Bottom line – based on what I have read and reviewed – the old city shops area, Windjammer Park, or the Navy area south of Crescent Harbor Road would work best for the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Email and Follow-up Email | **Initial Email**  
I wasn’t able to make it to the community forum the other night on the clean water planning project. I was hoping you could give me what the exit point is for the treated water at all of the sites that became finalists. My biggest concern is where exactly the treated water ends up after being treated. I hope it won’t be a place where the public enjoys an escape to experience our great quality of living here on the island. I don’t like Beachview Farm if it means the treated water ends up somewhere in West Beach which is such an attractive place to go for families, community members, and tourists. The current spot seems to have basically taken people away from going in the water at all at Windjammer. |
I don’t understand the whole process of water treatment but would love to see a site that is efficient, clean and out of a place where people expect to be able to access Puget Sound without invasion of wastewater.

Any insight to this would be appreciated.

Thanks for your all your work and time.

*Follow-up Email*

Very good. Thanks for the great info. Eric. I took the survey online and found the info. on the site helpful as well. I love west beach and would hate to have the outfall there, even if the reality is that it is not really an inherent problem with something like this.

*Mail*

I suspect my concern and desire to do the right and bestthing regarding the proposal site for the new Clean Water Facility is comparable to your own as well as the City’s. That would meanmake it effective, out of sight, available for quick emergency fixes, minimize its intrusion visually and environmentally, situate it where future expansion would be readily available and keep costs within reason.

Crescent Harbor is my recommendation

- **Out of sight**: The Navy property meets this in spades.
- **Available for quick emergency fixes (with minimum interruption of services and street compromises)**: You recall the breakdown at the Windjammer existing plant required special “car-weight-resistant” street surface piping to the Navy facility. It was an expensive (procuring the mics of pipe, installing it, holding the city’s waste in overflow conditions.) Here, amuch shorter ar, perhaps, anticipatory, temporary (as was the previous case) piping system between the plants would be easy to achieve. Looking at all the 4 other alternatives, an emergency condition would be a mess. Note: ifanother water contamination were to occur like this past summer’s to Oak Harbor Bay, the Crescent Harbor Bay would absorb the damage more quickly
- **Minimize its intrusion visually and environmentally**: The other sites disqualify themselves on this point. They are all very visible sites. Imagining such a facility next to the Marina is counter to all the improvements and future plans anticipated for the area. The same goes for utilizing Windjammer Park. Several render the immediate area undesirable for home purchase or sales: “Here is a nice home across the street from our city’s sewage treatment facility. Would you like to make an offer?” I don’t think so.
- **Situte it where future expansion would be readily available**: Windjammer Park, the Old City Shops, the Marina/Seaplane Base are automatically disqualified on this point, and again, run counter to the other criteria listed. The Beachview Farm would require land purchase—an add-on expense to the cost of the Treatment center, not required by the other 4 alternatives.
- **Effective**: The Navy has installed a facility already. The land is already available (meaning no purchase is required. No existing buildings: to remove/modify). It uses unused public property not available to the public.
- **To add an additional new CleanWater Facility would be meetinthe other criteria above.**
- **Keep costs within reason**: Bonuses to the Crescent Harbor choice:
  - The Windjammer Park absorbs into park the site of the former facility—adding to the continuity and beauty of the park.
  - The Old City Shops Property can be renewed to a different use or sold to the public for development—creating off-set funds for this new Clean Water Facility.
  - As mentioned above, the Marina/Seaplane Base would continue following its master plan objective of bringing boaters and tourists to Oak Harbor vs. “Let’s boat up to Oak Harbor, we can tie up next to its new sewage plant.”
  - City doesn’t have the funds in its already stretched budget nor would it have to find land purchase funding sources for the Beachview Farm property.

In conclusion, my concern and desire to do the right and best thing regarding the proposal site for the new Clean Water Facility is for Crescent Harbor to be selected.

*Website*

I am concerned that the Beachview farm site would have too high an initial cost, and I’m also concerned that the prevailing summer wind would cause an unpleasant smell at the beautiful Whidbey Golf and Country club. Therefore, I would prefer the site not be located at Beachview Farm.

Yes?
**FINAL LIST OF QUESTIONS**  
June 7, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>To establish some background, what is the purpose of this project? What is the City of Oak Harbor’s current “wastewater facility” and why do we need a new one?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Response 1** | The City’s current “wastewater facility”, shown as Figure 1, consists of a network of pipes and pump stations that carries raw wastewater to two facilities: a rotating biological contactor (RBC) facility near Windjammer Park; and a lagoon facility on the Navy’s Seaplane Base. Treated water from both facilities currently flows through an outfall pipe into Crescent Harbor bay.  
Oak Harbor needs a new facility for several reasons:  
- First and foremost, the RBC facility located near Windjammer Park is very old and is starting to fail. As an example, the outfall pipe from this facility recently collapsed and had to be shut down. Now all treated water from the RBC facility must be pumped over to Crescent Harbor.  
- Secondly the lagoon facility at the Navy’s Seaplane Base is not large enough to serve Oak Harbor’s current and future population. If the RBC plant were shut down, the City would be out of capacity at the lagoon site in the near term.  
- Finally, neither facility can be efficiently modified to reliably produce water that is clean enough to meet future regulations and protect surrounding water quality. |
| **Graphic/Figure** | Figure 1: Map of the collection system showing the two plant locations. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>What is the overall timeline for the project, and when does the new facility need to be in operation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response 2</strong></td>
<td>Replacing existing facilities that are wearing out is a key driver for the project, so the short answer is: “As soon as possible.” We know that it takes time to plan for and construct these large projects, so the City’s planning documents call for the new wastewater facility to be up and running by 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graphic/Figure</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>2017 seems like a long ways off. Why is the City starting so early with the planning process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Response 3** | A project of this size takes several steps:  
- The current schedule includes about 2 years for planning and permitting… essentially to select the best site for the new facility, and to select a treatment process and discharge location for the cleaned water.  
- Once we have the plan and permits approved, it will take about 1.5 years to design the new facility.  
- Following design it will take another 2.5 years to construct and start up the facility.  
Overall we are talking about a 6 or 7 year project, which is why we are moving |
| **Graphic/Figure** |  

"pw://Carollo/Documents/"
### Question 4

**Regarding the first step (planning)... initially you were planning to propose a final alternative/site this summer. Now you have recommended that we push this decision back a couple of months. Why did you decide to slow the planning schedule, and how will this impact the overall project schedule?**

**Response 4**

*Brian M.*

Gaining a high level of public input is essential for this project to be successful, and our planning schedule is based around the public process. To date, the feedback we have received from public forums and the web site has been extremely helpful. We have modified the schedule to gain better community input in this critical step of the project.

Following Public Forum No. 2, which was held in April, we felt the project would benefit if there was an opportunity to gain additional public input before selecting an alternative and site for further planning and environmental review. A revised schedule for the planning phase is shown in Figure 3. The updated schedule includes:

- An additional Technical Workshop, where the project team will refine the current alternatives on five (5) sites and develop a proposed short-list of three (3) sites.
- An additional level of coordination with key stakeholders in the project, including the US Navy and key permitting agencies.
- An additional Council Workshop in late July, where we will present the refined analysis and collect input from the Council.
- An additional Public Forum in late August, where we will present the three final alternatives/sites and collect input from the public.

These additional points of input will help us select the best alternative/site by the end of the year without significantly impacting the overall schedule we showed earlier.

### Question 5

**Council voted to proceed with five (5) sites in March. You’ll be narrowing that list to three (3) this summer, before selecting the proposed alternative/site at the end of the year. Briefly summarize for our audience the five sites that you will be refining, and describe what you see as their respective advantages and challenges.**

**Response 5**

*Brian M.*

<<Summary of site advantages/challenges from Public Forum No. 2 Slides>>
### Question 6

The additional public forums and workshops are a great way to get more input on these sites… but you’ve also reached out to a wider audience using the project website and on-line survey. Give us an overall summary of what you’ve learned from these sources so far, and explain how this input is influencing the planning process.

**Response 6**

Brian M.

<<<Summary of survey results>>>

### Question 7

Please summarize the next steps again for our audience. We want to be sure everyone is aware of the upcoming opportunities to weigh-in on this project.

**Response 7**

Eric J.

The next “official” opportunity for the public to hear more about this project will be at the July 27 Council Workshop, to be held at xxx o’clock at City hall. During this workshop, Brian and I will be presenting the technical team’s refinements to the existing alternatives and five (5) sites.

After that, we’ll hold another Public Forum in late August. The date, location, and agenda for this event will be advertised on our project website, on Channel 10, in the WNT, and on flyers posted about town. We are hoping to get as many interested community members at this meeting as we can, to help our team select the best overall alternative and site for the community.

After hearing your input, we’ll be asking Council for a resolution to select three (3) final sites for further evaluation in September. Our plan is to complete the analysis and identify a proposed site for planning/permitting by the end of this year.

In addition to these “formal” touch points, you can contact me anytime. We’re very interested to hear your input so we can make the best decision for our community.

**Graphic/Figure**

Figure 10: Summary table of key events and dates, plus Eric’s contact info.
Agenda

• Project Schedule Update
• Brief Review of Preliminary Alternatives/Sites
• Preliminary Alternatives Refinement
• Preliminary Conclusions
• Discussion
• Summary/Next Steps
Overall Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Start Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning and Preliminary Engineering Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Evaluate Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine Preliminary Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine/Select Proposed Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement Milestones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Decision Points (City Created):
- Confirm preliminary alternatives (up to 5)
- Confirm alternatives (up to 3)
- Confirm proposed alternatives (1)
- Approve Feasibility Plan

Community Involvement Milestones:
- Public Forum No. 1:
  - Review project documents, costs, and timeline
  - Provide input to help shape evaluation of preliminary alternatives
- Public Forum No. 2:
  - Have more alternatives identified for further consideration
  - Provide input to help shape evaluation of preliminary alternatives
- Public Forum No. 3:
  - Have more alternatives identified for further consideration
  - Provide input to help shape evaluation of final alternatives
- Public Forum No. 4:
  - Provide input on proposed alternative project scope and costs
  - Get additional information on the next steps for the project

Planning Phase Work Flow

[Diagram showing planning phase work flow]
Sites Selected For Further Evaluation  
March 22 Council Meeting

Windjammer Park Site  
MBR with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Most efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

**Challenges**
- Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park
Marina / Seaplane Base Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park

**Challenges**
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Impacts to Marina and US Navy Property
- Land acquisition and permitting

---

Old City Shops Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park
- Relatively efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

**Challenges**
- Places facilities in neighborhood area
Beachview Farm Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

Advantages
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas
- Opportunity for beneficial reuse of effluent

Challenges
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Land acquisition and permitting

Crescent Harbor Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

Advantages
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas

Challenges
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Land acquisition and permitting
Steps to Confirm/Refine TBL+ Criteria

• Additional technical analysis completed for 5 sites
  – Field wetlands investigation
  – Cultural “paper survey”
  – Geotechnical “paper survey”
  – Confirmation of land use, zoning, and acquisition complexity
• Meeting with DOE/DOH to discuss outfall options
• Refinement of conveyance/pumping assumptions and costs for each alternative
• Additional public input from forum and on-line survey

Wetlands Limit Use of Several Sites

Marina / Seaplane Base
Beachview Farm
Old City Shops
Crescent Harbor
Cultural Resources Findings

- Some level of risk exists for all 5 sites
- Particular concern at Windjammer, Crescent Harbor, Marina/Seaplane Base sites
- No “fatal flaws” based on recorded information

Poor Soils Increase Cost at Windjammer and Marina/Seaplane Base
Zoning, Land Use, Acquisition Findings

• Beachview Farm Site Complexity
  – Acquisition of property for WWTP outside of UGA has been accomplished elsewhere
  – Typically involves annexation of “island” area
  – Restrictions in Rural/Agricultural Zone per Island County unclear

• Marina/Seaplane Base Site Complexity
  – Current Marina must remain so per restrictions on deed
  – To date, Navy has not favored original “train wreck” site

While cost is important, majority of public favor MBR benefits…

![Bar Chart]

- Protect Health & Environment
- Good Neighbor
- Flexible for Future
- Preserve Parks
- Preserve Views
- Low Cost

Percentage Responding “Extremely Important”
Summary and Overall Conclusions

• All 5 sites remain viable following refined evaluation
• The preferred outfall location remains in Oak Harbor
• Conveyance costs have increased to account for:
  – New pump station at Windjammer Park
  – Gravity pipeline improvements for Crescent Capehart flows (except Crescent Harbor site)

Summary and Overall Conclusions
(Continued)

• MBR is the preferred treatment technology for alternatives selection
  – Consistent with City Council and public feedback
  – Appropriate for all sites (does not limit site selection)
  – Depending on selected site, decision may be revisited during development of implementation and financing plan
Financial Comparison of Alternatives
Project (Capital) Cost

NOTE: Costs based on MBR Process

TBL+ Summary
### Environmental Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E1</th>
<th>Produce Best Water Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produce the best effluent quality (NTU, TSS, BOD) within a reasonable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produce “Class A” reclaimed water for beneficial reuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E2</th>
<th>Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protect wetlands, streams, wildlife habitat, forests, and other critical areas *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: Critical areas defined by OHMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E3</th>
<th>Minimize Carbon Footprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pursue alternatives that emit the lowest levels of Greenhouse Gases (GHG) (or alternatives that are “reasonably close” to lowest GHG levels)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

### Social Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1</th>
<th>Protect Public Health &amp; Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimize public and City staff exposure to toxics and chemicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reliably meet NPDES permit requirements; provide for safe water quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S2</th>
<th>Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserve existing undeveloped open spaces for public use *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protect important view corridors in the community *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S3</th>
<th>Minimize Neighborhood Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construct facilities to match the character of surrounding areas *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimize public exposure to noise, odor, and truck traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Technical Objectives

Reliable Performance
- Select treatment processes with many years of proven service
- Design for adequate redundancy

Ease of Construction
- Avoid steeply sloped sites and/or sites with difficult access
- Avoid sites where acquisition/construction could cause excessive, costly delays *

Overall System Efficiency
- Maximize the amount of gravity flow to/from the new WWTP
- Minimize the amount of new conveyance infrastructure

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Financial Objectives

Low Capital Cost
- Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or "reasonably close" to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers WWTP, conveyance, and outfall costs

Low Life Cycle Cost
- Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or "reasonably close" to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers capital cost and annual O&M cost for 20-year period

Protect Assets for Future Economic Development
- Avoid areas zoned for commercial/business use within downtown urban core *

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Agenda

• Project Schedule Update
• Brief Review of Proposed Alternatives
• Alternative Refinement and Evaluation Summary
• Proposed Final Alternatives and Sites
• Summary/Next Steps
# Project Schedule Update

## Original Planning and Preliminary Engineering Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK 100 - PROJECT MGMT</td>
<td>Identify Proposed Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 200 - PRELIM ALTS</td>
<td>Short List 4 Alts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 300 - FINAL ALTS</td>
<td>Approval to Submit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 400 - OUTFALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 500 - REUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 600 - FACILITIES PLAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 700 - ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 800 - PUBLIC PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 900 - MGMT. RESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOP/EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES</td>
<td>REFINING/SELECT PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE</td>
<td>COMPLETE FACILITIES PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updated Planning and Preliminary Engineering Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>DEVELOP/EVALUATE ALTS</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>REFINE/SELECT PROPOSED ALT</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
<th>COMPLETE FACILITIES PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK 100 - PROJECT MGMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 101 - PRELIM ALTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 102 - FINAL ALTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 103 - OUTFALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 104 - REUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 105 - FACILITIES PLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 106 - ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 107 - PUBLIC PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 108 - MGMT. RESERVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2010**
  - Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar |
  - Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May |

- **2011**
  - Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar |
  - Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May |

- **2012**
  - Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar |
  - Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May |

- Short List 5 Alts
- Short List 3 Alts
- Identify Proposed Alt
- Identify Proposed Alt
- Approval to Submit Plan

Schedule Extended to Increase Public Input

- Overall Project Schedule
- Planning and Preliminary Engineering Phase
- Key Decision Points (City Council)
  - Public Forum No. 1
  - Public Forum No. 2
  - Public Forum No. 3
  - Public Forum No. 4
Review of Preliminary Alternatives / Sites

2 WWTP Process Options

- **Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Treatment Process**
  - Features:
    - Produces very clean water
    - Requires the installation of new equipment near the public
    - Membrane Bioreactors are relatively low maintenance and cost-effective

- **Activated Sludge (AS) Treatment Process**
  - Features:
    - Takes more space and time
    - Requires additional processes to provide nutrients to support biofilm
    - Rectangular shapes often used in larger urban areas

- Additional Features:
  - Smaller rectangular shapes often used in smaller rural areas
  - Additional benefits and considerations for each process
Sites Selected For Further Evaluation
March 22 Council Meeting

3 Candidate Outfall Locations

- Crescent Harbor
  Mitigate Shellfish Impact With Deep Diffuser

- Oak Harbor
  Limited Shellfish Impact

- West Beach
  Mitigate Shellfish Impact With Deep Diffuser
Windjammer Park Site
MBR with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Most efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

**Challenges**
- Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park

Marina / Seaplane Base Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park

**Challenges**
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Impacts to Marina and US Navy Property
- Land acquisition and permitting
Old City Shops Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park
- Relatively efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

**Challenges**
- Places facilities in neighborhood area

---

Beachview Farm Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas
- Opportunity for beneficial reuse of effluent

**Challenges**
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Land acquisition and permitting
Crescent Harbor Site
MBR / AS with discharge to Oak Harbor outfall

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas

**Challenges**
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Land acquisition and permitting

Technical/Environmental Site Refinements
Steps Taken to Refine Alternatives

• Completed technical analysis at each site
  – Field wetlands investigation
  – Cultural “paper survey”
  – Geotechnical “paper survey”
  – Confirmation of land use, zoning, and acquisition complexity
• Met with DOE/DOH to discuss outfall options
• Refined of conveyance/pumping assumptions and layouts for each alternative

Wetlands Limit Use of Most Sites

Marina / Seaplane Base

Beachview Farm

Old City Shops

Crescent Harbor
Cultural Resources Risk at All Sites

- Particular concern at Windjammer, Crescent Harbor, Marina/Seaplane Base sites
- Additional field investigation is recommended once the sites have been narrowed

Geotechnical Issues Confirmed at 2 Sites
Zoning/Land Use & Acquisition Complexity

• Beachview Farm Site
  – Property outside of UGA; annexation of “island” area and change in Island County Zoning

• Marina/Seaplane Base Site
  – Current Marina must remain so per deed; acquisition or lease from US Navy

• Crescent Harbor Site
  – Acquisition or lease from US Navy

• Old City Shops Site
  – Acquisition of private property

Summary of Discussion with DOE/DOH
April 13 Meeting

• Oak Harbor Outfall
  – Adequate mixing with highest effluent quality
  – No impact on shellfish harvesting

• Crescent Harbor/West Beach Outfalls
  – Better mixing
  – Potential impact on shellfish harvesting
  – Mitigating this impact is very expensive

• Meeting confirmed original assumptions regarding cost/risk of outfall locations
Proposed Outfall Location

- Crescent Harbor
  Mitigate Shellfish Impact With Deep Diffuser

- Oak Harbor
  Limited Shellfish Impact

- West Beach
  Mitigate Shellfish Impact With Deep Diffuser

Conveyance Piping/Pumping Refinements
Refinements to Pipe Alignments

• Most sites require costly improvements to existing pipes for Navy Crescent Capehart flow
  – Fewer improvements required for Crescent Harbor site
• All sites will require infrastructure (pump station or WWTP) at Windjammer Park
• Windjammer Park site has lowest conveyance impact (cost)
• Beachview Farm site has highest conveyance impact (cost)
  – Piping effluent to West Beach very costly due to geographic, environmental constraints

Pump station at Windjammer Park
Photos of similar facilities in public view
Summary of Public Input

Sources of Public Input

- Initial phone survey
- Input received through email and website posting
- Public Forums 1 and 2
- On-line survey completed in April
  - Survey ran for over 6 weeks
  - 109 respondents provided input
- Written correspondence (letters) received by City and forwarded to project team
While cost is important, majority of public favor features best provided by MBR technology

Other trends are clearly apparent from feedback

- Very little support for Windjammer Park
- Community has expressed health concerns, particularly associated with Old City Shops

- Valid concerns must be addressed
- Starts by redefining “WWTP”
  - Fully-enclosed facility
  - Complete air capture/scrubbing
  - Designed for high level of public interaction
Based on feedback, MBR process option is appropriate for evaluating remaining sites

- Best water quality
- Most flexibility to meet future NPDES permit limits
- Least impact on surrounding area
- Smallest footprint
  - Only viable option at several sites
- A common comparison to illustrate site tradeoffs
- Process decision may be revisited once a pending final site selection

Cost Refinements
Financial analysis refined, used to compare relative cost of alternatives

• “Conceptual level”\(^{(1)}\) costs developed for 3 major components:

  - **Outfall**: 2% - 5% of total
  - **Conveyance**: 3% - 20% of total
  - **Treatment Plant**: 80% - 90% of total

**NOTES:**
(1) Expected accuracy is -50% to +30%
(2) Estimated Construction Cost ranges from $85 to $100 million in 2011

---

**Financial Comparison of Alternatives (Sites)**
Estimated Project (Capital) Cost Difference in 2016 $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Site</th>
<th>% Greater than Lowest Cost Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old City Shops</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina / Seaplane Base</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachview Farm</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
(1) Costs based on MBR Process
(2) Difference in cost (low to high) represents ~$8M
Summary and Recommendations

• MBR recommended as basis for alternatives selection
  – Consistent with feedback received to-date
  – Appropriate for all sites (does not limit selection)
• All 5 sites remain “technically viable”
  – Challenges exist at all sites
  – Technical team recommends narrowing to 3 sites
• Preferred outfall location remains in Oak Harbor
### TBL+ Summary of Refined Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of TBL+ Objectives Met</th>
<th>Ideal Alternative</th>
<th>Windjammer</th>
<th>Old City Shops</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. Comparison based on MBR Process with outfall to Oak Harbor

### Sites Proposed by Technical Team for Further Evaluation

- Windjammer Park
- Crescent Harbor
- Old City Shops

[Map showing locations of proposed sites]
Next Steps

Upcoming Schedule

• August 24 Public Forum No. 3
  – Summarize refinements
  – Collect additional feedback
• September 20 City Council Meeting
  – Seeking resolution to proceed with alternatives on three (or fewer) sites
• Final site/alternative selection anticipated in late 2011 / early 2012
  – Maintain flexibility in public process between August and December
Questions?

Environmental Objectives

**E1** Produce Best Water Quality
- Produce the best effluent quality (NTU, TSS, BOD) within a reasonable cost
- Produce “Class A” reclaimed water for beneficial reuse

**E2** Protect Environmentally and Culturally Sensitive Areas
- Protect wetlands, streams, wildlife habitat, forests, and other OHMC critical areas *
- Protect /avoid culturally sensitive areas

**E3** Minimize Carbon Footprint
- Pursue alternatives that emit the lowest levels of Greenhouse Gases (GHG)
  (or alternatives that are “reasonably close” to lowest GHG levels)

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Social Objectives

Protect Public Health & Safety
- Minimize public and City staff exposure to toxics and chemicals
- Reliably meet NPDES permit requirements; provide for safe water quality

Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities
- Preserve existing undeveloped open spaces for public use *
- Protect important view corridors in the community *

Minimize Neighborhood Impacts
- Construct facilities to match the character of surrounding areas *
- Minimize public exposure to noise, odor, and truck traffic

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Technical Objectives

Reliable Performance
- Select treatment processes with many years of proven service
- Design for adequate redundancy

Ease of Construction
- Avoid steeply sloped sites and/or sites with difficult access
- Avoid sites where acquisition/construction could cause excessive, costly delays *

Overall System Efficiency
- Maximize the amount of gravity flow to/from the new WWTP
- Minimize the amount of new conveyance infrastructure

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Financial Objectives

F1 Low Capital Cost
• Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or "reasonably close" to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers WWTP, conveyance, and outfall costs

F2 Low Life Cycle Cost
• Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or "reasonably close" to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers capital cost and annual O&M cost for 20-year period

F3 Protect Assets for Future Economic Development
• Avoid areas zoned for commercial/business use within downtown urban core *

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Windjammer Pump Station Concept

[Diagram of Windjammer Pump Station Concept]
City of Oak Harbor
Clean Water Facility Planning Project

Oak Harbor needs a new wastewater treatment facility . . . what will it look like and where should it go?

Oak Harbor is planning a modern wastewater treatment system to serve our community and better protect Oak and Crescent Harbors. The goal is to replace Oak Harbor’s two aging treatment facilities with a new facility by 2017. Please attend an August 24th public forum to share your ideas about the look and location of the new facility.

A modern treatment facility will be designed to:
- Produce the cleanest water to protect our environment
- Be a “good neighbor” . . . control noise and odor; protect public health; preserve community views and assets
- Fit with the surrounding area
- Provide a long-lasting investment for the future of Oak Harbor
- A membrane bioreactor (MBR) process is recommended to meet these requirements.

The City of Blaine recently built an MBR designed for public interaction that produces the cleanest water for discharge and reuse.

Oak Harbor’s current wastewater facilities and possible site locations

Possible treatment facility locations for Oak Harbor:
The planning team recommends further evaluation of an MBR at three locations:
- Windjammer Park
- Old City Shops
- Crescent Harbor

The recommendation was presented to City Council at a July 27th workshop. View the presentation at www.oakharborcleanwater.org; then share your thoughts at the August 24th public forum, 6:30 p.m. at the Oak Harbor Elks Lodge.

Want more information? Unable to attend the August 24th public forum, but still want to provide feedback? Here’s how.

Contact Eric Johnston: E-Mail: ejohnston@oakharbor.org Web: www.oakharborcleanwater.org

Mail: City of Oak Harbor
Clean Water Facility Planning
865 SE Barrington Drive
Oak Harbor, WA 98277
Clean Water Facility Planning Public Forum

Wednesday, August 24, 2011

Purpose of Tonight’s Public Forum

• Provide information to the community
  – Project status and schedule update
  – Review the technical team’s recommendation to narrow the preliminary list of sites considered for a treatment facility

• Gather your feedback on proposed sites
Why is a New Facility Needed?

Completing a new facility by 2017 will:

- Replace existing aging facilities;
- Protect Puget Sound;
- Keep pace with population growth.

Recognizing that the City of Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City’s goal is to obtain the highest of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements.

Schedule Extended to Increase Public Input
Final Alternative Includes Three Components

To stay on schedule a final alternative must be selected in early 2012.

Where will a new facility be located?
What technology will be used?
Where will clean water go; what will it be used for?

How Will We Pick the Best Alternative?

Triple Bottom Line + Technical (TBL+) Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Performance</td>
<td>Low Capital Cost</td>
<td>Protect Public Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Produce Best Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Construction</td>
<td>Low Life Cycle Cost</td>
<td>Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities</td>
<td>Protect Culturally &amp; Environmentally Sensitive Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall System Efficiency</td>
<td>Protect Assets for Future Economic Development</td>
<td>Minimize Neighborhood Impact</td>
<td>Minimize Carbon Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five Preliminary Sites Shared in April

Cost for five preliminary alternatives ranged from: $85 to $100M (2011 dollars)

Three Final Sites Proposed in July
Steps Taken to Refine Alternatives

1. Evaluated public input.
2. Met with regulatory agencies to discuss options for clean water discharge.
3. Updated conceptual costs.
4. Reviewed each site in more detail to confirm advantages & challenges:
   - Public Concerns; Wetlands; Cultural Resources; Soil Stability; Land Use/Permitting.
5. Develop technical recommendation using TBL+ process.

Important Features Identified by the Public

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who consider various features important. The features include Protect Health & Environment, Good Neighbor, Flexible for Future, Reserve Parks, Reserve Views, and Low Cost. The chart indicates that Protect Health & Environment is considered the most important, followed by Good Neighbor and Flexible for Future.]
Other Trends From Public Feedback

• Very little support for Windjammer Park
• Community has expressed health concerns, particularly at Old City Shops Site
  – Valid concerns must be addressed
  – Primary concern related to health hazard from airborne pollution
  – Information presented from 2 sources:
    • Cornell Dept. of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1997
    • Environmental Protection Agency, 1978

MBR Process Best Reflects Public Input

- Smallest Footprint
- Produces cleanest water to protect Oak Harbor
- Fully enclosed / covered to protect health
- More easily blends with surrounding area
Advantages of discharging “MBR quality” clean water to an Oak Harbor outfall:

- Mixing/dilution to protect water quality.
- New outfall can be installed within/near the existing outfall alignment.
- No impact to shellfish harvesting.
- Lowest cost.

Final Alternative Includes Three Components

Tonight’s Focus
Site
Where will a new facility be located?

Alternative
MBR

Oak Harbor
Refined Evaluation Suggests 3 Sites

NOTE:
- Comparison based on MBR Process with clean water outfall to Oak Harbor

Windjammer Park Site

Advantages
- Lowest relative cost
- Most efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

Challenge
- Facilities located in/near Windjammer Park
Windjammer Challenge

The challenge: Treatment facility located in/near a city park.

One solution: A modern facility can be designed to include public amenities.

Old Facility: Oak Harbor RBC Plant

Modern Facility: City of Edmonds AS Plant

Challenge Must Be Met for All Sites

- Other sites require a pump station at Windjammer Park (< 5% of existing WWTP footprint)
- There are many ways to design an attractive pump station to match the site
Old City Shops Site

Advantages

- Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park
- Relatively efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

Challenge

- Places facilities in neighborhood area

Old City Shops Challenge

The challenge: Site near existing residences and businesses.

One solution: Modern facilities can be compact and entirely covered.

Old Facility: High potential for odors

Modern Facility: Covered to control odor (Carnation, WA)
Crescent Harbor Site

**Advantages**
- Avoids facilities in parks/neighborhood areas

**Challenges**
- More conveyance piping/pumping relative to other sites
- Land acquisition, permitting, environmental constraints

Conceptual rendering and site layout of treatment facility shown for reference.

Crescent Harbor Challenge

The challenge: Site includes wetlands and potential cultural resources.

One solution: Avoid mapped resources; develop new, high-functioning wetlands as mitigation.
Based on TBL+, 3 Sites Worth a Closer Look

NOTE:
• Comparison based on MBR Process with clean water outfall to Oak Harbor

Cost Remains an Important Criterion

• Cost estimates are “conceptual” at this level of planning.
• Conceptual costs used to compare alternatives.
• Detail (and cost accuracy) added during future planning and design.
Proposed Sites are Lowest Cost

NOTES:
(1) Costs based on MBR Process
(2) Difference in cost (low to high) represents ~$8M

Cost Will be Refined for Selected Alternative

- Costs for three proposed alternatives range from $90 to $95M (2011 dollars)
  - Lowest cost at Windjammer Site
  - Increase in cost reflects conveyance to other sites
- Rate analysis will be developed for proposed alternative, compared to existing rate structure
- Team will explore all options to reduce rate impact
  - Project phasing, funding sources, etc.
Next Steps

• Tonight: Collect your feedback
  – Summary of public feedback will be available on our website: www.oakharborcleanwater.org
• September 20 City Council Meeting:
  – Team will seek a resolution to narrow the list of sites.
• In early 2012, a single alternative/site will be proposed for environmental review
• Your input will continue to be used at each step

Questions?

To learn more, visit: http://www.oakharborcleanwater.org/
Background and Event Format

The City of Oak Harbor hosted its third Clean Water Facility Planning public forum on August 24, 2011 at the Oak Harbor Elks Lodge. The purpose of this forum was to collect public feedback and review with the public a staff recommended (and narrowed) list of the three possible sites for a new wastewater facility. The project schedule was extended to allow for an additional forum.

A total of 35 community members attended the public forum with city elected officials also in attendance. The goals of the forum was to let the public know which three sites have been short-listed and why, as well as collect more input from the public. Feedback collected from the forum will continue to help guide the project and city decision makers as they move forward toward selecting a single, preferred site.

The forum was organized as a participatory event and information session. When meeting attendees arrived, they were greeted by a staff member and asked to sign in. The forum began with a presentation that focused on the three possible sites, and included overview information and a review of how the sites were narrowed from five to three. A question and answer session followed the presentation.

Following the question period, the open house resumed and attendees asked staff questions, viewed displays, submitted comments on Post-Its and comment cards and provided general feedback about what they’d like the City to consider when selecting a location and treatment type for the new facility. Attendees provided input related on each site, alternative treatment methods, and what criteria should be used when selecting the final site.

The presentation was filmed and aired on Channel 10 through the months of August and September 2011.

Themes heard in public comments and questions

The City of Oak Harbor sought public opinion about the three potential sites and what considerations are most important to the public in locating and designing a new wastewater facility. A total of ten comments were received during the forum, five Post-It notes and five comment forms.

The public forum offered two ways to provide comments:

1. Comment form
2. Post-It exercise to indicate comments or concerns when selecting a preferred site

The following questions were posed at a high level:

- What are your thoughts about the three short-listed sites?
- What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?
- What other questions or concerns do you have about wastewater planning for Oak Harbor?
The following themes in questions, comments and feedback were noted (see comment table in Appendix A for a transcription of written comments):

- **Cost considerations are important.** Wherever the new facility is located, both capital and operations/maintenance costs for a new facility and the effect on rates to build and maintain a facility were identified as two of the most important factors when locating and building a new facility.

- **Windjammer Park.** The Windjammer Park location was noted on all five comment forms and in two of the five Post-Its. Attendees recognize the benefit of utilizing existing infrastructure, but are concerned about locating a wastewater treatment facility in middle of a community asset – a downtown waterfront park.

- **Crescent Harbor received the most support.** In the written comments received, Crescent Harbor received the most support citing its location away from businesses and neighborhoods as a key factor in its favor.

- **Odor control.** The use of modern technology in controlling odors is important regardless of the new facility’s location.

- **Technology.** Questions about the type of treatment method, outfall requirements, and potential use of treated water continue to arise; in part this is related to project costs and the necessary space and proximity to water for an outfall.

**Questions and comments recorded during the Question and Answer session**

The following questions were posed to staff at the public forum.

- In the diagrams shown, where is the projected cost of property development?
- If a site has future revenue possibilities, how is that factored into future lost revenue projections and cost analysis?
- What is the variance of the conceptual costs?
- What are the associated maintenance costs?
- What is the discount level used?
- Is replacement cost of broken or failed infrastructure (long term) accounted for in the overall conceptual project cost?
- Is there another process that is less expensive, but equal or better for the environment than the MBR process? If so, would using it be an option?
- Has the City considered composting solid wastes?
- The City should focus on outfall quality. The reclaimed and cleaned water could be reused and recycled to bring down overall costs.
- Do all proposals omit using the existing Crescent Harbor Lagoons? Would they be eliminated with the new facility?
- What is the current volume of discharge from existing facilities, and what is the expected volume of future discharge? Could effluent be reused?
- Knowing that water is an important resource, using the outfall to recharge aquifers would be a very important consideration for new facility.
- If all of the Oak Harbor community wanted to use composting toilets, would the City help to buy them? The City could save thousands of gallons of water.
- What percent of structures in the City of Oak Harbor have low-flow efficiency appliances? Is there potential for savings in conserved water?
- Has a sewage receiving system been considered for new plant?
SUMMARY

- Has the City planned for potential future growth of the population for 20 years and beyond?
- Could wastewater “cluster sites” within each community be built instead of staying with one large, single site?
- An AIRR system is less expensive than MBR.
- What is the bonding rate capacity given current water/sewer rates?
- If the City has bonding estimates then there should be a ceiling for cost of project
- Will the new plant remove pharmaceuticals?
- What if there is a failure in the pumps? Are backup systems assumed?
- Can the new plant be modified in the future to remove pharmaceuticals?
- Will the new plant have tertiary treatment?
- As a relatively new process, MBR does not have longevity studies. The long term affects to people are not known and therefore an MBR facility should not built within the community.
- There have been recent health studies showing the risks to people. The new facility should be sited outside of the most densely populated areas.
- MBRs are having problems in phase two with the membrane enlarging.
- Keep the new facility away from populations. The Old City Shops site has people and neighborhoods with compromised health systems near it. Do not use the Old City Shops site.
- Could the aquifers be recharged if pharmaceuticals have not been removed?

Public Forum Materials
Following the presentation, meeting attendees viewed displays around the room. They were asked to provide comment on the three detailed sites, submit concerns they might have about selection criteria and other factors they’d like the City to consider when selecting a preferred site. Meeting attendees were encouraged to write their comments on Post-It notes and attach to site maps, complete a comment card and/or ask questions of staff. The following displays were set up around the room:

General Displays
- Why a New Wastewater Treatment Facility is Needed
- Project Schedule
- Detail of the three sites with facility layout:
  - Crescent Harbor
  - Old City Shops
  - Windjammer Park
- Evaluation Summary and Basis for Recommendation
- Wastewater Facilities – Past and Present
- How Much is the Project Expected to Cost

Handouts
- Clean Water Facility Planning Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
- Comment form for questions/comments about construction
SUMMARY

- Site selection criteria “cheat sheet”

Notification

The Oak Harbor community was notified of the public forum in the following ways:

- **Display ad** posted in the print edition of the Whidbey News-Times (Wednesday, August 17 and Saturday, August 20, 2011)
- **Online display ad** posted from Wednesday, August 3 through Thursday, August 25, 2011, linking directly to the project website.
- Announcement on City of Oak Harbor website: [http://www.oakharbor.org/](http://www.oakharbor.org/) as well as the project website: [www.oakharborcleanwater.org](http://www.oakharborcleanwater.org)
- Announcement of the workshop shown on the City TV station (Channel 10).
- Flyers posted at gathering locations throughout the community.

Next Steps

Additional comments were encouraged following the forum via email, phone and/or mail in the weeks following the workshop. The public forum was videotaped, and will be provided for further dissemination via Public Access Channel 10.

Input received at this public forum, previous public forums and follow-on comments will be considered by project staff and City Council when further refining the sites from three sites to one. The City of Oak Harbor will continue to narrow the potential locations, gather feedback about considerations and amenities, and will refine general sites into a recommended preferred site in early 2012.

A fourth public forum, anticipated in conjunction with site selection, will be held in the first quarter of 2012 to inform the public about the selected preferred alternative and continue to gather feedback from the public. A final decision about site selection is currently anticipated from City Council in early 2012. Following decision on a site, additional design would take place to fully develop amenities and a site plan.
### Appendix A: Specific Comments from Comment Card and Post-It Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-It Note comments</th>
<th>Old City Shops</th>
<th>Windjammer Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment total: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage listed here is the most important to the public (as expressed by recent survey results).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not here!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor #1. No #2 or #3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t step in it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor fewer people lease land if we can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment cards

**Comment cards received: 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: What are your thoughts about the three short listed sites?</th>
<th>Q2: What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?</th>
<th>Q3: What other questions do you have about wastewater planning for Oak Harbor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer Park and Old City Shops with an AIRR system</td>
<td>Utilizing existing routing, recharging, cost, social &amp; aesthetics</td>
<td>Compare the AIRR system with the MBR process. Consider encouraging composting toilets, incinerating toilets and low-flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer Park: Utilizing existing routing, recharging, cost, social &amp; aesthetics</td>
<td>Low cost/efficiency</td>
<td>Consider the site storm drain issues ahead of time. Treatment of all paved areas is going to be the norm in the future. Perhaps the asphalt that drains them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With state of the art and advanced technology to eliminate odor. Why not build it at Windjammer Park with a public gathering building in conjunction with the treatment plant. The public gathering facility would be a great asset to the city.</td>
<td>Neighborhood odor control. Ability to grow with population with chosen site. Accessibility of site if on Navy land. Cost – not only initial construction but operational costs. Do we need to pump to or from the site?</td>
<td>Consider the site storm drain issues ahead of time. Treatment of all paved areas is going to be the norm in the future. Perhaps the asphalt that drains them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning toward the Windjammer Park for practical and expense reasons.</td>
<td>Windjammer would be the most cost effective. I like the Crescent Harbor proposal but will it be [illegible] cost effective?</td>
<td>No to Windjammer Park. No to Old City Shop Grounds. Yes to Crescent Harbor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to Windjammer Park. No to Old City Shop Grounds. Yes to Crescent Harbor.</td>
<td>Remove existing facility at Windjammer Park so the public can enjoy the park without coexisting with a facility that smells and detracts from a pristine waterfront park.</td>
<td>That the City of Oak Harbor has the wisdom to place a treatment facility that preserves our best park and does not detract from future development within our unique city. Don’t destroy a pristine waterfront park. Common sense says keep plants out of town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photos of Displays
Old City Shops Site

Advantages
• Avoids facilities in/near Windjammer Park
• Relatively efficient use of conveyance piping/pumping

Challenges
• Places facilities in neighborhood area
• Property acquisition

Conceptual site layout and rendering of treatment plant. Location of facility shown for reference.
Agenda

• Summarize Recommended Final Alternatives
  – Treatment Process
  – Outfall Location
  – Sites

• Summarize Conceptual Costs
• Review Next Steps
Project Team Recommendations

1. Develop final alternatives around membrane bioreactor (MBR) process
2. Discharge treated effluent through new outfall in Oak Harbor
   – Evaluate opportunities for beneficial reuse
3. Consider three final sites for MBR process:
   – Windjammer Park
   – Old City Shops
   – Crescent Harbor

Basis of MBR Recommendation

• MBR offers a number of advantages:
  – Better effluent quality
  – Smaller footprint
    • Only feasible option at 2 proposed sites
  – Better ability to control odors
  – Better ability to blend with surrounding environment
  – Better ability to meet future regulations
  – Enhanced opportunities for reuse
• Primary disadvantage:
  – Cost is approximately 8 to 10% ($5 to $6 million) higher than AS
Basis of Outfall Recommendation

- Oak Harbor offers a number of advantages:
  - Good mixing to protect water quality
  - Least cost option
  - Limited risk of shellfishing impact
- Primary disadvantage:
  - Although Oak Harbor offers good mixing, slightly better mixing at Crescent Harbor

Recommended Final Sites
Recommendation Based on TBL+ Evaluation

NOTE:
• Comparison based on MBR Process with clean water outfall to Oak Harbor

Windjammer Park Site

Distinguishing Advantages
1. Lowest initial cost (F1)
2. Lowest annual cost (F2)
3. No commercially zoned property (F3)
4. No private property acquisition (T2)
5. Most efficient use of infrastructure (T3)

Distinguishing Challenges
1. Impact on amenities (S2)
2. Impact on neighborhood (S3)
3. Potential cultural resources (E2)
Old City Shops Site

**Distinguishing Advantages**
1. Low initial cost (F1)
2. Low annual cost (F2)
3. Private property currently for sale (T2)
4. Efficient use of infrastructure (T3)
5. Preserves amenities (S2)

**Distinguishing Challenges**
1. Impact on neighborhood (S3)
2. Potential cultural resources (E2)

Crescent Harbor Site

**Distinguishing Advantages**
1. Preserves amenities (S2)
2. Little neighborhood impact (S3)
3. Low initial cost (F1)
4. Low annual cost (F2)
5. No commercially zoned property (F3)

**Distinguishing Challenges**
1. Potentially lengthy acquisition (T2)
2. Least efficient use of infrastructure (T3)
3. High potential cultural resources and wetlands (E2)
Questions?
Agenda

• Project Need
  – Why does Oak Harbor need a new sewer system?
  – When does the planning team need direction?

• Summary of Prior Work
  – What is the basis for the planning team’s recommendation?

• Requested Direction
  – Eliminate 2 sites from consideration
  – Continue analysis of 3 remaining sites based on MBR process and Oak Harbor outfall
Existing Rotating Biological Contactor (RBC) Facility

- Served the City for over 50-years
- Major parts and equipment starting to fail
- Meets current permit, but will not meet future standards for clean water

Oak Harbor Outfall Failure

ADD VIDEO CLIP OF OUTFALL
**Existing Seaplane Base Lagoon Facility**

- System nearing capacity; must now handle 100% of City’s wastewater
- Meets current permit, but will not meet future standards for clean water
- Options for expansion and/or improvement limited by surrounding wetlands

**Project Timeline Spans 4 Years To-Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Project need identified (Comprehensive Sewer Planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2007</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Wastewater Committee explores potential alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2009</td>
<td>City begins process of selecting engineering consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2010</td>
<td>City approval to start Clean Water Facility Planning Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direction Will Keep Project On-Schedule

Planning Phase has been extended 6 months to collect additional input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Overall Project Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Environmental Phase</td>
<td>Highly dependent on final proposed site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direction Will Keep Project On-Schedule

- Schedule required by Department of Ecology
  - Submit Facilities Plan for approval on/before 12/31/12
  - Submit Final Design Documents for approval on/before 12/31/14

Activities Leading to Current Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2010</td>
<td>City meets with Navy to discuss siting options on Navy Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Over 20 potential sites identified by community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2011</td>
<td>Planning team recommends narrowing initial list to 13 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Additional technical and cost analysis completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2011</td>
<td>Planning team recommends further narrowing list to 5 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2011</td>
<td>Additional community input gathered through meetings, survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2011</td>
<td>City meets with Navy to discuss short-listed sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2011</td>
<td>Planning team presents refined analysis of 5 sites to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
<td>Additional community input gathered through meetings, web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2011</td>
<td>Planning team recommends further narrowing list to 3 sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wastewater Alternative Components

Site
Where will a new facility be located?

Alternative
Process
What technology will be used?

Discharge
Where will clean water go; what will it be used for?

MBR Process Best Reflects Public Input

- Smallest Footprint
- Produces cleanest water to protect Oak Harbor
- Best able to meet future regulations
- Fully enclosed / covered to protect health
- More easily blends with surrounding area

Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Treatment Process
Oak Harbor Outfall Provides Cost, Regulatory Benefits

- Mixing/dilution protects water quality
- New outfall can be installed within/near the existing outfall alignment
- No impact to shellfish harvesting
- Lowest cost

Recommended Final Sites
September 20, 2011
Recommendation Based on TBL+ Evaluation

NOTE:
• Comparison based on MBR Process with clean water outfall to Oak Harbor

Reasons to Eliminate Sites From Consideration

• Marina/Seaplane Base Site
  – Wetland impacts on open space
  – Other areas not favored by US Navy
  – Listed advantages found at other sites for lower cost

• Beachview Farm Site
  – Social advantages questionable based on public feedback
  – Listed advantages found at other sites for lower cost
Reasons to Consider 3 Remaining Sites

• Updated and refined information will help City make the best decision
  – Key differentiators have yet to be identified
    • Ability to phase project, reclaimed water benefits, etc.
  – Public input will aid in evaluating ways to address site-specific challenges
  – Cost information will improve for the shortened list of alternatives
  – Cost analysis will identify rate impacts based on phasing scenarios
• Ecology, EPA require rigorous evaluation of alternatives for plan approval and future funding

Summary

• Project needed to replace aged and failing system
• Direction on final sites will keep project on regulatory schedule
• Current recommendation reflects significant input from community, stakeholders, and technical team
• Requested direction:
  – Eliminate 2 sites from consideration
  – Continue analysis of 3 remaining sites based on MBR process and Oak Harbor outfall
Windjammer Park Site

**Distinguishing Advantages**

1. Lowest initial cost (F1)
2. Lowest annual cost (F2)
3. No commercially zoned property (F3)
4. No private property acquisition (T2)
5. Most efficient use of infrastructure (T3)

**Distinguishing Challenges**

1. Impact on amenities (S2)
2. Impact on neighborhood (S3)
3. Potential cultural resources (E2)
Old City Shops Site

**Distinguishing Advantages**
1. Low initial cost (F1)
2. Low annual cost (F2)
3. Private property currently for sale (T2)
4. Efficient use of infrastructure (T3)
5. Preserves amenities (S2)

**Distinguishing Challenges**
1. Impact on neighborhood (S3)
2. Potential cultural resources (E2)

Crescent Harbor Site

**Distinguishing Advantages**
1. Preserves amenities (S2)
2. Little neighborhood impact (S3)
3. Low initial cost (F1)
4. Low annual cost (F2)
5. No commercially zoned property (F3)

**Distinguishing Challenges**
1. Potentially lengthy acquisition (T2)
2. Least efficient use of infrastructure (T3)
3. High potential cultural resources and wetlands (E2)
Basis of MBR Recommendation

- MBR offers a number of advantages:
  - Better effluent quality
  - Smaller footprint
    - Only feasible option at 2 proposed sites
  - Better ability to control odors
  - Better ability to blend with surrounding environment
  - Better ability to meet future regulations
  - Enhanced opportunities for reuse
- Primary disadvantage:
  - Cost is approximately 8 to 10% ($5 to $6 million) higher than AS

Basis of Outfall Recommendation

- Oak Harbor offers a number of advantages:
  - Good mixing to protect water quality
  - Least cost option
  - Limited risk of shellfishing impact
- Primary disadvantage:
  - Although Oak Harbor offers good mixing, slightly better mixing at Crescent Harbor
Potential Treatment Plant Sites Proposed by Public December 6, 2010 Public Forum

8 Candidate Sites
(Public/US Navy Input + Technical Requirements)
FROM: Cathy Rosen, Public Works Director  
Eric Johnston, City Engineer

INITIALED AS APPROVED FOR SUBMITTAL TO THE COUNCIL BY:

Scott Dudley, Mayor  
Paul Schmidt, City Administrator  
Doug Merriman, Finance Director  
Margery Hite, City Attorney, as to form

PURPOSE
This agenda bill proposes adoption of a resolution related to candidate sites for a new wastewater treatment facility.

On September 20th, 2011 the agenda bill was moved to the November 15th, 2011 Council meeting by Council motion. On November 1st, 2011, recognizing that two council members had requested excused absences from the November 15th Council meeting, Council motioned for a special meeting on November 28th, 2011. This item was moved to the November 28th special Council meeting.

At the November 28th special council meeting a motion was made to delay further discussion to the January 17, 2012 regular council meeting

AUTHORITY
The City has authority under RCW 35A.11.020 to render governmental services including operating and supplying of utilities and municipal services commonly or conveniently rendered by cities or towns. The authority to provide sewer services is found in RCW 35.21.210 Chapter 35.67. Planning for those services as may be required under WAC 173-240 is included in this authority.

FISCAL IMPACT DESCRIPTION
Funds Required: $  none

Appropriation Source: n/a

SUMMARY STATEMENT
On July 27, 2011, a workshop with the City Council was held to present and discuss the status of the wastewater facility planning process and to present three sites for further consideration. As discussed during the workshop, a resolution would be presented for consideration and adoption by the Council. The resolution considered authorizing and directing the project team to proceed with the three candidate sites. A public forum was subsequently held on August 24, 2011 at which the information presented at the Council workshop was presented and public input was sought.

Information presented at both the public forum and Council workshop was made available to the public via the
01/17/12 - Resolution, Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan
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Following the August public forum the resolution for the short list three sites was then discussed at City Council meeting on September 20, November 1 and November 28, 2012. This topic was also discussed at multiple city council committee meetings during the same time period. During the same time period, several Council members were able to participate in educational tours of wastewater facilities in Blaine, Carnation and King County.

In contrast to the resolutions presented at previous council meetings to narrow the number of sites, this resolution proposes to add a new area for consideration. If the resolution is adopted a new sixth site will be analyzed to the same level of detail and vetted through the public process in the same fashion as the previous 5 sites.

This sixth site is generally north of Crescent Harbor Road and east of Regatta Drive. In preparation for this meeting a letter from the Mayor was mailed to property owners in this area notifying them that the Council would consider this area at tonight's meeting. A figure showing the potentially affected properties and ownerships to whom letters were sent is attached to this agenda bill. Note the resolution is not explicitly limited to the area in this figure and that if additional areas warrant investigation that notification will be provided to the affected property owners.

In addition, more detailed cost information will be provided by the project team. This cost information is expected to address cost responsibility between the City and Navy, cost impacts resulting from the phasing of improvements and specific impacts to rate payers in comparison to the 2010 rate study.

Following the analysis and public process it is expected that the Council will discuss another resolution to narrow the candidate sites to a short list of 2 or 3 final sites.

**STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT**
This item was presented to the Public Works committee on January 5, 2012 and the Government Services committee on January 10, 2012

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**
A motion adopting Resolution 12-05

**ATTACHMENTS**
Resolution 12-05
Figure
RESOLUTION NO. 12-05

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF OAK HARBOR DIRECTING THE EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL SITES FOR A FUTURE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY.

WHEREAS, the 2008 City of Oak Harbor Comprehensive Sewer Plan identifies the need for a new wastewater treatment facility to meet future growth needs and to replace aging and at-risk infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, recognizing that the City of Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor Bay and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City's goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements; and

WHEREAS, the City of Oak Harbor Capital Improvement Plan of 2010-2015 specifically lists the Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan as a prioritized public project to be undertaken within the capital improvement plan time period; and

WHEREAS, on August 4, 2010 the City Council authorized the Mayor to enter into a contract with Carollo, Inc. for development of the aforementioned Facilities Plan required by RCW 90.48.110 and Chapter 173-240 WAC for a new wastewater treatment facility; and

WHEREAS, public input was sought, received and considered on potential wastewater treatment plant locations resulting in the identification of 13 potential locations; and

WHEREAS, input from the U.S. NAVY was sought, received and considered on potential wastewater treatment plant locations; and

WHEREAS, public input was sought, received and considered on the evaluation criteria to be used; and

WHEREAS, input from various stakeholder groups including the U.S. Navy, the Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Health, was sought and incorporated into the evaluation criteria; and

WHEREAS, based on input from the public, various stakeholder groups, technical staff, engineering professionals and City staff, four equally weighted categories, being Social, Technical, Environmental and Financial, were developed for the evaluation of all potential site locations, and

WHEREAS, the Social criteria are as follows: 1) Protect Public Health and Safety, 2) Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities, and 3) Minimize Neighborhood Impacts; and

WHEREAS, the Environmental criteria are as follows: 1) Produce Best Water Quality, 2) Protect Environmental Sensitive Areas, and 3) Minimize Carbon Footprint; and

WHEREAS, the Technical criteria are as follows: 1) Reliable Performance, 2) Ease of Construction, and 3) Overall System Efficiency; and
WHEREAS, the Financial criteria are as follows: 1) Low Capital Cost, 2) Low Life Cycle Cost, and 3) Protect Assets for Future Development; and

WHEREAS, as directed by City Council Resolution 11-07, the 13 candidate sites were narrowed to 5 candidate sites; and

WHEREAS, Carollo, Inc., provided a report to the Council, on July 27, 2011 comparing the 5 candidate sites being Windjammer Park, Marina/Seaplane Base, Old City Shops Beachview Farm and Crescent Harbor; and

WHEREAS, public input has been sought, received and incorporated in the analysis of the aforementioned 5 sites; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has asked for additional and more detailed information on the cost of developing a new wastewater treatment plant than was provided during the analysis of the 5 sites in order to make a more informed decision, specifically as to the effect on the typical sewer customer rate and phasing opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the contract with Carollo includes scope of work elements sufficient to provide the detailed cost information desired; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has asked for evaluation of an additional candidate site generally located north of Crescent Harbor Road, east of Regatta drive and south of the intersection of Torpedo Road and Regatta Drive; and

WHEREAS, evaluation of an additional candidate site is consistent with Resolution 11-07, and

WHEREAS, to protect the integrity of the public process it is appropriate to evaluate any additional site to the same level of detail as all candidate sites so that all may be considered on an equal basis using the selection criteria and public process set forth by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Oak Harbor as follows:

1. That Carollo, Inc., acting on behalf of the City and under the management of the City Engineer, is directed to further evaluate six locations for further consideration as part of the wastewater treatment facility planning process.
2. That the six locations to be evaluated further are generally shown on Exhibit A and are referred to as:
   a. Windjammer Park
   b. Marina/Seaplane Base
   c. Old City Shops
   d. Beachview Farm
   e. Crescent Harbor
   f. Crescent Harbor North
3. That Carollo is directed to provide additional cost information to assist in the decision making process
4. That both Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) and Activate Sludge treatment processes will be considered at all sites except for Windjammer Park where only MBR technology will be considered.

5. That an effluent outfall to Oak Harbor Bay will be considered for all sites.

6. That an effluent outfall to West Beach for the Beachview Farm site will be considered in addition to an Oak Harbor Bay outfall

7. That additional public input will be sought and incorporated in the analysis and development of all 6 alternative sites.

8. That a report will be provided to the City Council comparing the six candidate sites together with a recommendation for further consideration of at least two, but not more than three, candidate sites.

9. That, as appropriate, additional candidate sites, outfall locations and processes may be considered as may be directed by the City.

PASSED and approved by the City Council this 17th day of January, 2012.

THE CITY OF OAK HARBOR

________________________________________, Mayor

Attest:

City Clerk
Approved as to Form:

City Attorney
Today’s Presentation Agenda

• Why is a project needed?
• What will the project include?
• What sites are being considered?
• How will the City pick the best site/alternative for the community?
• How much will the project cost… how will the City pay for the project?
• What is the project schedule?
• How can I stay involved?
Project Goal and Objectives

“Recognizing that Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City’s goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements.”

Existing wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) have served the City well for many years.
Existing Rotating Biological Contactor (RBC) Facility

- Served the City for over 50-years
- Major parts and equipment starting to fail
- Meets current permit, but will not meet future standards for clean water

Existing Seaplane Base Lagoon Facility

- System nearing capacity; must now handle 100% of City’s wastewater
- Meets current permit, but will not meet future standards for clean water
- Options for expansion and/or improvement limited by surrounding wetlands
Modern “Clean Water” Facilities

What will the project include?

The project will include 3 main components; when combined these become alternatives for the City to consider:

- **Site**
  - Where will a new facility be located?

- **Process**
  - What treatment technology will be used?

- **Discharge**
  - How will the clean water be used?
What sites are being considered?

Five preliminary sites were shared in April 2011
A sixth site was added in February 2012.

How will the City pick the best site/alternative for the community?

- **Technical**
  - T1
  - T2
  - T3

- **Social**
  - S1
  - S2
  - S3

- **Environmental**
  - E1
  - E2
  - E3

- **Financial**
  - F1
  - F2
  - F3

A comprehensive analysis based on City of Oak Harbor values provides the foundation for a credible, defensible decision.
Technical Objectives

**Reliable Performance**
- Select treatment processes with many years of proven service
- Design for adequate redundancy

**Ease of Construction**
- Avoid steeply sloped sites and/or sites with difficult access
- Avoid sites where acquisition/construction could cause excessive, costly delays *

**Overall System Efficiency**
- Maximize the amount of gravity flow to/from the new WWTP
- Minimize the amount of new conveyance infrastructure

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Social Objectives

**Protect Public Health & Safety**
- Minimize public and City staff exposure to toxics and chemicals
- Reliably meet NPDES permit requirements; provide for safe water quality

**Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities**
- Preserve existing undeveloped open spaces for public use *
- Protect important view corridors in the community *

**Minimize Neighborhood Impacts**
- Construct facilities to match the character of surrounding areas *
- Minimize public exposure to noise, odor, and truck traffic

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
Environmental Objectives

**Produce Best Water Quality**
- Produce the best effluent quality (NTU, TSS, BOD) within a reasonable cost
- Produce “Class A” reclaimed water for beneficial reuse

**Protect Culturally & Environmentally Sensitive Areas**
- Protect wetlands, streams, wildlife habitat, forests, and other critical areas *
  NOTE: Critical areas defined by OHMC

**Minimize Carbon Footprint**
- Pursue alternatives that emit the lowest levels of Greenhouse Gases (GHG)
  (or alternatives that are “reasonably close” to lowest GHG levels)

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan

Financial Objectives

**Low Capital Cost**
- Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or “reasonably close” to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers WWTP, conveyance, and outfall costs

**Low Life Cycle Cost**
- Pursue alternatives that are lowest in cost (or “reasonably close” to low cost)
  NOTE: Considers capital cost and annual O&M cost for 20-year period

**Protect Assets for Future Economic Development**
- Avoid areas zoned for commercial/business use within downtown urban core *

* Criteria matching Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan
A TBL+ summary helps to put all sites on an even playing field for comparison.

A TBL+ summary is being prepared to include the sixth site.

How much will the project cost?

- Cost estimates are “conceptual” at this level of planning.
- Conceptual costs used to compare alternatives.
- Detail (and cost accuracy) added during future planning and design.

Lowest cost sites are near the existing WWTP

NOTES:
(1) Costs based on MBR Process and all facilities required through year 2030
(2) Difference in cost (low to high) represents ~$8M
How will the City pay for the project?

- Project will be paid for with rates from the City’s sewer fund.
- Current rate structure based on a $70 million project.
- Project phasing plans will be developed to match City’s financing constraints.
  - Some sites have more potential for phasing than others.
- Information to be presented at upcoming City Council Workshop (April 11).

What is the project schedule?

- Schedule required by Department of Ecology
  - Submit Facilities Plan for approval on/before 12/31/12
  - Submit Final Design Documents for approval on/before 12/31/14
How can I stay involved?

• Visit the project website: www.oakharborcleanwater.org

• Come to the next community open house:
  Wednesday, April 11
  Elk’s Lodge
  5:30 – 6:30 pm

• Contact Eric Johnston:
  City Engineer
  Phone: (360) 279-4522 or
  Email: ejohnston@oakharbor.org

Questions?
City’s Goal for this Project

“Recognizing that Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City’s goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements.”
Goal of Tonight’s Workshop

- Provide sufficient information to support the Project Team’s recommendation…
  - Illustrate how a 6th site compares to others based on the City’s overall project objectives
  - Provide additional cost information for alternatives at all sites being considered

What comprises an alternative for evaluation?

- Site
  - Where will a new facility be located?

- Process
  - What treatment technology will be used?

- Discharge
  - How will the clean water be used?
Recommended Alternatives
September 20, 2011 City Council Meeting

1. Consider three final sites for further evaluation:
   – Windjammer Park
   – Old City Shops
   – Crescent Harbor
2. Develop final alternatives around membrane bioreactor (MBR) process
   – Consider AS (if applicable) for short-listed sites
3. Discharge treated effluent through new outfall in Oak Harbor
   – Evaluate opportunities for beneficial reuse

City Council Direction
Resolution 12-05: February 7, 2012

Report back with the following information...

1. Add a 6th site (Crescent Harbor North) to the list of candidate sites
2. Provide additional cost information to assist in the analysis
3. Consider both MBR and AS processes
   – Windjammer Park: MBR only
4. Consider Oak Harbor outfalls for all sites
   – Beachview Farm: Also consider West Beach
5. Collect and incorporate additional public input
Tonight’s Agenda

• Public Open House
• Overall Alternative/Site Comparison
• Additional Cost Information
  – Basis of Current Cost Estimates
  – Key Cost Assumptions for Each Site
  – Opportunities for Phasing to Reduce Cost
• Summary and Recommendation
• Questions?

Six Sites Included in Resolution 12-05
Crescent Harbor North Site Description

• Approximately 24 acres within Urban Growth Area (UGA)
• North of Crescent Harbor Drive
  – Not on Navy Seaplane Base
• Comprised of 9 separate privately owned parcels
• Field conditions are comparable to Crescent Harbor site (US Navy Property):
  – Some wetlands evident based on aerial photos
  – Similar risk of finding cultural resources

Crescent Harbor North Site Map
Triple Bottom Line Plus Technical (TBL+) Review of City’s Objectives for the Project

City’s Objectives (cont.)
City’s Objectives (cont.)

Protect Public Health & Safety
- Minimize public and City staff exposure to toxics and chemicals
- Reliably meet NPDES permit requirements; provide for safe water quality

Preserve/Enhance Public Amenities
- Preserve existing undeveloped open spaces for public use
- Protect important view corridors in the community

Minimize Neighborhood Impacts
- Construct facilities to match the character of surrounding areas
- Minimize public exposure to noise, odor, and truck traffic

City’s Objectives (cont.)

Produce Best Water Quality
- Produce the best effluent quality (NTU, TSS, BOD) within a reasonable cost
- Produce “Class A” reclaimed water for beneficial reuse

Protect Culturally & Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- Protect wetlands, streams, wildlife habitat, forests, and other critical areas
  NOTE: Critical areas defined by OHMC

Minimize Carbon Footprint
- Pursue alternatives that emit the lowest levels of Greenhouse Gases (GHG)
  (or alternatives that are “reasonably close” to lowest GHG levels)
Crescent Harbor North TBL+ Summary

- Property acquisition process is well defined for Crescent Harbor North
- Property acquisition process is highly uncertain for Crescent Harbor

Crescent Harbor North Compares Well with Other Recommended Sites
Full TBL+ Summary of Sites/Alternative Project Through Year 2030
MBR at all Sites

Cost remains a key question for all alternatives/sites...

Are costs for all sites truly equal? How much & why are costs higher?
To address more specific questions related to cost, we will:

- Summarize the basis of existing cost estimates
  - Cost for wastewater treatment plant (WWTP)
  - Cost for conveying wastewater to the WWTP
  - Cost for conveying treated effluent & outfall
- Explain key assumptions impacting cost for each potential alternative/site
- Review potential phasing opportunities to reduce cost, which may vary from site to site

Wastewater Treatment Plant Costs
WWTP costs are developed using a range of information and in three basic steps:

1. Size/layout a facility to meet Oak Harbor’s requirements
2. Develop cost estimate based on rough takeoffs, vendor quotes, and actual designs that have been constructed
3. Compare to similar facilities in the area to confirm overall costs are reasonable

1. MBR WWTP Sized for Oak Harbor (3.9 mgd)

NOTE: Elements 3 & 5 only apply to AS alternative
2. MBR Construction Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Element</th>
<th>MBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Equalization</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Headworks</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Primary Treatment</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Secondary Treatment</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tertiary Treatment</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Disinfection</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Solids Handling</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Odor Control</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Admin/Mnt</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Site Work</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Direct Costs $31.3

- Developed process model using Oak Harbor’s 5-year flow data
- Sized process/tanks using model
- Estimated quantities for major cost components
- Solicited budget pricing from equipment vendors
- Totaled costs for Oak Harbor estimate
- Compared Oak Harbor estimate to similar projects

2. MBR Construction Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Component</th>
<th>MBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>$31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs (GCs, OH&amp;P)</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax (8.7%)</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (30%)</td>
<td>$13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Costs</td>
<td>$60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Contingency

- Concept: 10%
- Level of Design: 15%
- Final: 20%
3. MBR Cost Comparison

### Construction Cost Comparison
**MBR vs. AS Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Element</th>
<th>MBR</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Equalization</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Headworks</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Primary Treatment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>($1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Secondary Treatment</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
<td>$6.3</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tertiary Treatment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>($1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Disinfection</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Solids Handling</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Odor Control</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Admin/Mnt</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Site Work</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>($0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td>$31.3</td>
<td>$28.9</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs, sales tax, contingency</td>
<td>$28.7</td>
<td>$26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site-Specific Cost Factors

The following were considered…

- Land acquisition
- Soil conditions
- Architecture/Landscaping
  - Premium for facilities in public view

Here’s how they compared…

- Land Acquisition Allowance
- Geotechnical Conditions Allowance
- Premium Architecture Allowance

Site Project Costs, Millions

Windjammer Park Crescent Harbor North

MBR Project Cost Summary for Year 2030

WWTP Project Costs

- Site
- Solids
- Liquid

Windjammer Park Crescent Harbor North Crescent Harbor Old City Shops Beachview Farm Marina / Sea Plane Base
Wastewater Conveyance Costs

Basis of Comparative Collection/Conveyance Costs

- Collection/Conveyance costs include:
  - Raw sewage pipes and pump stations
- Assumptions
  - Peak flows from Navy do not increase over time
  - City flow increases consistent with Comp. Sewer Plan (and with WWTP analysis)
  - Pipe sizes based on 2060 flows
  - Pump sizes based on 2030 flows
  - ROW/land acquisition as needed
  - Pipe installation includes surface repair, utility relocation, (full Right-of-Way restoration and improvements)
Wastewater Conveyance, Windjammer

Wastewater Conveyance Direct Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Windjammer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump Stations</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Main</td>
<td>$654,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity Sewer</td>
<td>$1,111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhole</td>
<td>$188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewatering, bracing, sheeting</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement cutting, removal</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer bypass, connection</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing, trench patch</td>
<td>$402,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration/cleanup</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,336,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit Price Comparison

- Oak Harbor Cost Est.
- Comparative Price #1
- Comparative Price #2
- Comparative Price #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-Inch Gravity Sewer</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-Inch Manhole (1% of total cost)</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTC</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wastewater Conveyance, Crescent Harbor N.

- Map showing the conveyance system with various labels and annotations.
## Wastewater Conveyance Direct Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Windjammer</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump Stations</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
<td>$2,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Main</td>
<td>$654,000</td>
<td>$2,131,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity Sewer</td>
<td>$1,111,000</td>
<td>$551,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhole</td>
<td>$188,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewatering, bracing, sheeting</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement cutting, removal</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer bypass, connection</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing, trench patch</td>
<td>$402,000</td>
<td>$427,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration/cleanup</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,336,000</td>
<td>$6,417,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Wastewater Conveyance Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Windjammer</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor North</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor</th>
<th>Old City Shops</th>
<th>Beachview Farm</th>
<th>Marina Sea Plane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td>$4,336,000</td>
<td>$6,417,000</td>
<td>$6,327,000</td>
<td>$5,858,000</td>
<td>$8,729,000</td>
<td>$6,510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax (8.7%)</td>
<td>$377,000</td>
<td>$558,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$759,000</td>
<td>$566,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$4,713,000</td>
<td>$6,975,000</td>
<td>$6,877,000</td>
<td>$6,368,000</td>
<td>$9,488,000</td>
<td>$7,076,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (30%)</td>
<td>$1,414,000</td>
<td>$2,093,000</td>
<td>$2,063,000</td>
<td>$1,910,000</td>
<td>$2,846,000</td>
<td>$2,123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td>$6,130,000</td>
<td>$9,070,000</td>
<td>$8,940,000</td>
<td>$8,280,000</td>
<td>$12,330,000</td>
<td>$9,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs (25%)</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
<td>$2,270,000</td>
<td>$2,240,000</td>
<td>$2,070,000</td>
<td>$3,080,000</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Costs</strong></td>
<td>$7,660,000</td>
<td>$11,340,000</td>
<td>$11,180,000</td>
<td>$10,350,000</td>
<td>$15,410,000</td>
<td>$11,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full Replacement of R/W Cross Section

[Image of Full Replacement of R/W Cross Section]
## Wastewater Conveyance Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Windjammer</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor</th>
<th>Old City Shops</th>
<th>Beachview Farm</th>
<th>Marina Sea Plane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td>$4,336,000</td>
<td>$6,417,000</td>
<td>$6,327,000</td>
<td>$5,858,000</td>
<td>$8,729,000</td>
<td>$6,510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax (8.7%)</td>
<td>$377,000</td>
<td>$558,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$759,000</td>
<td>$566,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$4,713,000</td>
<td>$6,975,000</td>
<td>$6,877,000</td>
<td>$6,368,000</td>
<td>$9,488,000</td>
<td>$7,076,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (30%)</td>
<td>$1,414,000</td>
<td>$2,093,000</td>
<td>$2,063,000</td>
<td>$1,910,000</td>
<td>$2,846,000</td>
<td>$2,123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td>$6,130,000</td>
<td>$9,070,000</td>
<td>$8,940,000</td>
<td>$8,280,000</td>
<td>$12,330,000</td>
<td>$9,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs (25%)</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
<td>$2,270,000</td>
<td>$2,240,000</td>
<td>$2,070,000</td>
<td>$3,080,000</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Costs</strong></td>
<td>$7,700,000</td>
<td>$11,300,000</td>
<td>$11,200,000</td>
<td>$10,400,000</td>
<td>$15,400,000</td>
<td>$11,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below the line project costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>$6,900,000</td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Treated Effluent Conveyance & Outfall Costs
Potential Outfall Locations

- Crescent Harbor
  - Mitigate Shellfish Impact With Deep Diffuser

- Oak Harbor
  - Limited Shellfish Impact

- West Beach
  - Mitigate Shellfish Impact With Deep Diffuser

Effluent Conveyance, Beachview Farm
Confirmation of Outfall Location
December 22, 2011 Project Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential WWTP Sites</th>
<th>Beachview Farm</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Beach</td>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline to Shoreline</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$5,200,000(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Water Work(2)</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Damage Fees</td>
<td>$10,600,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Cost

- Beachview Farm: $16,400,000
- Crescent Harbor: $16,200,000

Notes:
1. Costs include sales tax, contingency and soft costs.
2. Estimated cost of a near-shore outfall.
3. Includes the cost of an effluent pump station.
Effluent Conveyance / Outfall Cost Summary

Summary of Overall Project Costs
Project Cost Summary for Year 2030
MBR Process at All Sites

![Graph showing project costs for different sites]

Project Phasing Considerations

![Images of project locations]
Projects are “phased-in” over time in several ways…

- **Phase-in WWTP capacity**
  - Design for lower flows/loads now; expand to meet higher flows/loads in the future

- **Phase-in WWTP components**
  - Build new liquid stream now; defer solids treatment (i.e. continue to use existing Seaplane Base Lagoon)

- **Phase-in WWTP “performance”**
  - Design for less restrictive permit limits now; expand to meet more restrictive limits in the future

- **Phase-in wastewater conveyance**
  - “Just-in-time” installation/expansion of pipes/pumps for wastewater

---

**Example of Capacity Phasing (MBR or AS)**

Current: Assume slower growth rate

Construct smaller Phase 1 WWTP

2030 Projection
Example of Component Phasing (MBR or AS)

**Phasing Approach:**
Defer construction of new solids treatment
Continue to use Seaplane Lagoon for interim solids treatment

Example of “Performance” Phasing (AS)

**Phasing Approach:**
Design Phase 1 for “Conventional” Permit
(No Nitrogen Removal, no “Class A” Reclaimed Water)
Example of Conveyance Phasing (Windjammer)
Phased Conveyance Costs for Each Site

- Windjammer
- Crescent Harbor North
- Old City Shops
- Beachview Farm
- Marina / Sea Plane

Long-Term: $12, $14, $16
Initial Phase: $6, $8, $10

Project Costs, Millions

Phasing Opportunities Differ from Site to Site
Windjammer (Component + Conveyance)

- Effluent Pipeline
- In water work
- Sewage Conveyance - Ultimate
- Sewage Conveyance - Initial
- WWTP - Site
- WWTP - Solids
- WWTP - Liquids

Project Costs, Millions

Windjammer
Windjammer Phase 1
Phasing Opportunities Differ from Site to Site
Crescent Harbor North ("Performance" + Conveyance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost, Millions</th>
<th>Effluent Pipeline</th>
<th>In water work</th>
<th>Sewage Conveyance - Ultimate</th>
<th>Sewage Conveyance - Initial</th>
<th>WWTP - Site</th>
<th>WWTP - Solids</th>
<th>WWTP - Liquids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Cost Summary for Potential "Phase 1"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost, Millions</th>
<th>Effluent Pipeline</th>
<th>In water work</th>
<th>Sewage Conveyance - Initial</th>
<th>WWTP - Site</th>
<th>WWTP - Solids</th>
<th>WWTP - Liquid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Windjammer Beachview
Farm AS
Crescent Harbor North MBR
Crescent Harbor AS
Old City Shops MBR
Marina / Plane MBR
Summary and Recommendation

City Council Direction
Resolution 12-05: February 7, 2012

Report back with the following information…

1. A 6th site (Crescent Harbor North) compares well with other candidate sites
2. Windjammer and Crescent Harbor North provide the lowest combination of initial/long-term cost
3. Using an AS processes at Crescent Harbor North is required to reduce initial and long-term cost
4. An outfall into Oak Harbor Bay provides adequate mixing and is the lowest cost option for all sites
5. Additional public input collected tonight will be included in the final site selection process
Recommended Alternatives
April 17, 2012 City Council Meeting

1. Consider two sites for further evaluation:
   – Windjammer Park
   – Crescent Harbor North
2. Develop final alternatives around membrane bioreactor (MBR) process
   – Consider AS at Crescent Harbor North
3. Discharge treated effluent through new outfall into Oak Harbor Bay
   – Evaluate opportunities for beneficial reuse

Full TBL+ Summary of Sites/Alternatives
Project Through Year 2030
MBR at all Site
Project Cost Summary
Potential Phase 1 and Year 2030

Final Thoughts

*Our recommendation is based on the following key points:*

- **Windjammer MBR**
  - Best opportunity to complete an initial phase below $70M target while controlling long-term cost
  - Highest quality water for current and future environmental protection
  - Required to justify decision to use more expensive alternative

- **Crescent Harbor North AS**
  - Meets all “Social” objectives for the Project
  - Very close to the lowest Phase 1 / Ultimate cost
  - Straight forward site acquisition and permitting
Summary of comments received on 4/11 at open house.

Comment cards were typed for clarity however no attempt was made to correct spelling or otherwise alter the comment. Original scans of the comments are attached.

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

Please put the sewer plant at the Crescent harbor site because I do not want the sewer plant on the waterfront. The waterfront is a big part of the beauty of the area. Boating, fishing, beaches etc. for employment tourists and Oak Harbor res. Employment

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

Yes, please at Oak Harbor North.

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

Not on the water please.

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

The only one I am concerned with is the Fleet Reserve Assn. Why would the City of Oak Harbor try to interrupt a service organization that does tons of charitable work? I + numerous other people find it appalling.

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

This is the best idea so far, far away from everything.

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

Far away from Downtown, we need more traffic problems like we need another hole in the head!

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

I think the 3 sites originally proposed were the best and I think windjammer park is the best site.

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

A waste of money and time

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

We’ve already spent $10’s of thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours of community, government and professional time to come up with the 3 sites on the short list. The best site is Windjammer. Quick jerking us around and get on with it. Built the best system and building at Windjammer.
**What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?**

1) You did not advertise this meeting
2) The cost to drain the Bridgeford property would eat up your 30% override-
3) The 6\textsuperscript{th} site has been short notice- how could you have done the same due diligent as the other sites in that time?

**What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?**

**What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?**

If windjammer is the lowest cost and can be made the safest + cleanest + incorporated to the park pleasing environment- at the lowest cost why is not it the best- most cost efficient way to go?
Tell us about yourself:

☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

I think the 3 sides Originally proposed went the best and I think Windjammer Park is the best site.

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

A waste of money and time.

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

We've already spent $40's of thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours of community, government and professional time in some way with the results on the short list. The best site is Windjammer. Quick jerking us around and getting with it, built the best system and building at Windjammer.
Tell us about yourself:

☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☒ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

Please put the treatment plant at the Crescent Harbor site because we do not want the sewage plant on the water grant. The water intake site is a big part of the beauty of the area.

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

Yes, please.

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

Not on the water, please.

Tell us about yourself:

☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

1. You did not advertise this meeting.
2. The cost to drain the Bridger property would eat up your 30% override.
3. The site has been short notice - how could you have done

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

The same due diligent as all the others sites in that area.

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

The safest and cleanest incorporated In the park pleasing environment - at the lowest cost. Why is not it the best - most cost efficient way to go?
Tonight’s Agenda

• Schedule
• Overview of 6th Site (Crescent Harbor North)
• Public Comments Summary
• Overview of 2010 Rate Study
• Briefly Summarize Workshop Presentation
• Questions?
Schedule - Council Actions & Deadlines

- April 18 - Action on Resolution
- August 14 - Resolution on final, preferred site
- October 16 - Resolution on phasing plan
- December 18 - Resolution on facility plan for submittal to Department of Ecology
- December 31, 2012 - Required facility plan submittal deadline
- December 31, 2014 - Required engineering design plan submittal deadline
Overview of 6th Site

Six Sites Included in Resolution 12-05
Crescent Harbor North Site Map

Summary of Public Comment
Public Input from April 11, 2012

• Continue public involvement throughout process
• 4 written comments received
  – 2 in favor of Crescent Harbor North
  – 2 in favor of Windjammer
• Unwritten feedback:
  – Site-specific conditions at Crescent Harbor North must be addressed
    • Drainage, wet lowland areas
    • Aesthetics/screening are important
    • Be consistent with rural land use
  – Maintain affordability of sewer rates
  – Take a long-term view for the project

Overview of 2010 Rate Study
2010 Wastewater Rate Study

- Cost of Service Analysis
  - Differing costs for different customer classes
- Accounted for Capital projects listed in 20 year Comprehensive plan
- Includes an assumed $70 million capital expense for wastewater plant
  - Now listed in CIP but was not listed during development of rate study
- Council adopted recommendations for progressive rate increases in water, sewer and storm drainage (Ord 1587)

2010 Wastewater Rate Study- Assumptions

- 6% Interest rate on standard revenue bond
- Standard 20 year payback period on bond
- No adjustment to connection/capacity charges
- Assumes full $70million expenditure between 2016 and 2017 for plant construction
- Assumes no contribution from outside sources or funding partners (US Navy, grants etc)
## 2010 Wastewater Rate Study

### Average Single-Family Monthly Bill - Projected Rate Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$70 Million</th>
<th>$90 Million</th>
<th>$95 Million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.65</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$60.55</td>
<td>$55.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$69.65</td>
<td>$60.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
<td>$80.10</td>
<td>$71.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
<td>$96.10</td>
<td>$83.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
<td>$115.30</td>
<td>$100.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagram

The diagram shows the projected average single-family monthly bill increases for $70, $90, and $95 million over 9 years.
2010 Wastewater Rate Study

Average Single-Family Monthly Bill - Projected Rate Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$40 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$44.10</td>
<td>$47.65</td>
<td>$51.45</td>
<td>$55.55</td>
<td>$61.10</td>
<td>$67.20</td>
<td>$73.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$45.15</td>
<td>$49.20</td>
<td>$53.65</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$64.90</td>
<td>$71.40</td>
<td>$78.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$45.55</td>
<td>$50.35</td>
<td>$55.65</td>
<td>$61.50</td>
<td>$67.95</td>
<td>$75.10</td>
<td>$83.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$58.50</td>
<td>$67.25</td>
<td>$77.35</td>
<td>$88.95</td>
<td>$102.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.65</td>
<td>$60.55</td>
<td>$69.65</td>
<td>$80.10</td>
<td>$96.10</td>
<td>$115.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$95 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.65</td>
<td>$60.55</td>
<td>$71.15</td>
<td>$83.60</td>
<td>$100.30</td>
<td>$120.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$54.05</td>
<td>$62.15</td>
<td>$73.05</td>
<td>$85.85</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
<td>$123.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 11 Workshop Summary
Alternatives Presented on April 11, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor North</td>
<td>MBR (1)</td>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor</td>
<td>MBR (1)</td>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer</td>
<td>MBR</td>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old City Shops</td>
<td>MBR</td>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachview Farm</td>
<td>MBR (1)</td>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina/Seaplane Base</td>
<td>MBR</td>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Activated Sludge (AS) possible to reduce cost of initial phase.

Full TBL+ Summary of Sites/Alternatives
Project Through Year 2030
MBR at all Site
Projects are “phased-in” over time in several ways...

- **Phase-in WWTP capacity**
  - Design for lower flows/loads now; expand to meet higher flows/loads in the future

- **Phase-in WWTP components**
  - Build new liquid stream now; defer solids treatment (i.e. continue to use existing Seaplane Base Lagoon)

- **Phase-in WWTP “performance”**
  - Design for less restrictive permit limits now; expand to meet more restrictive limits in the future

- **Phase-in wastewater conveyance**
  - “Just-in-time” installation/expansion of pipes/pumps for wastewater
Project Cost Summary
Potential Phase 1 and Year 2030

Recommended Alternatives

1. Consider two sites for further evaluation:
   - Windjammer Park
   - Crescent Harbor North

2. Develop final alternatives around membrane bioreactor (MBR) process
   - Consider AS at Crescent Harbor North

3. Discharge treated effluent through new outfall into Oak Harbor Bay
   - Evaluate opportunities for beneficial reuse
Final Thoughts

*Our recommendation is based on the following key points:*

- **Windjammer MBR**
  - Best opportunity to complete an initial phase below $70M target while controlling long-term cost
  - Highest quality treated water for current and future environmental protection
  - Required to justify decision to use more expensive alternative

- **Crescent Harbor North AS**
  - Meets defined “Social” objectives for the Project
  - Very close to the lowest Phase 1 / Ultimate cost
  - Defined site acquisition and permitting process

Next Steps Following Council Direction

- Develop information to directly compare and differentiate sites
  - “Master Plan” concepts at each location:
    - Where on the site could the facility go?
    - How would/could adjacent property fit in?
  - Added detail for the community:
    - What might the facility look like?
    - What kind of neighbor would this facility be?
  - Updated cost information:
    - Finalize estimated costs for “engineering” elements
    - Fine-tune “site-specific” costs
  - Compare Phase 1, long-term rate impacts
Will it be Crescent Harbor Road or Windjammer Park?
Want to help determine the location for a new wastewater treatment plant?

WANTED
Four Oak Harbor utility customers willing to help

The Oak Harbor City Council recently narrowed the list of potential locations for a new wastewater treatment plant to two general vicinities – Crescent Harbor Road and Windjammer Park. To help make the final selection, a conceptual master plan will be developed for each site and we are seeking help with the design. Four seats have been reserved for utility customers as part of what promises to be a fun and lively, 20-person design discussion led by an architect facilitator. No qualifications needed, only an interest in using your creativity to imagine how the new treatment plant can best serve the citizens of Oak Harbor.

WHEN:       Wednesday and Thursday, June 27 and 28, 8:00 am to noon
             (must be available both mornings)

If interested, please drop an email no later than noon on Friday, June 1, 2012, to Eric Johnston, City Engineer, at ejohnston@oakharbor.org, or call him at (360) 279-4522 for more information.

The names of all persons expressing an interest will be placed in a hat and the first four names drawn will be contacted to join the exercise. Good luck and thanks for your interest!
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

July 2, 2012

CONTACT: Eric Johnston, (360) 279-4522
ejohnston@oakharbor.org

SAY “I DO” AT THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY?

Oak Harbor, WA -- [June 29, 2012] A small group of citizens, rate payers and property owners recently gathered to discuss the future of waste water in Oak Harbor. With the guidance of facilitator Dave Christensen, an architect with Christensen Design Management, the group considered design options at the two potential wastewater facility sites chosen by City Council: Windjammer Park and Crescent Harbor North. They were tasked with answering the question “If the treatment plant goes here, what can be done to make this site the best it can be?” After two mornings of work, the group emerged with a number of ideas, some of which may be surprising.

On Wednesday, June 27th, the citizen group focused on Windjammer Park and determined that if the facility remained within or around the park, it would need to “wow the community”. What would wow you? How about public meeting rooms, event and wedding facilities, an amphitheater, and enhanced public restrooms? Or perhaps the relocation of the baseball fields to create a baseball/softball facility that could accommodate tournaments, bringing revenue to local businesses? Would you like to see Bayshore Drive extended, enhancing parking and pedestrian access to the waterfront? These are some of the ideas the group believes are possible if City Council selects Windjammer Park as the site for the newly christened “Water Resource Center” on the Oak Harbor waterfront.

The following day, discussion moved to the Crescent Harbor North site and discussion turned towards the potential for water reclamation and reuse, with less discussion about facility aesthetics. Could reclaimed water be used at nearby farmland? Could a fish hatchery be incorporated? The group shared value-adding ideas such as incorporating open space and walking trails, and using existing topography and trees to buffer and mask the site. There was also discussion of a realignment of the current roadway network (from SR 20 to Crescent Harbor Rd.), providing infrastructure to support commercial development and protecting view corridors in the area.

In both sessions, participants expressed a strong desire to provide the highest quality water possible while keeping the cost to rate payers to a manageable level, regardless of which site is chosen.

At the conclusion of the two-day session, several participants reported coming to the design workshop with a strong bias to one site; but after working through the process they could see advantages to both sites and opportunities to improve the community through the construction of a water resource facility at either site.

Participants included David Acton, Corky Bridgeford, Gray Giordan, Joanne Hartley, Russ Hartley, Mike Horrobin, John Koetje, Robin Kolaitis, Jill Johnson, Bruce Neil, Sean Rafferty, Daisy Sapida, Dale Smith, and Jeff Trumbore.

On July 12 the City Council will be given a briefing on the group’s efforts during a televised workshop. The workshop will be held in the City Council chambers starting at 6:00 pm. The results of the design charrette are being incorporated into the analysis by the technical design team to assist the City Council in choosing a final site in August.

###

Planning is underway to develop a modern wastewater treatment system that will serve Oak Harbor’s growing community and better protect our Puget Sound waters – specifically the waters of Oak and Crescent Harbors. The goal is to replace Oak Harbor’s two aging treatment facilities with a new system by 2017. More information is available on the project website: www.oakharborcleanwater.org
CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts

• Participants: (Non City/Consultants)
  • David Acton, Ratepayer
  • Corky Bridgeford, Property owner
  • Mike Horrobin, Property owner
  • Gray Giordan, Waterside condos
  • Joanne & Russ Hartley, Property Owner
  • John Koetje, Ratepayer
  • Robin Kolaitis, Ratepayer
  • Jill Johnson, Chamber of Commerce
  • Bruce Neil, Planning Commission
  • Sean Rafferty, Ratepayer
  • Daisy Sapida, Parks Board
  • Dale Smith, Whidbey Island Bank
  • Jeff Trumbore, Ratepayer
  • Ken Tyler, North Whidbey Little League

CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts
CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts

• Agenda
  • 1. Goals for the Masterplan Charrette:
  • 2. History of the process so far
  • 3. Environmental
  • 4. Infrastructure
  • 5. Transportation
  • 6. Land Use
  • 5. Financial
  • 7. Political/Social
  • 8. Examples of other Facilities
  • 9. How is *this* site best developed?
  • 10. Political and Regulatory
  • 11. Final thoughts & summary
    conclusions in relation to:
    Technical, Financial, Social
    and Environmental aspects.

CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts

*Day One: Windjammer Site*
CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts

Day One: Windjammer Site

Day One: Windjammer Site
CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts

Day Two: Crescent Harbor North Site
Day Two: Crescent Harbor North Site

Windjammer Site Concept
Positive Issues

- Existing Utilities at site saves on new infrastructure costs.
- The entire shoreline area could remain open and add to the usable area.
- RV area can remain in place, and enhanced with services in a new Facility.
- Open green space is maintained near Waterside Condos.
- New restrooms, community room, educational & cultural areas accessible to Park.
- New facility could help facilitate a Bayshore Drive connection.
- A new Bayshore Drive connection would add value to existing commercial parcels.
- Bayshore realignment would add commercial land at the Bayshore / City Beach Rd.
- and a better pedestrian connection to Park from old town area
- A new Bayshore Drive could add additional on-street parking accessible to Park.
- Provides pedestrian view corridor into Park site from Pioneer Way.
- Provides opportunity for smaller scale commercial on Pioneer Way in a depressed, an existing under-used commercial area.
- Could provide a “Wow” Architectural structure as a Gateway to the Park.
- New Bayshore Drive connection could help solve flooding issues at west end.
- The location could provide services for a future amphitheatre area.
- All the potential ancillary improvements could be phased in, without affecting usability of the chosen MBR site location.
- A smaller footprint MBR facility will have improved water quality beyond current requirements into the future.
- Site area is designed for anticipation of a 50-year growth need.
- No separate Pump Station would be required. (Integrated in new facility)
- Some of the chosen MBR site is city-owned property.
- This location allows the project to leverage other needed improvements at Park.

Negative Issues

- Probable archeological finds will affect costs and schedule.
- Iconic Architecture will cost approx. 5% more.
- Community Rooms, Restrooms, etc. will add to the expense.
- MBR facility cost more than an AS facility, but less of a “footprint” (2.5-3 acres).
- Chosen site requires acquisition of some commercial private property and a zone change on any city-owned land.
- New Bayshore Drive connection is an additional expense, if chosen.
- Reconfiguration, or relocation of little League fields required if Bayshore Dr. built.
CLEAN WATER FACILITY  
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts  

Crescent Harbor North Site Concept

Positive Issues

• Land is mostly undeveloped, except for some residences.  
• Approx. 6-24 acres would have to be acquired at existing market values.  
• Large site area allows for expansion of other City uses, besides a treatment facility.  
• Site allows for construction of an AS type facility, which is less costly, but needs, a larger “footprint” (6 acres) and can be phased-in easier over time.  
• Building architecture can be more economical, if hidden from view with buffers.  
• Opportunity for some educational facilities to access trails down to wetland habitat areas.  
• Topography potentially assists gravity-assist AS systems.  
• Potential for some commercial use parcels fronting on Regatta Road once utilizes are in place with a new facility.  
• Large site allows maximum flexibility for the future
CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts
Crescent Harbor North

Negative Issues

• All effluent/waste water would have to be pumped from the exist. WJ site, up to this site, and back down to WJ site again, after treatment. This requires new piping expense and pump stations.
• Topography will require additional expense for several retaining wall systems to create flat areas for development and internal roads.
• Stormwater control expense will be required on west side of site along Regatta and/or Torpedo Roads.
• Decommissioning Torpedo Road, will require additional expense for improvements to Regatta and Crescent Harbor Roads, including curb/gutter sidewalk at and possible new roundabout to access Navy Base entrance.
• Critical areas on site at easterly end will require delineation and adequate buffers.
• If more land is utilized for other uses (i.e. Solid waste, etc.), a smaller footprint MBR facility will cost more than an AS system.
• A Pump Station structure will be required at WJ site.
• Site will have to go through a City Annexation process, and Land use Zone change.

CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts
CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts

Blaine Master Plan Design Charrette Example
CLEAN WATER FACILITY
Design Charrette Masterplan Concepts
“…the right thing to do for the entire Community…”
CALL TO ORDER  Mayor Dudley called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Mayor Scott Dudley          Larry Cort, Interim City Administrator
Six Members of the Council,  Cathy Rosen, Public Works Director
    Rick Almberg            Eric Johnston, City Engineer
    Jim Campbell            Renée Recker, Executive Assistant to the Mayor
    Tara Hizon
    Danny Paggao
    Joel Servatius
    Bob Severns
Beth Munns was absent and excused from the workshop.

City Engineer, Eric Johnston introduced David Christensen, Christensen Design Management and Brian Matson, Carollo Engineers along with members of the design charrette team.

City Engineer Johnston gave an overview of the waste water treatment facility's history and project status and then turned the meeting over to Mr. Christensen. Mr. Christensen defined the word "charrette" which emanated from the École des Beaux Arts as an intense workshop to arrive at consensus. The term is defined on his firm's website as: A charrette is an intense effort to solve any architectural problem within a limited time. From a creative standpoint, a charrette can be divided into three portions: listen, brainstorm and draw fast. The WWTP design charrette included 14 community participants who represented property owners, business and organization members, and rate payers. The question asked for each of the two sites: If a treatment plant was built at this site, how does the site incorporate to make the City a better place to live. The facts of each site were presented with an agenda of everything that could be thought of and how the site could best be developed. The two-day charrette was a community-driven and non-binding process. It was not an adversarial charrette and the process generated a number of ideas.

Mr. Christensen gave a PowerPoint presentation which is attached to these minutes as Exhibit A and details:
- Masterplan concepts for the charrette
- Positive issues and negative issues for the Windjammer Site
- Positive issues and negative issues for the Crescent Harbor North Site
- The Blaine, Washington master plan design charrette example
Next steps: July 31, 2012 Public open house followed by a Council workshop at the Elk's Lodge, Oak Harbor. August 14, 2012 Council meeting at City Hall, Oak Harbor.

Council questions and discussion included the commercial center associated with the Windjammer site, acquisition of additional parking, Staysail RV Park at Windjammer, ballfields’ reconfiguration and/or relocation, leverage of other values through Bayshore’s realignment, and the lack of Windjammer negative issues not attached to financial concern. Council questions and discussion about the Crescent Harbor North site, the economy of an AS facility and state-of-the-art and smaller footprinted MBR facility, concern with pumping from the Crescent Harbor North site, wetland mitigation, reconfiguration of Torpedo Road, loss of three residences to accommodate this site, and that this site is within the Urban Growth Area (UGA).

Mayor Dudley called for public comments from the charrette participants.

**Corky Bridgeford, Property Owner, Torpedo Road.** Mr. Bridgeford talked about the wetlands, the tree farm location (to the north of this proposed site), and the positive education process the charrette provided which changed his opinion of the Crescent Harbor North site as a viable possibility. Mr. Bridgeford also spoke in support of the MBR alternative for this facility and the City's foresight to have built the Fire Department and City Shops complexes with room for future growth.

**Joanne Hartley, Property Owner, Crescent Harbor Road.** Ms. Hartley spoke in support of the charrette experience and that the WWTP charrette was non-combative and positive. Ms. Hartley felt that pumping from the Crescent Harbor site back to the park would be financially wasteful. Using the Windjammer site and suggested changes to Bayshore Drive would allow the facility and area to become a remarkable draw for Oak Harbor. Ms. Hartley felt an MBR facility is the best process and could support the Crescent Harbor site even though it would take her property noting it would be to the City's advantage to take all of the affected properties at one time. In response to people who do not want to give up park area, Ms. Hartley felt they should remain mindful of what is best for the community and she asked Council to facilitate for the people, and though difficult, not be emotional.

**Jeff Trumbore, Rate Payer.** Mr. Trumbore originally opposed the Windjammer site, but through the charrette process, came to see it as a viable opportunity. He had been concerned about the Crescent Harbor property owners who now seem to be supportive of that site. Mr. Trumbore felt the City has two decent options and should look toward a fifty-year horizon. Beyond the opportunities mentioned and more hidden at Crescent Harbor, an interpretative park and wetlands areas could be a positive draw to this site.

Council questions and discussion continued about the UGA and City limits, if preliminary improvement costs would be presented this evening (no), and that design charrette results were meant to take ideas, apply them to each site, and move toward a site decision. Mr. Matson spoke to questions concerning future treatment requirements which are difficult to determine at this point, that AS and MBR can effectively remove suspensions/pollutants, meeting of current regulatory requirements, and that the choice of MBR or AS becomes a balancing act for communities.
Discussion continued regarding Windjammer's existing facility as the proposed site, the acquisition of private property, rezoning, and park zoning. Master plan concepts and those ideals will need future attention but site selection is the present focus. Discussion returned to the ballfields and the increased traffic on Bayshore Drive, size of property on Pioneer to be kept commercial (30,000 sf), right-of-way for the Boyer property, pull-throughs for the RV park which is already considered a City jewel, the give and take of park area, consistency with the Windjammer Plan, that site acquisition was seen as a negative for the Windjammer site and positive (less costly) for the Crescent Harbor North site, the balancing of Pioneer improvements, and Dock Street's asphalt which extends to the water.

There were no representatives from Little League at this evening's meeting but Ken Tyler, North Whidbey Little League had participated in the charrette. City Engineer Johnston noted that moving the ballfields was discussed during the charrette with the "take away" that new fields would need to be in place first (bigger, better, lighted and able to accommodate Little League and adult leagues). The football fields at Ft. Nugent Park took eighteen months to build so there would be time to relocate the ballfields prior to the 2017 wastewater treatment facility construction date.

Discussion returned to the financial-only negatives shown for the Windjammer site and that people don't like this site, that political/social issues were addressed for both sites and that, though citizen concern about this site began as an issue, as the charrette's educational process continued, it didn't become an issue within the charrette's results for positives and negatives at this site. The charrette's results represent what was said.

**Cathy Harbour, Property Owner, Bayshore Drive.** Ms. Harbour spoke with concern about moving the existing ballfields since she enjoys seeing them used beyond League play.

Discussion continued about reestablishing the task force that discussed the ballfields some years ago, relocating the fields yet keeping a play field at Windjammer Park, with discussion returning to costs and if they could be presented at the July 31, 2012 meeting (plant costs and ancillary costs) and question if that would be within Carollo Engineer's purview.

More public comment was invited in response to statements made about people not wanting Windjammer as the selected site.

**Joanne Hartley, Property Owner, Crescent Harbor Road.** Ms. Hartley said the charrette was not a political issue. The site choice is a personal and emotional issue: I don’t know anyone more emotional (than me) about having my house taken. But, we came around and do understand now from participating in the charrette.

**Corky Bridgeford, Property Owner, Torpedo Road.** It was not a political issue since the plant has to be built. We were asked how we want it to look, what if we put it there (for each site), and then how we would deal with it.

**Jeff Trumbore, Rate Payer.** As Mr. Trumbore had stated earlier, he was adamantly against Windjammer, but as the charrette progressed, he understood; it was not
political. There are still issues and there needs to be a strong public information program. Sewer plants have changed. The technology has moved forward considerably.

Discussion followed about water quality from an MBR facility (could it be drinking water quality). Mr. Matson talked about the measure of suspended solids - the lagoon is at 40 milligrams per liter, AS would produce 30 milligrams per liter but could then be filtered, and MBR brings 1 milligram per liter. There are restrictions on how reclaimed water can be used (do not think of it in terms of drinking water) and an MBR plant will provide the highest class, Class A, of water; AS can provide such water through filtration. In terms of regulation, they are equal. In terms of perception, they are not equal. If sited at Windjammer, Mr. Matson personally commented it would be a shame to put MBR-quality water into the ocean since reclaimed water can be used.

Next steps were discussed in terms of the July 31, 2012 and August 14, 2012 meetings.

**ADJOURN**
With no other discussion coming forth, Mayor Dudley adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

________________________
Connie T. Wheeler
City Clerk
City’s Goal for this Project

“Recognizing that Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City’s goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the City to fund the improvements.”
Goal of Tonight’s Workshop

• *Per Resolution 12-10*, provide sufficient information to support a City Council Decision on a proposed site and treatment process for a new clean water facility.

Steps Completed Following Council Direction
Report to Council on April 17, 2012

• Develop information to directly compare and differentiate sites
  – “Master Plan” concepts at each location:
    • Where on the site could the facility go?
    • How would/could adjacent property fit in?
  – Added detail for the community:
    • What might the facility look like?
    • What kind of neighbor would this facility be?
  – Updated cost information:
    • Finalize estimated costs for “engineering” elements
    • Fine-tune “site-specific” costs
    • Compare Phase 1, long-term rate impacts
Tonight’s Agenda

• Public Open House
• Site Refinements: *What will it look like?*
  – Charrette Process and Outcome
  – Potential Facility Layouts and Renderings
• Cost Refinements: *How much will it cost?*
  – Review Prior Basis of Cost Estimates
  – Updated Total and Phase 1 Cost Estimates
  – Estimated Rate Impacts
• Schedule Moving Forward
• Questions?
Planning Charrette, Christensen Design Mgmt
June 27 & 28, 2012

Participants: (Non City/Consultants)
David Acton, Ratepayer
Corky Bridgeford, Property owner
Mike Horrobin, Property owner
Gray Giordan, Waterside condos
Joanne & Russ Hartley, Property Owners
John Koelje, Ratepayer
Robyn Kolaitis, Ratepayer
Jill Johnson, Chamber of Commerce
Bruce Neil, Planning Commission
Sean Rafferty, Ratepayer
Daisy Sapida, Parks Board
Dale Smith, Whidbey Island Bank
Jeff Trumbore, Ratepayer
Ken Tyler, North Whidbey Little League

Planning Charrette Objective

“If a clean water facility had to be located on this site, how could it best be incorporated to provide the greatest overall community benefit?”
Windjammer Vicinity
Conceptual Area Master Plan

Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Plan View

Building Key
1. Potential Community Building (lines not included)
2. Administration Building
3. Maintenance Shop
4. Headworks
5. Aeration Basins (buried beneath road)
6. Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Building
7. Mechanical Building
8. Electrical Building
9. Chemical Building
10. Sludge Building
11. Odor Control Building

North
Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Site Section View

Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Perspective View

Street view looking North from park past future re-aligned Bayshore Drive
Windjammer Alternate Concept
Conceptual Plan and Perspective View

View From Pioneer Way Looking Toward Park

Building Key
- Potential Commercial Development
- Administration Building
- Facility Buildings
- Boat Storage
- Tender Docks (shown beneath buildings)
- North
- transfers (shown beneath buildings)
- Mechanical Building
- Electrical Building
- Chemical Building
- Salvage Building
- Other Control Building

Crescent Harbor North
Conceptual Area Master Plan
Crescent Harbor North Charrette Concept
Conceptual Plan View for Activated Sludge (AS)

Crescent Harbor North Charrette Concept
Conceptual Site Section View for AS
Crescent Harbor North Charrette Concept
Conceptual Plan View for MBR

Crescent Harbor North Charrette Concept
Conceptual Perspective View (AS or MBR)

Street view looking Northeast from Torpedo Road
Cost Refinements

Level of Detail for MBR WWTP
April 2012

NOTE:
Elements 3 & 5 only apply to AS alternative
Basis of MBR Construction Cost Estimate
April 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Element</th>
<th>MBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Equalization</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Headworks</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Primary Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Secondary Treatment</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tertiary Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Disinfection</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Solids Handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Odor Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Admin/Mnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Site Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Component</th>
<th>MBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td>$31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs (GCs, OH&amp;P)</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax (8.7%)</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (30%)</td>
<td>$13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td>$60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Cost Comparison for Year 2030
Windjammer MBR Facility

- Effluent Discharge
- Sewage Conveyance
- WWTP

**Conveyance/Discharge**
- Added to WWTP costs
- No Change (not site specific)

**WWTP**
- Updated to reflect charrette

$90.9 M
$90.0 M
$80.4 M
$2.9 M
$7.6 M

Project Cost, Millions

$50  $55  $60  $65  $70  $75  $80  $85  $90  $95  $100

Apr-12
Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Plan View

Allowance for land acquisition of commercial frontage
Site construction cost increases including service road, runoff, etc.
Aeration basin cost increased to reflect placement beneath road

Project Cost Comparison for Year 2030
Windjammer MBR Facility

What Changed?
• Increased cost of buried structures with traffic-rated slabs
• Added allowance for land acquisition
• Added cost for site electrical service
• Added costs for sewage/effluent conveyance from existing
• Added demolition of existing WWTP
• Reduced sitework & contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost, Millions</th>
<th>Apr-12</th>
<th>Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$90.9 M</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$93.5 M</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80.4</td>
<td>$83.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effluent Discharge
Sewage Conveyance
WWTP
Project Cost Comparison for Year 2030
Crescent Harbor North AS Facility

What Changed?
• Eliminated influent pump station (gravity through site)
• Reduced geotechnical allowance based on site reconnaissance
• Reduced contingency
• Increased sitework allowance (steep site)

Summary of Revised Project Costs
Year 2030
Cost of an MBR Facility Differs By Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Windjammer Vicinity</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influent Pump Station</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
<td>$--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeration Basins</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influent/Effluent Routing</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework/Yard Piping</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Geotechnical</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Architecture</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost Subtotal</td>
<td>$11,680,000</td>
<td>$6,845,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost(1)</td>
<td>$20,250,000</td>
<td>$12,308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition(2)</td>
<td>$2,075,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost(3)</td>
<td>$22,325,000</td>
<td>$13,608,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
(1) Includes 25% contingency, Contractor markups, and Sales Tax.
(2) Allowance based on assessed value.
(3) Total of Construction plus Land Acquisition.

Summary of Revised Project Costs
Year 2030

$93.5 M
$90
$89.0 M
$85
$80
$75
$70
$65
$60
$55
$50

Windjammer MBR
Crescent Harbor North AS
Crescent Harbor North MBR

Higher
Lower

$83.0
$7.6
$69.8
$7.9
$11.3
$74.3
$93.5 M
$7.9
$11.3
$7.6
$7.9
$11.3
$7.6
$7.9
$11.3
$7.9
$11.3
Summary of Updated Costs

- WWTP costs on all sites updated to reflect charrette process and higher level of detail
  - WWTP contingency has been reduced accordingly
- Conveyance & Discharge costs remain the same
- Results:
  - MBR facility costs nearly the same at both sites
  - AS facility at Crescent Harbor ~5% lower

Project Phasing Considerations

- Phasing is required to reduce initial project cost
  - Year 2030 costs are all significantly above City’s targeted budget
- Phasing options reviewed during April 11 workshop
  - Capacity phasing
  - Component phasing
  - Performance phasing
  - Conveyance phasing
Phasing Potential differs for each, which reflects in the estimated cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phasing Option</th>
<th>Windjammer MBR</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor N AS</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor N MBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity(1)</td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Highest Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Moderate Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Lowest Potential" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Highest Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Moderate Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Lowest Potential" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Moderate Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Highest Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Moderate Potential" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance</td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Highest Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Moderate Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Lowest Potential" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Highest Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Moderate Potential" /></td>
<td><img src="circle" alt="Lowest Potential" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Phase 1 Cost(1)</td>
<td>$74.2</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>$90.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
(1) Current estimates do not include capacity phasing, which can be considered at all sites.

---

Phasing Risk differs for each, which does not reflect in the estimated cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phasing Option</th>
<th>Windjammer MBR</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor N AS</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor N MBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Low Risk (City Controlled)</td>
<td>Low Risk (City Controlled)</td>
<td>Low Risk (City Controlled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Higher Risk (Not City Controlled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Moderate Risk (Not City Controlled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance</td>
<td>Low Risk (City Controlled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Risk of Not Being Able to Phase</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Cost Summary

- Without phasing, est. year 2030 cost are all similar
- Both Windjammer MBR and Crescent Harbor North AS offer phasing options to reduce Phase 1 cost
  - Windjammer MBR: interim use of Navy lagoon (higher risk)
  - Crescent Harbor North AS: phasing-in effluent quality (moderate risk)
- To further reduce cost, capacity phasing may be considered at either site once a selection is made
- Ultimately, rates are highly influenced by phasing and cost sharing (e.g. Navy, potential grants)
2010 Wastewater Rate Study

• Cost of Service Analysis
  – Differing costs for different customer classes
• Accounted for Capital projects listed in 20 year Comprehensive plan
• Includes an assumed $70 million capital expense for wastewater plant
  – Now listed in CIP but was not listed during development of rate study
• Council adopted recommendations for progressive rate increases in water, sewer and storm drainage (Ord 1587)

2010 Wastewater Rate Study- Assumptions

• 6% Interest rate on standard revenue bond
• Standard 20 year payback period on bond
• No adjustment to connection/capacity charges
• Assumes full $70 million expenditure between 2016 and 2017 for plant construction
• Assumes no contribution from outside sources or funding partners (US Navy, grants etc)
2010 Wastewater Rate Study

Average Single-Family Monthly Bill - Projected Rate Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Rate Increase ($ Million)</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$40 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$44.10</td>
<td>$47.65</td>
<td>$51.45</td>
<td>$55.55</td>
<td>$61.10</td>
<td>$67.20</td>
<td>$73.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$45.15</td>
<td>$49.20</td>
<td>$53.65</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$64.90</td>
<td>$71.40</td>
<td>$78.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$45.55</td>
<td>$50.35</td>
<td>$55.65</td>
<td>$61.50</td>
<td>$67.95</td>
<td>$75.10</td>
<td>$83.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$58.50</td>
<td>$67.25</td>
<td>$77.35</td>
<td>$88.95</td>
<td>$102.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.65</td>
<td>$60.55</td>
<td>$71.15</td>
<td>$83.60</td>
<td>$100.30</td>
<td>$120.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 Million</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$54.05</td>
<td>$62.15</td>
<td>$73.05</td>
<td>$85.85</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
<td>$123.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Average Single Family Monthly Rate

No Phasing, Crescent Harbor North MBR

[Graph showing estimated average single-family monthly rates for different project scenarios, with the current assumption depicted as a dashed line.]
Estimated Average Single Family Monthly Rate
No Phasing, Crescent Harbor North MBR

Estimated Average Single Family Monthly Rate
Phasing, Windjammer MBR, Crescent Harbor North AS
Rate Impact Summary

- Current rate projections are based on series of assumptions that will be updated moving forward
  - Phasing approach
  - Level of cost-sharing
  - Available grant funding
  - Interest rates
- Crescent Harbor North AS offers initial rates on the low end of range
- Phasing risk for Windjammer MBR could create higher initial rates
- Limited phasing potential for Crescent Harbor North MBR results in highest initial rates
- The City could consider capacity phasing to reduce initial rates at both sites

Final Summary and Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Windjammer MBR</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor North AS</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor North MBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBL+ Rating</td>
<td>Similar (High)</td>
<td>Similar (High)</td>
<td>Similar (High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Long-term Cost</td>
<td>$93.5 million</td>
<td>$88.9 million</td>
<td>$93.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Impact (Range as shown)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potential for rates on low end of range</td>
<td>potential for rates on low end of range</td>
<td>potential for rates on high end of range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefit (Charrette Feedback)</td>
<td>Potential benefits to Windjammer Vicinity open space and transportation</td>
<td>Potential benefits to regional utility services and transportation</td>
<td>Potential benefits to regional utility services and transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule - Council Actions & Deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Council Actions &amp; Deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 31, 2012</td>
<td>Q&amp;A regarding additional evaluation per Resolution 12-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 14, 2012</td>
<td>Council resolution on proposed site for further planning and environmental review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 16, 2012</td>
<td>Council resolution on proposed phasing plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 31, 2012</td>
<td>Required Facilities Plan submission to Washington Department of Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 31, 2014</td>
<td>Required engineering design submission to Washington Department of Ecology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions?**
Tell us about yourself:
- [ ] I live in the City of Oak Harbor
- [ ] I work in the City of Oak Harbor
- [ ] I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

What are your thoughts about the concepts that have been presented for a facility located in the Windjammer Vicinity?

norther site - because of the pumping back into Oak Harbor

What are your thoughts about the concepts that have been presented for a facility located at Crescent Harbor North?

Do you have other thoughts or considerations for the project team?

1. It is understood that a new solid waste treatment plant would be an upgrade to the one we are using now. Also understood that roughly 99% of the effluent could be treated. About the 1%, flowing out into our waters; that 1% is no doubt the pharmaceutical drug prescriptions almost every family uses. Even

City of Oak Harbor
Attn: Eric Johnston, P.E.
865 SE Barrington Drive
Oak Harbor, WA 98277

though it is 1%, it has the potential to be very harmful to wildlife, fish & the waters themselves. How will the pharmaceuticals be handled? For either site?

2. Respectfully knowing you have paid engineers & planners to get this far, have you checked into how other communities, such as Homer, Alaska, returned to the earth & more goes into the water. It takes vision. It's not too late to be changed.
Tell us about yourself:

☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☒ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

What are your thoughts about the concepts that have been presented for a facility located in the Windjammer Vicinity?

[Handwritten text]

What are your thoughts about the concepts that have been presented for a facility located at Crescent Harbor North?

[Handwritten text]

Do you have other thoughts or considerations for the project team?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Tell us about yourself:
☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☒ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information) 

Eric Fields

What are your thoughts about the concepts that have been presented for a facility located in the Windjammer Vicinity?
WHAT IF "WE" DID NOT SPEND 2.5 - 3 MILLION FOR EXTRA ROAD STRENGTHENING OVER AERATION BASINS BURIED SO BASICALLY COST SAVING OPTION - YOU NOT HAVE HEAVY CARS

What are your thoughts about the concepts that have been presented for a facility located at Crescent Harbor North?

Do you have other thoughts or considerations for the project team?


I recommend MBR as the type of Waste Water Treatment Plant, and I recommend locating the MBR plant in the vicinity of City Beach (Windjammer Park). Current recommended site near the Chevy dealership is OK.

An MBR plant could be designed to disguise the primary purpose of the structure while providing the basic infrastructure for the creation of an Oak Harbor museum, featuring the historic aspects of downtown Oak Harbor and North Whidbey. I have discussed the concept of an adjunct museum with Richard Castellano (Executive Director Island County Historical Society). He is in favor of future discussions on this concept.

One of the unforeseen consequences of the consolidation of the Oak Harbor Museum with the creation of the Island County Museum in Coupeville is the lack of proximity of Oak Harbor items displayed/discussed in the museum with the actual location of that item, site, building, event, etc. A museum in Oak Harbor would provide proximity and bring greater understanding of the historic nature of Oak Harbor. Leveraging the infrastructure cost for an MBR plant should make it more likely for an Oak Harbor Museum to be created. Note, South Whidbey and Camano Island have their own museums.

Also of note, and should be considered, is the historic nature of North Crescent Harbor Road. The site depicted as Crescent Harbor North is the general location of the first Methodist church, parsonage and the Izett Creamery. The church existed from approximately 1892 to 1920. The parsonage built about 1912 still exists as a home in the triangle section and one of the Izett structures, built approximately 1899, still exists as a home on the Crescent Harbor North site. It makes me wonder if an Oak Harbor Museum, had existed, whether this site would have been proposed as a site for a waste water treatment plant.

Scott Hornung
Tonight’s Agenda

- Overview of Windjammer Vicinity MBR
- Overview of Crescent Harbor North AS
- Overview of Crescent Harbor North MBR
- Rate Analysis Update
- Public Comments Summary
- Schedule
- Questions?
Overview of Alternatives

Windjammer Vicinity
Conceptual Area Master Plan
Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Plan View

Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Site Section View
Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Perspective View

Street view looking North from park past future re-aligned Bayshore Drive

Windjammer Alternate Concept
Conceptual Plan and Perspective View
Project Cost Comparison for Year 2030
Windjammer MBR Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost, Millions</th>
<th>Apr-12</th>
<th>Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effluent Discharge</td>
<td>$90.9 M</td>
<td>$93.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td>$7.6 M</td>
<td>$7.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Conveyance</td>
<td>$80.4 M</td>
<td>$83.0 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Changed?**
- Increased cost of buried structures with traffic-rated slabs
- Added allowance for land acquisition
- Added cost for site electrical service
- Added costs for sewage/effluent conveyance from existing
- Added demolition of existing WWTP
- Reduced site work & contingency

---

Key Considerations
Windjammer Vicinity MBR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Year 2030 Facilities</th>
<th>Phase 1 Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Project Cost</td>
<td>$93.5 million</td>
<td>$81.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Net Present Value (NPV) of Annual O&amp;M(^{(1)})</td>
<td>$20.3 million ($1.6 million/year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 20-Year NPV</td>
<td>$113.8 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Phase</td>
<td>Phase 1 costs assume continued use of Seaplane Lagoon for solids (high risk assumption)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Considerations</td>
<td>Potential benefits to Windjammer Vicinity open space and transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
(1) Operations & Maintenance (O&M) costs include power, chemicals, labor, equipment replacement, and solids handling.
Crescent Harbor North Conceptual Area Master Plan

Crescent Harbor North Charrette Concept Conceptual Plan View for Activated Sludge (AS)
Crescent Harbor North Charrette Concept
Conceptual Site Section View for AS

Street view looking Northeast from Torpedo Road

Crescent Harbor North Charrette Concept
Conceptual Perspective View (AS or MBR)
Project Cost Comparison for Year 2030
Crescent Harbor North AS Facility

What Changed?
• Eliminated influent pump station (gravity through site)
• Reduced geotechnical allowance based on site reconnaissance
• Reduced contingency
• Increased sitework allowance (steep site)

Key Considerations
Crescent Harbor North AS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Year 2030 Facilities</th>
<th>Phase 1 Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Project Cost</td>
<td>$89.0 million</td>
<td>$78.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Net Present Value (NPV) of Annual O&amp;M(1)</td>
<td>$20.9 million ($1.7 million/year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 20-Year NPV</td>
<td>$109.9 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Phase</td>
<td>Phase 1 costs assume facilities for nitrogen removal and filtration are deferred (moderate risk assumption)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Considerations</td>
<td>Potential benefits to regional utility services and transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
(1) Operations & Maintenance (O&M) costs include power, chemicals, labor, equipment replacement, solids handling, and maintenance of the pump stations and pipelines used to convey flow between Windjammer and Crescent Harbor North.
Crescent Harbor North Charrette Concept
Conceptual Plan View for MBR

Summary of Project Costs
Year 2030

- Windjammer MBR: $83.0 M
  - WWTP: $2.9 M
  - Sewage Conveyance: $7.6 M
  - Effluent Discharge: $74.3 M

- Crescent Harbor North AS: $69.8 M

- Crescent Harbor North MBR: $93.5 M
  - WWTP: $7.9 M
  - Sewage Conveyance: $11.3 M
  - Effluent Discharge: $74.3 M
Key Considerations
Crescent Harbor North MBR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Year 2030 Facilities</th>
<th>Phase 1 Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Project Cost</td>
<td>$93.5 million</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Net Present Value (NPV) of Annual O&amp;M(1)</td>
<td>$22.4 million ($1.8 million/yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 20-Year NPV</td>
<td></td>
<td>$115.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Phase</td>
<td>Alternative does not allow for component, performance, or conveyance phasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Considerations</td>
<td>Potential benefits to regional utility services and transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
(1) Operations & Maintenance (O&M) costs include power, chemicals, labor, equipment replacement, solids handling, and maintenance of the pump stations and pipelines used to convey flow between Windjammer and Crescent Harbor North.

Final Cost Comparison
Total Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 2030 Cost</th>
<th>Phase 1 Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer MBR</td>
<td>$85.0</td>
<td>$90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor North AS</td>
<td>$75.0</td>
<td>$80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Harbor North MBR</td>
<td>$70.0</td>
<td>$75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Estimated O&M Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Windjammer MBR</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor North AS</th>
<th>Crescent Harbor North MBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power/Fuel</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solids Handling</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal WWTP</strong></td>
<td>$1,610,000</td>
<td>$1,490,000</td>
<td>$1,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance Power(1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance O&amp;M(1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Conveyance</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual</strong></td>
<td>$1,610,000</td>
<td>$1,660,000</td>
<td>$1,780,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
(1) Estimated costs for conveying raw sewage and effluent between Windjammer and Crescent Harbor North.

## Final Cost Comparison

**Total Project Cost and Annual O&M**

- **Year 2030 Cost**
- **Phase 1 Cost**
- **Annual O&M**

![Graph showing cost comparison](image-url)
Final Cost Comparison
Total Net Present Value (20-years)

Final Cost Comparison
Total Net Present Value (50-years)
Final Cost Comparison
Estimated City Share

- Windjammer MBR: $76.0
- Crescent Harbor North AS: $76.4
- Crescent Harbor North MBR: $80.3

Rate Analysis Update
WWTP Funding Assumption Review

- 2010 rate study included assumptions for the WWTP funding
- Assumptions were conservative given the project was 5 plus years in the future
- Revised assumptions are conservative yet still reflect current conditions
- Question: How do the assumptions impact the adopted rate transition plan

Summary of the Previous Rate Study Assumptions

- Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade cost of $70 million
- Rates are funding approximately $6.4 million
- Reserves are funding approximately $10 million
- Total revenue bond $53.7 million
  - Interest rate of 6.0% for 20 years
- Estimated annual debt service payment is approximately $4.7 million
- No additional outside funding for the upgrade
Current Project Cost and Revised Funding Assumptions

- Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade cost estimates have increased to $93.5 million
- Activated sludge treatment plant would reduce rate impacts compared to MBR
  - Additional future costs may be necessary
- Alternative Options Considered Include:
  - Current long-term borrowing rates and terms
  - Navy contribution
- No additional outside funding has been included at this time
  - Low-interest loans
  - Grants

Summary of Alternative Funding Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2 (A)</th>
<th>Option 2 (B)</th>
<th>Option 3 (A)</th>
<th>Option 3 (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term in Years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>$70,000,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Contribution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>17,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net City Cost</td>
<td>$70,000,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
<td>$85,500,000</td>
<td>$76,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue Bond</td>
<td>$53,700,000</td>
<td>$77,200,000</td>
<td>$77,200,000</td>
<td>$77,200,000</td>
<td>$69,200,000</td>
<td>$59,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Payment</td>
<td>$4,681,811</td>
<td>$6,790,648</td>
<td>$6,064,096</td>
<td>$5,165,987</td>
<td>$4,630,652</td>
<td>$3,994,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Option 3 (A and B) are the only alternatives that include additional outside funding, assuming a contribution from the navy for treatment and conveyance.
Additional Outside Funding Opportunities

- Other additional funding the City will attempt to obtain:
  - Grants
  - Low-interest Loans
- Additional low interest loans or grants will reduce the rate impacts even further

Project Cost of $70 million
Base Case Assumptions
Project Cost Comparison of $93.5 million

Summary of Required Single Family Monthly Sewer Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.88</td>
<td>$59.48</td>
<td>$68.41</td>
<td>$80.38</td>
<td>$96.45</td>
<td>$115.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Reduced the interest rate for the revenue bond from 6.00% to 4.75%.
Project Cost Comparison of $93.5 million With Reduced Interest Rate & Extended Term

Summary of Required Single Family Monthly Sewer Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2A</th>
<th>Option 2B</th>
<th>Option 3A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.88</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$59.48</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$66.41</td>
<td>$64.69</td>
<td>$64.69</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
<td>$76.04</td>
<td>$74.39</td>
<td>$74.39</td>
<td>$72.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
<td>$89.35</td>
<td>$85.55</td>
<td>$85.55</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
<td>$104.99</td>
<td>$98.38</td>
<td>$98.38</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Changed the interest rate for the revenue bond from 6.00% to 5.25%; and changed the length of the term from 20 years to 30 years.

Project Cost Comparison of $93.5 million With Reduced Interest Rate, Extended Term & Navy Contribution

Summary of Required Single Family Monthly Sewer Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2A</th>
<th>Option 2B</th>
<th>Option 3A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.88</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$59.48</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$66.41</td>
<td>$64.69</td>
<td>$64.69</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
<td>$76.04</td>
<td>$74.39</td>
<td>$74.39</td>
<td>$72.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
<td>$89.35</td>
<td>$85.55</td>
<td>$85.55</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
<td>$104.99</td>
<td>$98.38</td>
<td>$98.38</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Changed the interest rate for the revenue bond from 6.00% to 5.25%; changed the length of the term from 20 years to 30 years; assumes $8.0 million from Navy.
Project Cost Comparison of $93.5 million With Reduced Interest Rate, Extended Term & Navy Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2A</th>
<th>Option 2B</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.88</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$59.48</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$68.41</td>
<td>$66.13</td>
<td>$64.69</td>
<td>$63.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
<td>$80.38</td>
<td>$76.04</td>
<td>$74.39</td>
<td>$70.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
<td>$96.45</td>
<td>$89.55</td>
<td>$85.55</td>
<td>$77.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
<td>$115.74</td>
<td>$104.99</td>
<td>$98.38</td>
<td>$85.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Changed the interest rate for the revenue bond from 6.00% to 5.25%; changed the length of the term from 20 years to 30 years; assumes $17.5 million from Navy.

Summary of Review Funding Alternatives

- Original funding assumptions were conservative given the time frame (i.e., 5 years out).
- Revising long-term funding assumptions are based on conservative market information
  - Rates will change over the next three years
- Revised funding assumptions are reasonable estimates of available funding opportunities
- Additional low interest loans or grants can reduce the rate impact even further
- Revised assumptions allow the City to maintain the proposed rate transition plan even with increased project costs
How does risk factor into the decision?

Summary of Public Comment
Public Comments
Received at July 31st Open House

• 8 written comments received:
  – 1 not in favor of either site
    • Expressed desire for reuse in lieu of marine discharge
  – 3 in favor of Crescent Harbor North AS (or MBR)
    • Not in favor of WWTP near Windjammer Park
  – 3 in favor of Windjammer Vicinity MBR
    • Incorporate community benefits (e.g. museum)
  – 1 suggested evaluating Windjammer Vicinity layouts
    • Reduce cost of facility by not burying tanks beneath Bayshore Drive

Schedule
Schedule - Council Actions & Deadlines

Aug 14, 2012  Council resolution on proposed site for further planning and environmental review
Oct 16, 2012  Council resolution on proposed phasing plan
Dec 31, 2012  Required Facilities Plan submission to Washington Department of Ecology
Dec 31, 2014  Required engineering design submission to Washington Department of Ecology

Final Thoughts

• Alternatives are all technically viable
• Long-term alternative costs/rate impacts are similar
• Alternatives will all improve the environment
• What is the most sustainable alternative for Oak Harbor?
Questions?
Oak Harbor City Council Votes on Clean Water Facility Site
New information posted on website.

Oak Harbor, WA -- On August 14, 2012, the Oak Harbor City Council adopted a resolution directing the Clean Water Facilities Planning Team to develop planning and environmental documents for the City’s new wastewater treatment plant. Following an extensive two-year public process and engineering studies the Council voted unanimously to proceed with a new membrane bioreactor (MBR) facility located in the Windjammer Vicinity. The proposed $93.5 million dollar facility will meet the City’s long term future wastewater treatment needs and replace aging and failing infrastructure. The need to preserve and protect Windjammer Park was discussed extensively before the decision was reached. City Council members echoed a key recommendation made by a group of Oak Harbor citizens, rate payers, and property owners in June 2012: a new facility in the Windjammer Vicinity should not reduce the amount of open space that is currently accessible to the public. During the discussion, the planning team confirmed that it would be possible to design a facility following concepts brought forth by the community group in June.

Another key factor in the decision to locate the facility near Windjammer Park was the anticipated reduced long term operation and maintenance costs associated with conveying wastewater to an alternative site. During the August 14 special council meeting, annual costs to pump wastewater away from Windjammer Park and cleaned water back to Oak Harbor Bay, estimated at $170,000, were discussed by the Council and Mayor. Avoiding these additional costs became a key consideration in the final decision.

With selection of a final location a treatment process, the project design team will focus on finalizing documents that must be submitted for review and approval by State and Federal agencies.

An additional point made during the August 14 City Council meeting was the need for continued community involvement as the process moves forward. Several layouts and renderings of a new facility in the Windjammer Vicinity have been presented by the planning team over the past month. As these concepts are further developed, a high level of public input will be essential to successfully blend the new facility into an urban design that will provide the greatest benefit to the citizens of Oak Harbor. Opportunities for continued public involvement will be provided before planning documents are finalized at year-end, and will continue as the project transitions into the design process next year.

-###-
FROM: Cathy Rosen, Public Works Director

INITIALED AS APPROVED FOR SUBMITTAL TO THE COUNCIL BY:
Scott Dudley, Mayor
Larry Cort, Interim City Administrator
Doug Merriman, Finance Director
Grant Weed, Interim City Attorney, as to form

PURPOSE
This Agenda Bill requests the approval of Amendment No. 5 to the Agreement with Carollo Engineers for the preparation of a facilities plan necessary for the development of a new wastewater treatment facility for the City of Oak Harbor. The development of a new wastewater facility is identified as a necessary improvement in the City of Oak Harbor Wastewater Comprehensive System Plan and is needed due to the age and condition of the existing plants.

AUTHORITY
The authority to enter into agreements for improvements or use of real property is granted to the City of Oak Harbor under RCW 35A.11.020.

FISCAL IMPACT DESCRIPTION
Funds Required: $149,700

Appropriation Source: Wastewater Fund

SUMMARY STATEMENT
The City Council approved an agreement with Carollo Engineers for the development of a facilities plan for a new wastewater treatment plant on August 4, 2010. With Carollo's assistance, the City and its citizens engaged in a two year long process to evaluate potential sites and technologies for a new wastewater treatment plant, and on August 14, 2012, the City Council selected the Windjammer Vicinity as the site for a new MBR wastewater treatment plant.

The Windjammer Vicinity is more than 52 acres in area and additional site investigation is needed to assist the City in determining the best locations within this area to construct the wastewater treatment plant. It has been suggested that, as part of our site investigation, we also obtain information on some vacant property near Windjammer Park. Field exploration required to determine the best site within the Windjammer Vicinity is more detailed and site specific than the planning tasks included in the original scope of work with Carollo, therefore an amendment to Carollo's contract is warranted.
The information collected as a result of the proposed Contract Amendment No. 5 will provide the City with surface, subsurface and environmental information to help the City quantify risks prior to moving forward with purchasing property for the new wastewater treatment plant.

The scope of Contract Amendment No. 5 includes:

**Task 100 Project Management**
The scope of the project management task is being increased by the proposed contract amendment to include project management activities associated with the additional site investigation. In addition, the overall schedule will extend approximately four months beyond the anticipated duration of the authorized contract. The proposed Contract Amendment No. 5 will increase the amount of the project management task by $8,997 to reflect the additional scope and extended contract duration.

**Task 1000 Topographical Survey**
The survey will be broken out into 2 phases. An initial preliminary phase will collect preliminary information about the entire Windjammer Vicinity which will assist the City in selecting the final location for the wastewater treatment plant. The cost for this work will be billed at cost plus a 5% markup for subcontractors and will not exceed $25,000.

The second phase of the topographical survey will be completed upon authorization of the City once the final location for the treatment plant has been identified. This work will collect detailed topographic information of the selected site which will be adequate for preliminary design (30%) of the treatment plant. Costs for this second phase will be negotiated once a final site is selected, and will not exceed $37,700.

**Task 1100 Geotechnical Exploration**
This task will include geotechnical information sufficient to assist the City in selecting the final location for the wastewater treatment plant and for completion of preliminary (30%) design detail. Specific work includes:

- a review of existing information including geologic maps and previous geotechnical reports in the project vicinity;
- drilling of 10 geotechnical borings to evaluate subsurface conditions;
- an analysis and evaluation of pertinent physical and engineering characteristics of the foundation and subgrade soils;
- identification of seismic design considerations;
- development of recommendations for foundation design for the proposed structures;
- identification of lateral soil pressures and lateral resistance parameters for subsurface elements;
- development of recommendations for slab-on-grade support;
- development of recommendations for pavement subgrade support and design of pavement sections;
- development of drainage and dewatering considerations based on the groundwater conditions encountered or expected;
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- development of recommendation for earthwork including stripping depth, site preparation, use of on-site soils for structural fill, imported soils and compaction criteria;
- development of recommendations regarding temporary slopes and shoring for below-grade walls;
- archeological support during the geotechnical exploration of the site including:
  o assistance in developing the Area of Potential Effect (APE);
  o background research on the project and study area;
  o on-site monitoring and examination of the geotechnical samples collected during field exploration;
- attendance at up to two meetings with the City to discuss the results of explorations and preliminary recommendations.

The cost for this work will be billed at cost plus a 5% markup for subcontractors, and is estimated at $40,130. In addition to this amount, the proposed Contract Amendment No. 5 also includes a contingency amount of up to $15,225 (covering 2 additional days of drilling and/or test pit excavation) which would only be used upon authorization by the City for additional geotechnical work if it is deemed necessary by the City and Carollo.

Task 1200 Phase I ESA
This purpose of this task is to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to identify the recognized environmental condition (RECs) associated with the selected location in preparation for a future property acquisition. Specific tasks include:
- a review of existing records and databases;
- interviews (as necessary) with individuals who may have information regarding past and present uses of the property;
- a visual reconnaissance of the selected site and adjacent properties to identify visible evidence of RECs;
- observation of soil and groundwater conditions during geotechnical borings for potential contamination;
- preparation of a report summarizing the results of the Phase I ESA results and identified RECs along with recommendations regarding the potential for contamination by hazardous substances at the subject property and the significance of any data gaps identified.

The budget for this task is $13,454. Work will be authorized by the City once a final site has been selected.

Task 1300 Additional Site Technical/Cost Analysis
Carollo has included this task for the possible consideration of a property which is adjacent to the Windjammer Vicinity but was not included on the list of locations considered during the "Charette" discussion. Recently, City staff was approached by the owner of this property who has suggested that the City consider the property as a location for the wastewater treatment plant.
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If it is determined that it is in the City’s best interest to consider this property, we will conduct public outreach to the local neighborhood prior to starting any field investigation of the site. Carollo’s scope of work for this task will provide technical and cost analysis which can be used by the City to determine if the site is feasible as a location for the wastewater treatment plant and whether conducting a full triple bottom line plus technical (TBL+) analysis and public vetting process that was used to identify the Windjammer Vicinity as the proposed site for the new WWTP has value. Specific tasks included in this scope of work are:

- Evaluate site-specific layout differences associated with potentially locating a WWTP on the new site, including wastewater/treated effluent conveyance; geotechnical and groundwater issues identified through Task 1100; and other relevant technical considerations.
- Develop an opinion of probable construction cost for a WWTP located on the new site, and develop a comparative analysis showing how costs may be different for this facility.
- Summarize differences into a brief project memorandum. Develop presentation slides illustrating differences and present information to City staff and Council.

The cost for this task is $9,170.

The table below summarizes the costs for Amendment No. 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Authorization</th>
<th>Requires Written Authorization</th>
<th>Total Amendment No. 5 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 100</td>
<td>$8,997</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$37,720</td>
<td>$62,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1100</td>
<td>$40,134</td>
<td>$15,225</td>
<td>$55,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,454</td>
<td>$13,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1300</td>
<td>$9,170</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$83,301</td>
<td>$66,399</td>
<td>$149,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract amount:
If all of the tasks included in Amendment No. 5 are completed, the total authorized amount of the contract with Carollo Engineers will be $1,239,261.

Justification:
The work proposed under Contract Amendment No. 5 is necessary to assist the City in identifying the final location of the new wastewater treatment plant and to collect site-specific information necessary for preliminary (30%) design.

It is recommended that the City Council authorize the Mayor to sign Contract Amendment No. 5 with Carollo Engineers with a not to exceed limit of $149,700.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT
This item was discussed at the October 4, 2012 Public Works Standing Committee meeting and at the October 9, 2012 Government Services Standing Committee meeting.
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RECOMMENDED ACTION
A Council motion authorizing the Mayor to sign Contract Amendment No. 5 with Carollo Engineers for additional site investigation related to a new wastewater treatment plant.

ATTACHMENTS
Scope of Work
Consultant Agreement Amendment
Number 5

Original Agreement Title: Engineering
Services for City of Oak Harbor Wastewater
Treatment Plant Preliminary Engineering and
Facilities Plan

Organization and Address
City of Oak Harbor
865 SE Barrington Drive
Oak Harbor, WA 98239

Phone: 360-279-4522

Project Number: 8549A.00

Execution Date
9/16/10

Completion Date (Prior)
December 2012

Project Title: Preliminary Engineering and
Facilities Plan

New Maximum Amount Payable
$1,239,261

Description of Work: This phase of the work includes further characterization of the selected
site and surrounding properties to allow for final site selection and preliminary design (30%).

The City of Oak Harbor

desires to supplement the agreement entered into with Carollo Engineers
executed on 9/16/10 and identified as: Preliminary Engineering and Facilities Plan

All provisions in the basic agreement remain in effect except as expressly modified by this
supplement

The changes to the agreement are described as follows:

SCOPE OF WORK is hereby amended to add the following:
Please see the attached scope of work.

SCOPE OF WORK is hereby changed and supplemented with the following:
PROJECT COMPLETION DATE AMENDED TO: April 2014
TIME OF COMPLETION – SCOPE OF SERVICES:

PAYMENT shall be amended as follows:
If all tasks in Amendment 5 are completed, the maximum payable amount of $1,089,561 will be
increased by $149,700 to $1,239,261. Up to $88,301 is authorized initially. An additional
$66,399 may be authorized in writing by the City.

Payment shall be made in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the original
contract.

If you concur with this amendment and agree to the changes as stated above, please sign in the
appropriate spaces and return to this office for final action.

By: _____________________________  By: _____________________________
Consultant Signature  Approving Authority Signature

Date
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EXHIBIT B - SCOPE OF SERVICES
AMENDMENT NO. 5 – September 28, 2012

ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR CITY OF OAK HARBOR
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND FACILITIES PLAN

AMENDMENT 5 PURPOSE

The Windjammer Vicinity has been selected as the proposed site for a new wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) for the City of Oak Harbor (City). Additional site investigation is required before the City can acquire property and initiate design. Information collected as a result of this amendment will provide the City with surface, subsurface, and environmental information to help quantify risks prior to moving forward. Also, a new site near the Windjammer Vicinity is under consideration. Amendment 5 provides scope for necessary additional tasks including preliminary topographical and boundary surveys; geotechnical exploration; and technical/cost analysis of the new site. This amendment also includes a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and more detailed topographical/boundary surveys, to be conducted once the final site for the new WWTP has been selected.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

TASK 100 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT
The scope for Task 100 is increased to include project management activities support services outlined in this amendment, and to extend activities four (4) months beyond the anticipated duration of the authorized contract.

*The existing Task 100 contract limit has been increased by $8,997 to reflect the additional scope and extended contract duration.*

TASK 200 – PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING
No change to Task 200 Scope and Contract Limit.

TASK 300 – FINAL ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING
No changes to Task 300 Scope and Contract Limit.

TASK 400 – OUTFALL EVALUATION
No changes to Task 400 Scope and Contract Limit.

TASK 500 – REUSE OPPORTUNITIES
No changes to Task 500 Scope and Contract Limit.

TASK 600 – FACILITIES PLAN
No changes to Task 600 Scope and Contract Limit.
TASK 700 – ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND DOCUMENTATION
No changes to Task 700 Scope and Contract Limit.

TASK 800 – PUBLIC PROCESS SUPPORT
No changes to Task 800 Scope and Contract Limit.

TASK 900 – MANAGEMENT RESERVE
No changes to Task 900 Scope and Contract Limit.

TASK 1000 – SITE SURVEY AND MAPPING
The purpose of Task 1000 is to provide site survey and mapping data for the Windjammer Vicinity site. This task will be completed in two phases. During the initial phase, preliminary survey and mapping will be completed on approximately 58 acres as shown in Attachment 1 and generally described as: Island County Parcels S6565-00-00B02-0, S6565-00-00B18-0, S6565-00-00B34-2, S6565-00-00B05-0, S6565-00-00B13-1, S6565-00-00B17-0, S6565-00-00B06-0, S6565-00-00B20-0, S6565-00-00B21-0, S6565-00-00B14-0, S6565-00-00B09-0, S6565-00-00B22-0, R13202-106-0750; related adjacent parcels owned by the City of Oak Harbor; baseball fields; a lot north of existing Bayshore Drive; and a lot near the Windjammer Vicinity. Once a final site has been selected, a second phase will be completed to collect detailed topographical information on this site.

Subtask 1010 – Phase 1 Preliminary Survey
Survey activities will include:

- Establish legal property lines for all parcels included within the site outlined in Attachment 1:
  - Field locate and tie all existing property boundary corners.
  - Research property ownership records and identify any boundary encroachments, discrepancies, or easements that could affect acquisition of properties within the site, and delineate encroachments on boundary lines.

- Establish horizontal control:
  - Locate existing City of Oak Harbor control points.
  - Establish new horizontal control points as needed. Reference horizontal datum plan coordinates to Washington State Plan Coordinates (NAD 83/98). Mark new control with permanent brass cap monuments with labels as specified by the City.

- Establish vertical control:
  - Locate existing City of Oak Harbor control points.
  - Establish elevations on new horizontal control points. Reference vertical datum to NAVD-88.

- Provide a preliminary topographical survey of the site, including:
  - Attend a site walk through prior to starting field work.
  - Shoot up to 20 spot elevations at locations selected during the site walkthrough.
  - Coordinate with utility locating service to identify and paint on site all underground utilities. Delineate underground utilities as marked by a locating service.
  - Coordinate with geotechnical work on the site, and identify locations of borings marked by geotechnical subcontractor.
- Provide mapping of site based on AutoCAD 2009 (Version 9), with a scaled aerial photo overlay. Show contour lines based on existing LIDAR data.
- Provide final electronic files of survey points and descriptors.

Subtask 1020 – Phase 2 Detailed Survey

Survey activities will include:

- Establish legal property lines for up to three parcels included within the site outlined in Attachment 1 to be determined at a later date:
  - If corners are missing set new corners.
  - File Record of Survey in accordance with Washington State Survey Recording Act.
- Provide a topographical survey of a site to be determined (up to 10 acres in area), including:
  - Attend a site walk through prior to starting field work.
  - Spot elevations and cross sections as needed to generate accurate contours at one (1) foot delineation.
  - Delineate major physical features of the site including but not limited to edges of pavement, curb lines, sidewalks, building corners, top/bottom of ditches, trees, signs, etc.
  - Coordinate with utility locating service to identify and paint on site all underground utilities. Delineate underground utilities as marked by a locating service.
  - Provide mapping of site based on AutoCAD 2009 (Version 9) showing topographical detail, spot elevations, and one (1) foot contour lines.
  - Provide final electronic files of survey points and descriptors.

Task 1000 Assumptions:

1. Field work does not include potholing for utilities.
2. Title reports and survey recording fees will be provided by the City.
3. Field survey will include as much of the site as can be surveyed at low tide. Soundings of Oak Harbor Bay are not included.
4. Survey deliverables will be stamped and signed by a Professional Surveyor licensed by the State of Washington.

Task 1000 Deliverables:

1. New survey control field monuments as defined above.
2. Original topographic survey map (24" by 36") and electronic files, as defined above for Phase 1 and Phase 2 surveys.
3. Record of Survey filed with auditor and electronic files.

Task 1000 is a new task with a budget of $62,720. Subtask 1010 is authorized with a budget of $25,000. Subtask 1020 may be authorized by the City at a later date, with a budget of up to $37,720.
TASK 1100 – GEOTECHNICAL EXPLORATION

The purpose of Task 1100 is to determine soil and groundwater conditions at the site at a level of detail that is sufficient enough to provide geotechnical engineering recommendations for preliminary design. As defined below, the scope of services for Task 1100 includes:

Subtask 1110 – Geotechnical Exploration

Complete the following services to provide geotechnical information sufficient for preliminary (approximately 30 percent) level of design detail:

- Review existing information including geologic maps and previous geotechnical reports in the project vicinity. Conduct an initial site visit to evaluate surface conditions and coordinate with the design team to develop a suitable exploration program.

- Locate borings in the field and call the state “dial-before-you-dig” contractor number to clear utility locations prior to the explorations, and/or coordinate a private utility locating service to ensure buried utilities are identified prior to digging.

- Drill ten (10) geotechnical borings located around the site as determined by the City and ENGINEER to evaluate subsurface conditions:
  - Provide a licensed geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist on a full-time basis during field exploration to obtain samples of the various soils encountered, classify the materials, and maintain a detailed log of the exploration.
  - Seal and return collected soil samples to a laboratory for additional examination and laboratory testing, as required.
  - Install a 2-inch diameter open standpipe piezometer (monitoring well) inside of two (2) of the boreholes for groundwater monitoring.

- Conduct analysis and evaluation of pertinent physical and engineering characteristics of the foundation and subgrade soils based on laboratory tests performed on samples obtained from the explorations. Laboratory testing will include determination of soil moisture content, Atterberg limits, and grain size distribution as applicable to the soils encountered.

- Provide seismic design considerations based on the 2009 or 2012 International Building Code (IBC).

- Develop recommendations for foundation design for the proposed structures. Include discussion of ground improvement techniques and/or pile support of structures as appropriate depending on soil conditions encountered, foundation loads and settlement tolerances of the proposed structures.

- Provide lateral soil pressures and lateral resistance parameters for subsurface elements.

- Provide recommendations for slab-on-grade support.

- Provide recommendations for pavement subgrade support and design sections for parking and driveway areas.

- Provide drainage considerations based on the groundwater conditions encountered or expected and provide dewatering considerations.
- Provide recommendations for earthwork including stripping depth, site preparation, use of on-site soils for structural fill, imported soils and compaction criteria for foundation support.

- Provide conclusions regarding temporary slopes to construct below-grade walls and temporary shoring recommendations, if required.

- Attend up to two (2) meetings in Oak Harbor to discuss results of explorations and preliminary recommendations.

**Subtask 1120 Additional Exploration As Authorized**

Subtask 1120 provides budget for additional site exploration as deemed necessary and authorized by the City and ENGINEER. Budget is provided for two additional days of drilling and one day of test pits with a subcontracted drill rig and excavator.

**Subtask 1130 Archaeological Support**

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), SEPA and Executive Order 05-05 requires agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties and to consult with others in carrying out historic preservation activities. Washington State also has a series of RCWs and the Associated WACs that regulate work in and around a range of cultural resources including human remains. The purpose of Subtask 1130 is to provide archaeological support during the geotechnical exploration of the site, in accordance with these regulations, including:

- Assist in developing the Area of Potential Effect (APE).

- Conduct background research on project and study area.

- Provide on-site monitoring and examination of geotechnical samples collected during field exploration.

**Task 1100 Assumptions:**

1. No special permits are required to complete the scope outlined herein.

2. City will coordinate with existing property owners and provide written permission to access site prior to authorizing work.

3. The site consists of multiple properties including: a car sales and maintenance facility; part of the existing Windjammer Park; and several parking lots. City and ENGINEER will coordinate with Geotechnical Engineer in selecting locations for field exploration during a site visit.

4. Drill cuttings will be disposed on site. Concrete surfacing will be cored in advance of the borings with a concrete corer.

5. Geotechnical Engineer's site visit will serve as the reconnaissance for the Phase I ESA (Task 1200).

6. The cost of filed exploration depends on the number of days of drilling. The budget for Task 1100 assumes two (2) days of drilling. The program may be adjusted within these
two days to complete a number and depth of borings to allow for reasonable
characterization of the site.

7. The cost of field exploration depends on the total depth of drilling. The budget for Task
1100 assumes: one (1) boring of approximately 50 feet below ground surface (bgs); two
(2) borings to approximately 20 feet bgs; seven borings of approximately 20 to 30 feet bgs.
Additional exploration budget may be used as authorized by City and ENGINEER, if
required by field conditions.

8. Piezometers installed during field exploration may be used for future pump or slug testing.
These tests are not included in this scope.

Subtask 1130 scope specifically does not include

- A phase one field investigation that includes subsurface testing in the project area;

- Costs associated with completing Historic Property Inventory Forms (HPIFs) for any
buildings older than 50 years;

- Costs associated with developing additional plans, protocols, or permits should they be
required for this project;

- Costs associated with encountering human remains or other archaeological findings that
may be encountered during the field testing.

**Task 1100 Deliverables:**

1. Draft and Final Preliminary Geotechnical Report (electronic .PDF version) summarizing
field work and including conclusions and recommendations for preliminary design.

2. Exploration logs, a site plan, cross sections of the subsurface profile and any supporting
test data.

3. A brief project memorandum describing archaeological conditions encountered at the site
in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA.

*Task 1100 is a new task with a budget of $55,359. Subtasks 1110 and 1130 are authorized with a
budget of $40,134. Subtask 1120 may be authorized by the City at a later date, with a budget of
up to $15,225.*

**TASK 1200 – PHASE 1 ESA**

The purpose of Task 1200 is to conduct a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to
identify the recognized environmental condition (REC) associated with the site in preparation for a
future property acquisition. The Phase 1 ESA will be conducted in general accordance with ASTM
International (ASTM) Standard E 1527-05 for Phase I ESAs and the U.S. Environmental
Appropriate Inquiries (AAI)."
Complete the services described below, or under the direction of, an environmental professional as described in 40 CFR Part 312:

- Review readily available geotechnical reports, environmental reports and/or other relevant documents pertaining to environmental conditions at the subject property.

- Review the results of a federal, state, and local environmental database search provided by an outside environmental data service (EDR) for listings of properties with known or suspected environmental concerns on or near the subject property within the search distances specified by ASTM. The database and file review search will include a check for and review of publications or reports on EPA and Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and other state agency websites concerning area-wide soil and groundwater contamination on or adjacent to the subject property. The EDR report will include a search for environmental liens for each parcel comprising the subject property.

- Review regulatory agency files regarding listed properties of potential environmental concern relative to the subject property.

- Identify a key site manager with specific knowledge of past and present property use and request that the key site manager meet on site for an interview during the visual site reconnaissance and/or an interview by telephone if he or she is not available during the site reconnaissance. Identify and interview others familiar with the use and history of the subject property, as available and appropriate, including representatives of current occupants that likely use, store, treat, handle or dispose of hazardous substances now or in the past.

- Interview current owners or occupants of neighboring properties only as necessary to gather information or fill site property use data gaps regarding the subject property or if the subject property is abandoned and no owner or occupant interviews can be conducted.

- Interview past owners and occupants of the subject property as necessary to gather information or fill property use data gaps regarding property use history.

- Interview a representative of the local fire department, health department, police department, planning department, and/or Ecology as necessary to gather information or fill data gaps regarding the history of the subject property and surrounding properties relative to the likely presence of hazardous substances.

- Review historical aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, building department records, city directories, chain-of-title reports, and land use and tax assessor records, as available and appropriate, to identify past development history on and adjacent to the subject property relative to the possible use, generation, storage, release or disposal of hazardous substances. Attempt to identify uses of the subject property from the present back to the time that records show no apparent structures on the property, back to the time that the property was first used for residential, agricultural, commercial, industrial or governmental purposes, or back to 1940, whichever is earliest.

- Review current United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps to identify the physiographic setting of the subject property and provide a statement on the local geologic, soil and groundwater conditions based on our general experience and sources such as geologic maps and soil surveys.
• Conduct a visual reconnaissance of the subject property and adjacent properties to identify visible evidence of RECs.

• Identify the source(s) of potable water for the subject property and current heating and sewage disposal system(s) used at the subject property, if any, and their age if readily available.

• Identify data gaps relative to the Phase I ESA study findings.

• Provide a report with a summary of the Phase I ESA results and identified RECs along with a recommendations regarding the potential for contamination by hazardous substances at the subject property and the significance of any data gaps identified.

• Observe the soil and groundwater conditions for potential contamination during completion of the borings.

Task 1200 Assumptions:

1. The City will complete a brief questionnaire in support of Task 1200 work.

2. The City will provide the names and phone numbers of key individuals with knowledge of the use history of the subject property.

3. If available, the City to provide copies of the following:
   - Any past ESA and/or audit reports;
   - Environmental permits;
   - Registrations for underground and aboveground storage tanks;
   - Material data safety sheets for hazardous substances used or stored on the subject property (if any);
   - Community right-to-know plans pertaining to the subject property; 6) safety plans pertaining to on-site facilities;
   - Reports regarding geotechnical and/or hydrogeologic conditions;
   - Notices of environmental violations and/or environmental liens or property use restrictions;
   - Specialized knowledge or experience and commonly known information of which you are aware regarding the subject property and related environmental conditions; and
   - Explanation for any significant difference between purchase price and market value, if the subject property is not known to be contaminated.

4. Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC) are defined in ASTM E 1527-05 as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater or surface water of the property. The term includes hazardous substances or petroleum products even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term is not intended to include de minimis conditions that generally do not present a material risk of harm to public health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies."
5. The following are specifically not included in Task 1200:
   - Soil, surface water or groundwater sampling and chemical analysis;
   - An environmental compliance audit or an evaluation for the presence of lead-based
     paint, toxic mold, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in light ballasts, radon, lead in
     drinking water, asbestos-containing building materials or urea-formaldehyde insulation
     in on-site structures or debris or other potentially hazardous building materials;
   - An assessment of vapor intrusion into structures on the property per ASTM Standard E
     2500-08.

**Task 1200 Deliverables:**

1. Phase 1 ESA summary report.

**Task 1200 is a new task with a budget of $13,454. Written authorization from the City is required prior to completing this task.**

**TASK 1300 – ADDITIONAL SITE TECHNICAL/COST ANALYSIS**

The purpose of Task 1300 is to conduct additional technical and cost analysis for a potential new site near the Windjammer Vicinity. Technical and cost information developed under Task 1300 will be used to determine the benefits of conducting a full triple bottom line plus technical (TBL+) analysis of the site, according to the criteria and process used to identify the Windjammer Vicinity as the proposed site for a new WWTP. Services for Task 1300 include:

- Evaluate site-specific layout differences associated with potentially locating a WWTP on property near the Windjammer Vicinity. Include wastewater/treated effluent conveyance; geotechnical and groundwater issues identified through Task 1100; and other relevant technical considerations.

- Develop an opinion of probable construction cost for a WWTP located property near the Windjammer Vicinity. Develop a comparative analysis showing how costs may be different for a facility located on this site (versus a facility located on the site proposed through the charrette process).

- Summarize differences into a brief project memorandum. Develop presentation slides illustrating differences in cost and layout. Present information to City Staff and City Council.

**Task 1300 Assumptions:** None.

**Task 1300 Deliverables:**


2. City Council presentation slides and information.

**Task 1300 is a new task with a budget of $9,170.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milepost</th>
<th>State Road</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Design Year</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road A</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>03/01</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>R-123</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>State Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road B</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>04/02</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>R-124</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Federal Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road C</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>05/03</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>R-125</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>State Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road D</td>
<td>027</td>
<td>06/04</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>R-126</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Federal Aid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Length is measured in miles, and Type indicates the nature of the work.
Tonight’s Agenda/Objectives

1. Review scope and purpose of Amendment 5
2. Present results of field work completed through Amendment 5
   – Topographical Survey
   – Environmental Assessment
   – Geotechnical Borings
3. Summarize estimated cost impacts
4. Gain direction from Council on next steps:
   – Resolution 12-33: Complete Facilities Plan for Windjammer Vicinity as defined by Resolution 12-17
   – Resolution 12-34: Expand Windjammer Vicinity to include adjacent property and complete Facilities Plan
Resolution 12-17 (August 14, 2012)

• Proceed with Facilities Plan based on Windjammer Vicinity
• Minimize space impacts on Windjammer Park to the extent possible
• Continue public process:
  – Define the best location within the Windjammer Vicinity
  – Define layout and other desirable features based on the final location

Amendment 5 Scope and Purpose

• Technical detail to help select the best location (3 to 4 acres) for the new WWTP
• Field work including:
  – Phase 1 topographical survey to establish elevations and flood protection requirements
  – Environmental assessment to better define permitting and wetland mitigation requirements
  – Geotechnical borings to characterize soils, better estimated design requirements and cost
October 16, 2012 City Council Direction

- Include adjacent property (Freund property) in scope of Amendment 5

**Does Freund property provide technical/cost advantages relative to Windjammer Vicinity?**

Amendment 5 Current Status

- Phase 1 survey work complete (Attachment 1)
- Environmental assessment completed based on October 30, 2012 site visit (Attachment 2)
- Geotechnical borings completed on October 30 and 31 (Attachment 3)
- Additional engineering analysis completed to compare three sites
  - Windjammer Vicinity (Charrette)
  - Freund
  - Windjammer Vicinity (Alternate)
Field Work Summary
Phase 1 Topographical Survey

100-Year Floodplain (El 12.5 NAVD 88)
Regulations for Floodplain Development

• Orange Book (Criteria for Sewage Works Design, '08)
  – G2-1.5.2 Flood Protection: Locate unit processes above the 100-year flood/wave action or adequately protect from 100-year flood/wave action
• Oak Harbor Municipal Code 17.20
  – 17.20.190(2) Nonresidential Construction: Locate construction above the base flood elevation or floodproof structure to 1 ft above base flood elevation
  – 17.20.190(3) Critical Facilities:
    • Construction permissible if no feasible alternative
    • Lowest floor > 3 feet above base flood elevation

Summary of Flood Protection Requirements

• Portions (or all) of sites being considered lie within 100-year flood plain (12.5 NAVD 88)
  – Recommend elevating grade and/or structures to 13.5
  – Additional protection for “critical facilities” (e.g. electrical)
• Southern portions of Windjammer Vicinity sites must be elevated approximately 3 feet
  – Retaining wall or sloped fill
• Existing grade at Freund property is an average of ~6.5 feet below 100-year flood elevation
  – Retaining wall/levee
  – Fill site
  – New/improved access to site is needed
• 100-year flood elevation [+12.5] more conservative than Mean Higher High Water (MHHW) + sea level rise [approx. + 11.3]
Summary of Environmental Assessment

• Wetland ditches at both Windjammer (Charrette) and Freund sites
• Federal, state, Oak Harbor permit approvals required for wetland fill/buffer impacts
• Windjammer (Charrette) Site
  – Wetland ditch along southern boundary may be filled as result of project
  – Mitigation costs estimated between $150,000 and $275,000
  – Risk of delays and/or cost increases relatively low (limited tidal water connection)
• Freund Site
  – Wetland ditches along boundaries would be filled as result of project
  – Site adjacent to mitigation wetland; portion may be filled for access
  – Mitigation costs estimated from $400,000 to $800,000
  – Risk of delays and/or cost increases relatively high (tidal water connection; impact to previous mitigation wetland)
Field Work Summary
Geotechnical Assessment

Geotechnical Boring Site Plan
Geotechnical Cross Sections

Geotechnical Cross Sections
Summary of Geotechnical Assessment

- Ground improvements needed at all sites
- Dewatering, shoring, and flood protection will also impact cost
- Sites to north, west and center of Windjammer Vicinity are preferred
  - Highest ground elevation
  - Shallowest to till (25 to 30 feet)
- Park site: deeper to till; additional flood control
- Freund, east sites most difficult/costly
  - Lowest ground elevation
  - Deepest to till (40+ feet)

Cost Comparison
Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Plan View (August 14, 2012)

Windjammer Charrette Concept
Conceptual Site Section View (August 14, 2012)
Total Project Cost Components
Windjammer (Charrette) Layout

Estimated Cost (Millions)

$2.9
$7.6
$83.0 (Total)

Windjammer (Charrette)

Estimate of Cost

Outfall
WW Conveyance
WWTP

WWTP Project Cost Components
Windjammer (Charrette) Layout

Estimated Cost (Millions)

$2.1
$15.0
$68.0 (Construction + Land)

Windjammer (Charrette)

Estimated Cost (Millions)

Soft Costs (25%)
Land Acquisition
WWTP Construction
Approximately 17% of WWTP Costs are “Variable” Based on Site

Sitework is Largest Variable Cost Component
Sitework Cost Elements
Windjammer (Charrette) Layout

- Estimated Cost (Millions):
  - Allowance (Wetlands Mitigation): $3.0
  - Allowance (Flood Protection): $4.0
  - Allowance (Stormwater Mgmt.): $5.0
  - Allowance (Clear/Demo): $6.0
  - Base Sitework Estimate: $7.0

$5.2 Sitework
$1.2 Site Allowances

Property Adjacent to Windjammer Vicinity
Conceptual Plan View

Conceptual Facility Layout
Property Adjacent to Windjammer Vicinity
Conceptual Site Section View

Offsetting Costs for Alternate (Freund) Property Relative to Windjammer (Charrette) Layout

**Lower Cost**
- Property acquisition (Assessed value)
- Demolition/clearing
- Aeration basin structure

**Higher Costs**
- Wastewater/effluent conveyance
- Geotechnical
- Sitework
  - Flood Protection
  - Wetland Mitigation
Sitework Cost Element Comparison
Windjammer (Charrette) & Freund Layouts

Windjammer (Charrette) Freund

Allowances increase due to Flood Protection and Wetlands Mitigation

- Allowance (Wetlands Mitigation)
- Allowance (Flood Protection)
- Allowance (Stormwater Mgmt.)
- Allowance (Clear/Demo)
- Base Sitework Estimate

Estimated Cost (Millions)

Windjammer Alternate Concept
Conceptual Plan and Perspective View (8/14/12)
Lower Costs for Windjammer (Alternate) Layout Relative to Windjammer (Charrette) Layout

**Same Cost**
- Property acquisition (Assessed value)
- Demolition/clearing
- Wastewater/effluent conveyance

**Lower Costs**
- Aeration basin structure
- Geotechnical
- Sitework
  - Flood Control
  - Wetland Mitigation

---

**Sitework Cost Element Comparison**
**Windjammer (Charrette) & Windjammer (Alternate)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowance</th>
<th>Base Sitework Estimate</th>
<th>Allowance (Wetlands Mitigation)</th>
<th>Allowance (Flood Protection)</th>
<th>Allowance (Stormwater Mgmt.)</th>
<th>Allowance (Clear/Demo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer (Charrette)</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freund</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windjammer (Alternate)</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allowances decrease due to Flood Protection and Wetlands Mitigation
“Variable” Cost Comparison for All Sites

Estimated Costs Shown in Millions ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Windjammer (Charrette)</th>
<th>Freund</th>
<th>Windjammer (Alternate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Premium</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Structural</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Premium</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater/Effluent Piping</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Sitework (Fixed)</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing &amp; Demolition Allowance</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Allowance</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Protection Allowance</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands Mitigation Allowance</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Sitework</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Specific Items</td>
<td>$11.7</td>
<td>$11.3</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Cost Comparison for All Sites

Summary of Technical & Cost Differences
Summary and Conclusions

1. Based on assessed value Freund site will likely be less costly to acquire
2. Based on technical field work, Freund site will likely have higher construction cost
   - Wastewater/effluent Conveyance
   - Geotechnical
   - Flood Protection
   - Wetland Mitigation
3. Very little difference in overall cost between sites
4. Means to reduce the cost of “variable” components will be considered regardless of tonight’s decision
5. Freund site presents higher risk due to environmental permitting and regulations for filling within the flood plain

Next Steps
## Paths Forward Based on Tonight's Decision

### Retain Windjammer Vicinity

**Resolution 12-33**

1. Complete draft technical chapters of Facilities Plan
2. Develop phasing/financing plan
3. Final Public Open House/Council Workshop (Early 2013)
4. Council resolution to submit draft plan (Q1, 2013)
5. Complete environmental documents for approval
6. Begin Preliminary Design
   - Final location & layout of WWTP with community input
   - Equipment procurement

### Expand Windjammer Vicinity (Freund)

**Resolution 12-34**

1. Amendment 6: Collect community input; compare locations using TBL+
2. Select final location/layout for WWTP with public input (Q1, 2013)
3. Complete draft technical chapters of Facilities Plan
4. Develop phasing/financing plan
5. Final Public Open House/Council Workshop (Q2, 2013)
6. Council resolution to submit draft plan (Q2, 2013)
7. Complete environmental documents for approval
8. Begin Preliminary Design
   - Final layout of WWTP with community input
   - Equipment procurement

---

### Questions?
From: Eric Johnston [mailto:ejohnston@oakharbor.org]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 7:12 AM
To: Brian Matson
Subject: FW: Waste Water Treatment facility public comment

Dear Sir,

As an owner of a "major" project/construction management company I hope you select Windjammer Park. Dump the "enhanced RV facility," "community room and amphitheater," the "Wow" gateway, all of which negate your proposed "architecture adds," and community "extras." Please consider these are tough times for the citizens and not good timing for a "good times project." Your graph emphasizing how much more we will pay is unconscionable but I applaud you for at least telling the people what's in store.

Sincerely,
Rudy Dukich
I prefer Crescent Harbor North. Don't mess up Windjammer Park. It's a downtown gem. Thanks for asking.

Don Torcesso

---

I believe the treatment plant would be best at Windjammer Park. It would save money and have less negative impact. Pumping long distances causes problems and can have lots of problems. If electricity is

More information at http://www.oakharborcleanwater.org
30 Aug 2012 PM 1
Everts WA 98250

Windjammer Park, recently named "Crescent Harbor North," was donated for the use of a park only. No need to take any of it for treatment facility. Thank you, Bob & Doris Craig.
February 22, 2012

To: Mayor Scott Dudley
From: Emory Bridgeford

Subj: Waste Water Site Proposals

Honorable Mayor,

I am writing to make comment about your proposal of the private property site consideration along W. Crescent Harbor Rd. My wife and I own 7.2 acres, and Susan E. Bridgeford owns 9.3 acres in the area you are considering. I apologize that neither of us were able to attend the meeting on February 7, 2012, however, we would like to offer our comments in a letter at this time.

We understand that this event was solely for the purpose of putting another viable option on the table at this time. We also understand that no decisions, or steps have been taken to move forward in the area at this time. We do want to let you know that it would make good sense to put the waste water plant on or near our property. It meets the two critical criteria for location, i.e. it is in the urban growth area and not in a residential area.

It is my opinion that while initial costs are higher to place the treatment plant there, in the long run the City benefits outweigh the costs. The area provides the room to put in all three phases of waste treatment that were discussed in the meeting. The area gives developers on the east side easier access to the system, allowing for more development and a stronger tax base for the city. The area is a natural tie point for the Navy waste water system, thus creating more income to the city utilities district, and allows for returning crescent harbor to its natural habitat for fishing industries.

Two of the City’s largest building projects during my time here in Oak Harbor, have been the Fire Station and City Shops. Both were built with the idea to have service life beyond 25 years and to have room for expansion at a reasonable cost in the future. I believe that the City would be well off to consider the same principles for the waste water treatment plant and this site would definitely allow you the ability to accomplish that feat.

Thank you for your time and your efforts as you move forward with this major project for the City of Oak Harbor.

Respectfully,

Emory W. Bridgeford, Jr.  
Susan E. Bridgeford
Dear Planning Committee,

When you discuss the Waste Water Treatment Plant and its location, please consider the amount of property that will be taken from City Beach Park (if you are thinking of the park as a location).

Think about more property taken from the park if Bayshore Drive is going to be completed/connected. These two additions will take away too much property. The part is the greatest thing we have. Do your best!

Thank you for your attention.

Kathy Harbous
July 16, 2012

City of Oak Harbor
Mayor & Council
865 SE Barrington Dr
Oak Harbor, WA 98277
Fax: 360-297-4507

With today's hydraulic technology there is no need to place a sewer plant on our waterfront. It didn't work in Bellingham.

You can smell the Bellingham plant up to ½ mile away on many days depending on wind. Oak Harbor should consider a site north or down wind from the city on city property or other locations.

Sincerely,

Joel Douglas
Summary of comments received on 4/11 at open house.

Comment cards were typed for clarity however no attempt was made to correct spelling or otherwise alter the comment. Original scans of the comments are attached.

**What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?**

Please put the sewer plant at the Crescent harbor site because I do not want the sewer plant on the waterfront. The waterfront is a big part of the beauty of the area. Boating, fishing, beaches etc. for employment tourists and Oak Harbor res. Employment

**What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?**

Yes, please at Oak Harbor North.

**What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?**

Not on the water please.

**What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?**

The only one I am concerned with is the Fleet Reserve Assn. Why would the City of Oak Harbor try to interrupt a service organization that does tons of charitable work? I + numerous other people find it appalling.

**What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?**

This is the best idea so far, far away from everything.

**What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?**

Far away from Downtown, we need more traffic problems like we need another hole in the head!

**What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?**

I think the 3 sites originally proposed were the best and I think windjammer park is the best site.

**What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?**

A waste of money and time

**What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?**

We’ve already spent $10’s of thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours of community, government and professional time to come up with the 3 sites on the short list. The best site is Windjammer. Quick jerking us around and get on with it. Built the best system and building at Windjammer.
What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

1) You did not advertise this meeting
2) The cost to drain the Bridgeford property would eat up your 30% override
3) The 6th site has been short notice- how could you have done the same due diligent as the other sites in that time?

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

If windjammer is the lowest cost and can be made the safest + cleanest + incorporated to the park pleasing environment- at the lowest cost why is not it the best- most cost efficient way to go?
Tell us about yourself:

☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

The only one I am concerned with is the Fleet Reserve Assn. Why would the City of Oak Harbor try to disrupt a service organization that does tons of charitable work? I and numerous other people find it appalling.

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

This is the best idea so far, far away from everything

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

Far away from downtown, we need more traffic problems like we need another hole in the head!

---

Tell us about yourself:

☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

Vern Peterson

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

I think the 3 sides originally proposed were the best and I think Windjammer Park is the best site.

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

A waste of money and time.

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

We've already spent 40's of thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours of community, government, and professional time on the short list. The best site is Windjammer. Quick jerking us around and get on with it! Built the best system and building at Windjammer.
Tell us about yourself:

☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☒ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

Please put the sewer plant at the Crescent Harbor site, because we do not want the sewer plant on the water grant. The water effluent will be a big part of the beauty of the bay. Beaches, fishing, beaches etc. for employment.

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

Yes, please.

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

Not on the water, please.

Tell us about yourself:

☐ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)

What are your thoughts about the short listed sites?

1. We did not advertise this meeting.
2. The cost to drain the Bridgewood property would eat up your 30% override.
3. The sixth site has been short notice — how could you have done

What are your thoughts about the added sixth site (the Crescent Harbor North site)?

The same due diligent site. The other site is the same site.

What considerations are important to you in choosing a new treatment facility site?

The safest and cleanest incorporated in the park, pleasing environment at the lowest cost.
Please add this to the list of public record on the project.

From: Eric Johnston [mailto:ejohnston@oakharbor.org]  
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 2:36 PM  
To: Brian Matson  
Subject: FW: City of Oak Harbor potential treatment facility  

Fyi

Eric J.

From: Eric Johnston  
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2011 4:57 PM  
To: George Anne Sherry  
Subject: RE: City of Oak Harbor potential treatment facility

Thanks for taking the time to look into the project. We will incorporate your input into the record for consideration.

You are correct that City utility customers will see an increase in rates to pay for the improvements. The City Council has already taken action on increasing rates gradually to help fund this very expensive project. You can get information about the rate increases over the next several years (water, sewer, storm drain etc) at this link.


You can also get there from the project website under the frequently asked questions section.

There is still a tremendous amount of work on this project but please be assured that a significant amount of effort is being put into the due diligence side of the planning. We are looking at issues ranging from environmental impacts, archaeology, geotechnical issues, shoreline, shellfish impacts, carbon footprint, long term maintenance etc in making the decision on a preferred site. At this level and in trying to compare sites the examination is at a fairly high level but is adequate to compare the risks of each site with the others.

Hope that is of use and again I really appreciate your input.

Please let me know if you have any questions or suggestions.

Eric J.
To: Eric Johnston  
Subject: City of Oak Harbor potential treatment facility  

Good Afternoon Eric,

I will not be able to attend the forum tonight but did want to comment on the current proposal. First, I want to thank you that the previous considered area of ‘Beach Drive Farm (Fakkema) Family’ land is no longer in consideration.

To the three proposed sites:

1. Crescent Harbor and Windjammer Park……..the biggest question I would have relates to requirements that DOE might have and/or any HPA requirements from DFW due to the close proximity to the water. If there are extensive requirements they may add costs not anticipated. There always seems to be a ‘surprise’ once a project has begun. And, with all the challenges the city is currently facing with the archeological challenges on Pioneer Way, I can only guess there would also be that type of consideration for the Crescent Harbor area. In today’s economic climate and the budget challenges we are all facing (private and public) I would believe the last thing that government would want to do is add more financial burden to the taxpayer. In my opinion these two sites would not be financially viable.

2. Old City Shops – Using a site that has already been developed for city use may be a little more cost effective. Depending on the past use of the city shop area there may be some cleanup requirements imposed by DOE but perhaps not as severe as what may be imposed by DOE or DFW for construction in and around a shoreline. I am not sure how big an area would be needed but would think that no new impervious surfaces would be created and drainage would already be in place. In my opinion use of the old city shops would be a much use of existing resources – both financially and structurally.

As it is apparent that all the residents of the City of Oak Harbor will be assessed additional charge in some form to assist in the payment of this upgrade it is hoped that the City of Oak Harbor is extremely prudent in examining all potential costs and even considering those costs that have not yet been uncovered. It would also be hoped that once the cost of the upgraded facility has been paid for that the extra assessment could be removed from our utility bills.

Thank you for taking the time to read and add this to the public comment record

Sincerely,

George Anne Sherry

490 SE Pasek St.
Oak Harbor  WA  98277
360 279 0260
Another for the record.

From: Eric Johnston [mailto:ejohnston@oakharbor.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2011 01:38 PM
To: Brian Matson
Subject: FW: waste water facility

fyi

Eric J.

From: Eric Johnston
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2011 1:23 PM
To: [name]
Subject: RE: waste water facility

Ms. Brown,

Thanks for taking the time to think about and comment on the process. It is never too late to provide input and in fact your comments are very timely as the City is still in the middle of the process of narrowing site selection. We are still several months away from a council decision on a preferred site. I would encourage you to keep track of our progress from the project website at www.oakharborcleanwater.org

Thanks.

Eric J.

From: Virginia B Brown
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2011 11:38 AM
To: Eric Johnston
Subject: waste water facility
I am very late on weighing in on this project but here it is. My husband and I live in Coupeville but own 20 rental units in Oak Harbor so I feel justified in voicing an opinion. I will not say what I feel is best but only what is not best. Please do not put a new treatment facility by Windjammer Park. Why would anyone put a smelly, unpleasant facility next to the crown gem of the city? People come from everywhere to enjoy the park, picnic and play ball. Why on earth would this happen? Money. Please do what is best for the city not just the budget.

Virginia B. Brown
Anne Conklin

From: Eric Johnston [ejohnston@oakharbor.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 5:55 PM
To: Brian Matson
Cc: Anne Conklin; Angela Braunstein
Subject: FW: Wastewater treatment facility

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please add to the list....

From: Ginny Weeks [mailto:ginn68@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 5:47 PM
To: Eric Johnston
Subject: Wastewater treatment facility

Mr. Johnston, I have read the pros and cons posted in the WNT regarding which wastewater treatment facility Oak Harbor should select, and my first and foremost comment is, "Why is there any contest at all?" ---

It is bad enough that an existing treatment facility of some kind is on or near the beach downtown without adding another one. The stench and mess that the existing facility creates is enough. Not one of the positives listed in the WNT contributes any benefit to the original purpose for which it would be built, and the "WOW ARCHITECTURAL AS A GATEWAY TO THE PARK" is ludicrous at best. I can just see the rush of tourists and locals to Oak Harbor's Windjammer Park so they can "oooh and aaahh" at the beauty of our wastewater treatment facility. Whooppee... Let's make a reservation right away! We don't miss out on that spectacular! ...... Further, considering the mess the downtown archeological finds created and the huge sums of money it will finally cost the city, to even consider the possibilities of another, even potential archeological find should be enough to scare planning or building near it far, far away.

The list could go on but I think you get my meaning. There is no contest between the two potential locations. Buying acreage in today's real estate market isn't such a bad thing, **IF we have any money to do it with**, which I doubt. Put that sucker on the Crescent Harbor acreage where it can be hidden from view as a treatment facility should be and use the remaining land for other city uses as we can afford to and/or need to. The fact that Windjammer is even a consideration is a joke....

Enough foolish spending is enough...

Ginny Weeks
Dear sir

As an owner of a "major" project/construction management company I hope you select Windjammer Park. Dump the "enhanced RV facility," "community room and amphitheater," the "Wow" gateway, all of which negate your proposed "architecture adds," and community "extras." Please consider these are tough times for the citizens and not good timing for a "good times project." Your graph emphasizing how much more we will pay is unconscionable but I applaud you for at least telling the people what's in store.

Sincerely,
DATE: June 20, 2011

TO: Councilmembers
  Paul Schmidt, City Administrator
  Eric Johnston, City Engineer
  Brian Matson, Carollo Engineers

FROM: Mayor Jim Slowik

SUBJECT: Wastewater Treatment Facility Location

I want to share with you a letter I received from Marvin and Jill Reed expressing their concerns regarding the Old City Shop site as a location of the new Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please see attached letter, which also includes letters from Mrs. Reed’s doctors.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at 279-4502. Thank you.
June 15, 2011

To: Mayor Jim Slowik
   and Whom It May Concern:

From: Marvin and Jill Reed

Re: New Wastewater Treatment Facility, Placement Consideration
   and Potential Health Hazards for populated areas

Using the “Old City Shops” area as an option for the new treatment facility will create serious health issues for those living in the many multiple dwellings and neighborhoods that surround that area. A simple internet search brings up many University and EPA studies, health surveys, articles and anecdotal testimonies to support this concern.

Comprehensive studies conducted by Cornell University and the National Small Flows Clearing House, funded by the EPA, cite multiple health hazards for those living within 400 meters of wastewater facilities. Think about the dense population that lives, works and shops within the radius surrounding the “City Shops” area. Many retired residents occupy the surrounding apartments, condos and older neighborhoods that makeup much of this area. It is important to remember that chronic illness and respiratory disease will be more prevalent in an older population, making them more susceptible to any new pollutants.

Airborne hazards: chemicals, organisms, pesticides, molds, contaminants from house flies, Coli Form bacteria and viruses find their way into the air where they are subsequently inhaled or swallowed. Moist night air, windy conditions and humidity above 35% exacerbate the hazard. This describes our year round conditions here on Whidbey Island.

Most common health hazards named in studies associated to living within the 400 meters:

- Severe Respiratory and Gastrointestinal Irritation / Infection
- Development of Asthma and lung disease and serious exacerbation of existing conditions
- Upper respiratory irritation, sinus infection, eye irritations
- Weakened immune system
- Headaches
- Pain in chest or when deep breathing
- Central nervous system damage
- Multiple Sclerosis
- Vomiting, diarrhea, general weakness
- Depression
- Systemic Poisoning
We moved into Bayview West Condominiums for medical reasons, in 1987. The pressing severity of a Lung and Immune disorder necessitated essentially giving away our house in Coupeville and finding housing high off the ground, near the water to assure good air flow. Here we set up a “safe” environment with large air filters and replaced carpets with wood and tile floors. The ‘City Shop’ area is approximately 30 meters from my bedroom window…and others in our complex who have chronic lung and Immune disorders.

Following our letter are two letters from physicians who write their concerns about this location.

Moving forward with the “Old City Shops” area as an option poses such a serious health hazard, that if not stopped, could precipitate legal action. The thought is devastating to me and many others who have moved to our beautiful island for health reasons or simply for the pleasure of it’s beauty and PURE AIR. It seems unconscionable to place a sewage treatment facility in the middle of our city. Even the birds know better than to soil their own nest.

Thanks for your attention,

Marvin and Jill Reed
May 25, 2011

Re: Jill V Reed

To Whom It May Concern:

Jill is a patient of mine with severe asthma who requires several medications, including oral steroids, to control her disease. She is very susceptible to odors and particulates of any type, which can result in an asthma exacerbation that can last for weeks and require high doses of oral steroids, with multiple adverse effects. Because of her prolonged use of oral steroids for asthma in the past, her adrenal function has deteriorated as well.

I would ask you to consider not placing the sewage treatment plant next to her home, this would likely result in an increase in her asthma, which, as noted, is already severe. This would also severely restrict her ability to leave her home.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul V Williams, MD
May 26, 2011

RE: REED, JILL
DOB: 01/23/1944

To Whom It May Concern:

Ms. Jill Reed is a woman I know well from having provided medical care to her over the last 7-8 years time. Ms. Reed has suggested to me today that there may be a purposed sewage treatment plant placed by the City of Oak Harbor very near to her condominium building. I do have concerns, and have shared those with Jill, that I think this would have the potential to aggravate several of her medical conditions. To the extent that this might have influence on the decision making process, I hope that her health and potential impact of the sewage treatment center being placed adjacent to her home might be considered.

I appreciate you taking this woman's circumstance into your decision making process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mark S. Backman, M.D.

MSB/dki
DATE: July 11, 2011

TO: Brian Matson, Carollo Engineers

FROM: Mayor Jim Slowik

SUBJECT: Wastewater Treatment Facility Location

Please see attached letters from concerned citizens. Eric Johnston also received copies of these letters.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at 279-4502. Thank you.
Date: July 5, 2011

RE: “Old City Shop”
Wastewater Treatment Facility

To: Mayor Jim Slowik
City of Oak Harbor
865 SE Barrington Dr
Oak Harbor WA 98277

From: Marge Walter

Message: Please consider a different location for the new Wastewater treatment plant. Many of the people in our complex and the surrounding area are older and have severe health problems. I’ve read many articles on-line and a Wastewater Treatment Facility just should not be placed in densely populated area.

Please remove the “Old City Shop” location as an option for the new treatment facility.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best Regards

Marge Walter
To: Mayor Jim Slowik
   and Whom It May Concern:

From: Robert and Diantha Douglas

Re: New Wastewater Treatment Facility, Placement Consideration and Potential Health Hazards for populated areas.

We are opposed to placing the new sewer treatment facility at the "Old City Shops". We live in "Bayview West" condo's which is right next door to the old city shops. Some of the obvious reasons we don't want it here is: health hazards, I have lots of health problems and this plant won't help them any. The post office is right across the street, they have lots of people coming and going all day long.

Thank you for listening to our concerns.

Robert and Diantha Douglas

http://sz0082.ev.mail.comcast.net/zimbra/public/blank.html 7/7/2011
DATE: July 18, 2011

TO: Councilmembers
Paul Schmidt, City Administrator
Cathy Rosen, Public Works Director
Eric Johnston, City Engineer
Brian Matson, Carollo Engineers

FROM: Mayor Jim Slowik

SUBJECT: Wastewater Treatment Facility Location

Attached are six letters from residents expressing their concerns regarding the Old City Shop site as a location of the new Wastewater Treatment Facility.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at 279-4502. Thank you.
July 12, 2011

Mayor Jim Slowik & City Council
Oak Harbor City Hall
865 SE Barrington Drive
Oak Harbor, Washington 98277

Dear Mr. Mayor & City Council,

My name is Steve N. Harada, PT and I own a physical therapy clinic at 210 SE Pioneer Way in Oak Harbor. I understand you are thinking of locating a new waste water treatment facility for the city and one of the locations is where the City has some “old city shops”. I have looked at the several locations you have discussed and the “old city shops” are located in the heart of the City.

I am concerned of the health hazards that a wastewater treatment facility at this location can cause to residents in the area. If this facility is similar to other wastewater treatment facilities, it depends on air to help decompose the waste. This can cause airborne pollutants to float into the downtown area and make the city of Oak Harbor a negative place to live and visit. Oak Harbor, like many other cities, depends on tourism and this type of facility will not help attract tourists. I would hate to see Race Week and other activities along Pioneer Way, that help bring revenue into Oak Harbor, be discontinued or decrease in size because of health fears.

If you have any questions, please contact me at the above address. Thank you for your concern.

Sincerely,

Steve N. Harada, PT
TO: Mayor Jim Slwik
AND WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:
FROM: Alfred and Elvina Gonzales

RE: NEW WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY.

WE LIVE AT __________
OAK HARBOR WA. WE ENJOY THE CLEAN AIR AND
BEING NEAR THE WATER.

I, Elvira am a diabetic and already have
A WEAK IMMUNE SYSTEM. I AM ALSO ALLERGIC
to air borne chemicals, among other things.

WE ARE AWARE OF THE HEALTH HAZARDS
ASSOCIATED IN LIVING WITHIN 400 METERS OF
A WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY. OUR CONDO
WOULD BE ABOUT 30 METERS FROM THE AREA
THAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED.

WE FEAR FOR OUR HEALTH. I Alfred also
SUFFER SEVERE ALLERGIES.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR INTEREST.

Alfred & Elvira Gonzales

cc: Council
Paul Schmidt
Cathy Rosen
Eric Johnston
Brian Malson
Mayor Jim Slowik
865 S.E. Barrington Drive
Oak Harbor, WA 98277
July 11, 2011

Dear Mayor Slowik and Who May It Concern,

I am a resident of Bayveiw West Condominiums. I am very concerned about the New Wastewater Treatment Facility that might be built at the Old City Shop. I am afraid it might affect my health worse. I have sinus problems (year around allergy and sinus infections). I cannot afford to move to another place.

Having this kind of facility nearby apartments, condominiums, doctors' offices and post office will cause a lot of smell and air pollution; I feel it is not a good location. Please choose another option to place the new facility. I thank you for taking your time reading this letter.

Sincerely

[Signature]
Peggy Callister
To: Mayor Jon Loken

and whoever it may concern:

My name is Ron Boice and I live at number 302. I have lived here for 30 years. I am located about 100 yards from your new proposed new wastewater treatment plant. I have lived for 65 years and have seen how mankind has ruined up our environment. Please don't let this happen to our beautiful Island and Oak Harbor.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Boice

PS We also have two elderly people in our complex on oxygen tanks.

cc: Council

Paul Schmidt
Cathy Rosen
Nate Johnston
Brian Makson
7 July 2011

To: City of Oak Harbor

Re: Placement of Sewage Treatment Plant

To Whom It May Concern:

We are condominium owners at Bay View West Condominiums. It has come to our attention that the city is considering locating the new sewage treatment plant in the old City Shop Site. This property is directly behind our condo community.

We have reviewed the studies regarding the health hazard this would create. We know of residents in each of the three buildings who have serious heart and lung conditions and are deeply concerned for them, as well as everyone who lives and works in this very populated area.

We are asking you to please review this and place the treatment center somewhere that would do the least amount of harm.

Thank you for your cooperation,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chris and Shirley Murray
June 15, 2011

To: Mayor Jim Slowik
and Whom It May Concern:

From: Launa L. Lindbeck

Re: New Wastewater Treatment Facility, Placement Consideration and
Potential Health Hazards for populated areas

Using the “Old City Shops” area as an option for the new treatment facility will create serious health issues for those of us living in the multiple dwellings and neighborhoods that surround that area. An internet search brings up many University and EPA studies, health surveys, articles and testimonies to support this concern.

Studies that have been conducted by Cornell University, and other studies funded by the EPA, cite multiple health hazards for those living within 400 meters of wastewater facilities. There are many retired residents that occupy the surrounding apartments and condos that makeup much of this area. It is important that you remember that chronic illness and respiratory disease can be more prevalent in an area where retired and disabled people live (people with fixed incomes), making it more susceptible to any new or old pollutants.

I live in Bayview West Condos, and have since long before I had to retire with my disabilities. I know there are several people who live here and could not afford to move, and who have many health problems, that if made to live next to a Wastewater Treatment Facility, could lead to death.

I have an immune disease (Rheumatoid Arthritis), asthma, diabetes and sinus problems. Most people are not aware that Rheumatoid Arthritis, is an Immune Disease. My health will be directly affected by having airborne hazards ie: chemicals, pesticides, molds and any other pollutants that may arise from this facility.

If this program moves forward I feel that the City of Oak Harbor, will be inundated with law suits.

Please take the health risks to many people into consideration.

Launa L. Lindbeck

[Signature]
Tonight’s Agenda

• Facilities Plan Status Update
• Rate Analysis Update
• Schedule and Next Steps
  – Technical Aspects
  – Public Interface
  – Milestone Council Decisions
• How to Stay Involved
• Questions?
Facilities Plan Status

Proposed Site
Windjammer Vicinity
Windjammer Charrette Concept for MBR Conceptual Plan View

Total Project Cost Summary Year 2030

- Treatment Facility: $2.9 million
- Wastewater Conveyance: $7.6 million
- Effluent Discharge: $83.0 million
Phasing Scenarios Depend on City Growth

Phasing Also Depends on Navy Participation

- Navy currently contributes about 20% of flow to City facilities
  - **Scenario 1**: Navy continues as a customer
    - WWTP sized for City and Navy flows/loads
  - **Scenario 2**: Navy does not continue as a customer
    - WWTP sized for City only flows/loads

Notes:
1. Current measured capacity is 3.0 mgd.
2. Capacity required at projected year of startup (2017) ranges from 3.0 to 3.2 mgd.
3. Assuming 3.4 mgd of capacity is constructed in Phase 1, years of service (prior to Phase 2) range from 4 to 13 years.
Total Project Cost Summary
Phase 1, Scenario 1

The City’s cost share for this scenario is $60.0 M

Total Project Cost Summary
Phase 1, Scenarios 1 and 2

The City’s cost share for this scenario is $67.7 M
### Phase 1 Scenario Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Scenario 1 City + Navy</th>
<th>Scenario 2 City Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Project Cost</td>
<td>$82.6 M</td>
<td>$67.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Share (%)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Share of Cost</td>
<td>$22.6 M</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Share of Cost</td>
<td>$60.0 M</td>
<td>$67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Milestone Dates for Plan Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 6, 2013</td>
<td>Present Draft Plan to Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2013</td>
<td>Seek Council Approval to Submit Draft Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>Ecology Conditional Approval (pending environmental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2013 - Q1 2014</td>
<td>Final Environmental Approvals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Scenarios for Navy Participation

- **Scenario 1: City + Navy**
  - City provides service to Navy at startup of Phase 1 and through Year 2030
  - All project/O&M costs are shared

- **Scenario 2: City Only**
  - City, Navy operate independent facilities through Year 2030 (Navy no longer a customer)
  - All project/O&M costs are born by City
Navy Cost-Sharing Assumptions

- WWTP Project Costs
  - Navy share based on percentage of maximum month flow (ranges from 21% to 18%)
- WWTP O&M Costs
  - Navy share based on percentage of average annual flow (ranges from 17% to 14%)
- Collection System Project Costs
  - Navy provides 100% of costs associated with conveying Navy flow to Windjammer Vicinity
- Outfall Project Costs
  - Navy share based on percentage of peak flow (approximately 19% at 2030)

WWTP Funding Assumption Review

- 2010 rate study included assumptions for the WWTP funding
- Assumptions were conservative given the project was 5 plus years in the future
- Revised assumptions are conservative yet still reflect current conditions
- Question: How do the assumptions impact the adopted rate transition plan?
Estimated Rate Impact, August 14, 2012
“Base Case” Assumed $70 million Project

Summary of Required Single Family Monthly Sewer Bill

“Base Case”
Monthly Rate: $92.20

Variables include:
1. Borrowing term
2. Interest rate
3. Navy participation

Estimated Rate Impact, August 14, 2012
Rate Scenarios for $93.5 million Project

Summary of Required Single Family Monthly Sewer Bill

Monthly Rates range from $85 to > $115
( Depending on variable assumptions)
Updated WWTP Funding Assumptions

- 2 Borrowing terms evaluated: 20 and 30 years
- 2 Interest Rates evaluated: 4.5% and 6.0%
- Updated City’s sewer reserves balance
- Reconciled other key rate analysis assumptions
  - Project cost escalated to mid-point
  - City portion of project cost based on Navy participation
  - Cost of bonding
  - WWTP O&M components and costs
  - Project start/end dates

Three Potential Phase 1 Funding Scenarios

- Scenario 1: City + Navy
  - 30 years, 4.5% interest
  - Results in lowest City rate
- Scenario 2A: City Only
  - 30 years, 4.5% interest
  - Rate is higher than Scenario 1; still < “Base Case”
- Scenario 2B: City Only
  - 20 years, 6.0% interest
  - Highest rate; > “Base Case”
Comparison of Potential Monthly Sewer Bills

Summary of Rate Impacts, WWTP

- Lowest City rates result from City + Navy partnership in new facilities
- For “City Only” scenario, City rates held below “Base Case” with current, reasonable assumptions
- Opportunities to reduce City rate impact due to new WWTP continue to be explored
  - Grants/low-interest loan programs
  - Borrowing strategy
  - “Value Engineering”
  - Project Delivery Method
- Overall rate analysis for sewer utility is ongoing
Objectives for Next Phase of Project Through Year-end

- Facilities Plan approved
- Confirm planning assumptions through “Value Engineering”
- Select final location for WWTP within Windjammer Vicinity
- Complete preliminary design of WWTP
- Select most appropriate method of construction
- Complete final design of outfall to Oak Harbor
Key Features of Approach Moving Forward

• Continue to make every effort to deliver an appropriate facility while controlling cost and impact on ratepayers

• Maintain flexibility by considering options for final WWTP site location

• Select final location considering public input, cost and City policy directives

Step 1 – Value Engineering

• Completed on large projects to add value, control cost

• Condition of some funding sources

• Facilitated by an independent 3rd party and panel of experts

• Summer 2013: Results and recommendations offered to City Council for consideration
Step 2 – Select Final WWTP Location Within Windjammer Vicinity

A. Spring/Summer 2013: Public meetings, Council deliberations establish policy, guiding principles
   - Property acquisition
   - Use of open space
   - Additional features/ benefits associated with facility
   - Integration with other nearby land-use plans
Step 2 – Select Final WWTP Location Within Windjammer Vicinity

B. Summer/Fall 2013: Working Group Meetings, Charrette leverage public input to develop options within Windjammer Vicinity

C. Fall 2013: Project team presents analysis of options to City Council for decision
   - Confirm Value Engineering Recommendations
   - Confirm treatment facility location
   - Confirm approach to integrate facility into surroundings
     - Transportation
     - Parks/Open Space
     - Commercial/Retail
     - Government/Public Facilities
Step 3 – WWTP Preliminary Design

A. Fall 2013: Procure key process equipment for design (membranes, UV) based on qualifications and competitive pricing

B. Combine technical detail, public input to develop final “look & feel” of facility
Step 3 – WWTP Preliminary Design

B. Combine technical detail, public input to develop final “look & feel” of facility

C. Develop drawings and specifications to 30 percent level detail

D. Evaluate alternatives to complete the Project
   – Design-Bid-Build
   – Design-Build
   – General Contractor/Construction Manager

E. Spring 2014: Select delivery option and proceed to final design in early 2014
Step 4 – Outfall Final Design

- “Fast track” to provide necessary information for permitting
- Complete in parallel with Steps 1 – 3
- Design complete in fall 2013
- Construction possible in 2014, pending results of construction delivery analysis

Significant Council Actions & Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action/Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 19, 2013</td>
<td>Council authorizes submission to Ecology; Approves next phase of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>Council sets policy and guiding principles to select final location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>Council selects final location of treatment facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Council approves approach to complete project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall Project Schedule

**OAK HARBOR CLEAN WATER FACILITY**

**PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR PROJECT COMPLETION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROVE FACILITIES PLAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREDESIGN PHASE</strong></td>
<td><strong>FINAL DESIGN PHASE</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION PERIOD</strong></td>
<td><strong>START-UP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submit Plans &amp; Specs</strong></td>
<td>Agency Draft Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**How can I stay involved?**

[Images of coastal areas]
Send an email or give us a call if you would like to participate:

Joe Stowell, City Engineer
360-279-4520
jstowell@oakharbor.org

Questions?
What does the Facilities Plan include?

Facilities Plan
The Facilities Plan documents the need for a new treatment facility, describes the process of identifying the proposed alternative, and includes enough engineering and environmental detail for Agency review and approval. Starting March 13, Copies of the Facilities Plan can be viewed at City of Oak Harbor public facilities, or online at www.oakharborcleanwater.org.

Executive Summary
This volume includes a high-level summary of the Facilities Plan analysis, recommendations, costs, and estimated rate impacts.

Appendix A
This volume documents the extensive public outreach activities performed over the past three years of the Project.

Appendices B through I
This volume includes other relevant agreements, permits, and analysis considered during the planning process.

Appendix J
This volume will be completed in April 2013, and includes the following environmental documents needed for Plan approval: State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) checklist; State Environmental Review Process (SERP) documents; and other biological/cultural analyses.
The Windjammer Vicinity is the Proposed Site for a New Treatment Facility
What Could the New Treatment Facility Look Like?

An example street view looking north from Windjammer Park, past a future re-aligned Bayshore Drive.

An alternate concept showing a potential boardwalk and retail strip east of the new facility.

An example layout inspired by feedback from the June 2012 charrette process.
Estimated Project Costs

- Project Cost, Millions
  - $2.9
  - $7.7
  - $82.9
  - $2.9
  - $7.7
  - $72.0
  - $2.9
  - $64.8

- Project scope:
  - Treatment Facility: $82.9M
  - Wastewater Conveyance: $7.7M
  - Effluent Discharge: $2.9M

- Option 1: City + Navy
  - The City’s portion of this option is $60.0M
  - All Facilities Through Year 2030
  - Option 1: City + Navy
  - Option 2: City Only

- “Phase 1” Facilities
  - Option 2: City Only
  - Total Cost: $65.8M

Clean Water Facility Planning Project | Winter 2013
Estimated Rate Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
<td>$81.95</td>
<td>$92.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1: City + Navy; 30-yrs; 4.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$51.70</td>
<td>$56.87</td>
<td>$62.56</td>
<td>$68.81</td>
<td>$75.69</td>
<td>$83.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2A: City Only; 30-yrs; 4.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$64.40</td>
<td>$72.13</td>
<td>$80.78</td>
<td>$90.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2B: City Only; 20-yrs; 6.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$52.88</td>
<td>$59.48</td>
<td>$68.11</td>
<td>$77.99</td>
<td>$89.68</td>
<td>$107.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All rates are compared to base/2012 rates.
How Can I Stay Involved With the Project?

Public feedback will continue to shape the new wastewater facility’s final location and architecture.

- **Two-day charrette** to support the city in selecting the final wastewater site within the Windjammer Vicinity.

- **Working groups** will help the City plan for the final “look” of the treatment plan.

- Send an email, or give us a call if you would like to participate:
  Joe Stowell, City Engineer
  360-279-4520
  jstowell@oakharbor.org
## Proposed Schedule

### Clean Water Facility Planning Project | Winter 2013

#### Proposed Schedule for Project Completion, Spring 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Design Phase**

- **Complete and Approve Facilities Plan**

**Final Design Phase**

- **Construction Period**
  - **Start-Up**
    - Agency Draft Submission (Jun 2013)
  - **Submit Plans & Specs (Dec 2014)**

**Proposed Schedule for Preliminary Design Phase, Spring 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **March 2013**: Submit Plan to Ecology for Approval
- **July 2013**: Ecology Conditional Approval
- **Q1 2014**: Final Plan Approval (Windjammer Vicinity)
- **April 2013**: Begin Preliminary Design Phase
- **Summer 2013**: Council Sets Guiding Policy for Final Location
- **Working Group Meeting**
- **Fall 2013**: Council Selects Final Location
- **Public Open House**
- **Spring 2014**: Council Approves Next Steps
- **Develop Guiding Policy (Council/Public)**
- **AGENCY REVIEW PERIOD**
  - **Conceptual Design / Value Engineering (4 mo)**
  - **Develop 30% Design / Detail (6 mo)**
  - **Project Delivery (2 mo)**
- **Procure Key Process Equipment (4 mo)**
- **Select Final Location (5 mo)**
- **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PERIOD**

---

**Environmental Review Period**

- **Documentation**
- **Permitting**
- **Projects Delivery**
- **Construction**
- **Spring 2015**: Council Approves Next Steps
Tell us about yourself:

☑ I live in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I work in the City of Oak Harbor
☐ I would like to be on your mailing list (please provide contact information)
☑ I would like to be involved in the charrette and/or working group process
  
  If yes,
  ☐ Name:
  ☐ Phone Number:

Other comments:

Very well presented
Thank you for coffee and cookie
That long will last 5-10 years.

Clean Water Facility Planning Project
Public Open House & City Council Workshop
March 6, 2013