



## Clean Water Facilities Planning

# Community Feedback Report

---

*Spring 2011*

Prepared by Triangle Associates  
as part of the Carollo Project Team  
5/2/2011

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:

		Response Percent	Response Count
City of Oak Harbor resident		92.6%	75
Oak Harbor business owner / operator / representative		12.3%	10
	Other (please specify)		33
<b>answered question</b>			<b>81</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>30</b>

## 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

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		93.6%	102
No		5.5%	6
Not sure		0.9%	1
<b>answered question</b>			<b>109</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>2</b>

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

	Response Count
	94
<b>answered question</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>17</b>







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

	<b>Extremely important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Matters some</b>	<b>Not a deal breaker</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Preserves existing public green space (e.g. park property)	<b>47.4% (46)</b>	36.1% (35)	11.3% (11)	5.2% (5)	97
Preserves views important to the community	<b>43.9% (43)</b>	36.7% (36)	11.2% (11)	8.2% (8)	98
Built and operated at lowest cost	31.6% (31)	<b>40.8% (40)</b>	13.3% (13)	14.3% (14)	98
Is a good neighbor (low noise, traffic, odor)	<b>57.3% (55)</b>	31.3% (30)	8.3% (8)	3.1% (3)	96
Protects public health and environment	<b>80.8% (80)</b>	13.1% (13)	4.0% (4)	2.0% (2)	99
Flexible enough to meet future needs	<b>54.1% (53)</b>	35.7% (35)	7.1% (7)	3.1% (3)	98
<b>answered question</b>					<b>100</b>
<b>skipped question</b>					<b>11</b>

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

	<b>Response Count</b>
	39
<b>answered question</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>72</b>

**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):**

		<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Community meeting spaces/public gathering rooms		40.3%	31
Trails/public access		39.0%	30
<b>Distinct building style fitting with the character of the surrounding area</b>		<b>76.6%</b>	<b>59</b>
Open green space or parks with landscaping		55.8%	43
Interpretive signs		22.1%	17
Public art		26.0%	20
	Other (please specify)		36
	<b>answered question</b>		<b>77</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>		<b>34</b>

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

	<b>Response Count</b>
	80
<b>answered question</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>31</b>

**8. My suggestion to make a new facility located at the Marina/Seaplane Base more appealing is:**

	<b>Response Count</b>
	72
<b>answered question</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>39</b>

**9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:**

	<b>Response Count</b>
	78
<b>answered question</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>33</b>







**10. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Old City Shops more appealing is:**

	<b>Response Count</b>
	71
<b>answered question</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>40</b>

**11. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Crescent Harbor more appealing is:**

	<b>Response Count</b>
	74
<b>answered question</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>37</b>

**12. The best way to keep me informed as this project moves forward is through (check all that apply):**

		Response Percent	Response Count
Project website		52.2%	48
<b>Newspaper</b>		<b>59.8%</b>	<b>55</b>
Channel 10 (City of Oak Harbor TV)		30.4%	28
Mailings		34.8%	32
Public Forums		37.0%	34
Email		39.1%	36
	Other (please specify)		3
	<b>answered question</b>		<b>92</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>		<b>19</b>

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

	Response Count
	56
<b>answered question</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>55</b>

**Page 1, Q1. I am a:**

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



**Page 1, Q1. I am a:**

29	Past Business Owner and (perhaps) Future Business Owner	Apr 5, 2011 3:20 PM
30	City employee living in the county	Apr 5, 2011 12:23 PM
31	Retired....owned property and operated a business in Oak Harbor for 26 years	Apr 4, 2011 7:46 PM
32	Property Owner	Apr 4, 2011 4:12 PM
33	do not live in City limits	Apr 4, 2011 3:51 PM

**Page 1, Q3. If yes, where do you recall hearing about Oak Harbor's wastewater treatment plans?**

1	Newspaper	Apr 27, 2011 11:19 AM
2	whidbey news times	Apr 26, 2011 12:12 PM
3	Whidbey News-Times	Apr 25, 2011 1:44 PM
4	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.	Apr 22, 2011 4:33 PM
5	newspaper	Apr 21, 2011 9:16 AM
6	newspaper	Apr 21, 2011 8:00 AM
7	Letters and newspaper articles	Apr 19, 2011 12:46 PM
8	The Whidbey News-Times	Apr 18, 2011 9:17 PM
9	Post card info/meeting date time	Apr 17, 2011 5:01 PM
10	Channel 10	Apr 17, 2011 4:56 PM
11	Newspaper	Apr 17, 2011 4:52 PM
12	City Council meetings	Apr 17, 2011 4:49 PM
13	Channel 10 and newsletter	Apr 17, 2011 4:45 PM
14	mailing	Apr 17, 2011 4:31 PM
15	Whidbey News-Times	Apr 17, 2011 8:54 AM
16	Whidbey News Times	Apr 16, 2011 5:51 PM
17	whidbey news times	Apr 16, 2011 2:46 PM
18	Neighbor	Apr 15, 2011 8:04 PM
19	channel 10	Apr 15, 2011 8:17 AM
20	Whidbey News-Times	Apr 14, 2011 12:37 PM
21	Whidbey News-Times	Apr 14, 2011 12:29 PM
22	news-times	Apr 14, 2011 11:30 AM
23	newspaper	Apr 13, 2011 7:05 PM
24	A friend	Apr 13, 2011 6:06 PM
25	Newspapers	Apr 13, 2011 4:52 PM
26	Newspapers	Apr 13, 2011 4:50 PM
27	Online Whidbey News Times, mailer received at home	Apr 13, 2011 4:38 PM
28	Current plants are old, out of date and unable to meet future city growth.	Apr 13, 2011 4:35 PM

**Page 1, Q3. If yes, where do you recall hearing about Oak Harbor's wastewater treatment plans?**

29	Newspaper articles	Apr 13, 2011 4:34 PM
30	newspaper, word of mouth	Apr 13, 2011 4:18 PM
31	News paper and TV.	Apr 13, 2011 12:29 PM
32	person's talking about it	Apr 13, 2011 11:55 AM
33	City Council meetings. Brochures sent by the city	Apr 12, 2011 8:04 PM
34	from friends	Apr 12, 2011 6:04 PM
35	Mailings from City of OH, and Whidbey News Times	Apr 12, 2011 5:17 PM
36	pamphlet in the mail	Apr 12, 2011 3:14 PM
37	Newspaper and mailings from the city	Apr 12, 2011 2:04 PM
38	paper and other residents	Apr 12, 2011 1:52 PM
39	Whidbey News Times	Apr 12, 2011 1:22 PM
40	Paper, television, city meetings	Apr 12, 2011 12:37 PM
41	In the paper and at the last city meeting on the wastewater.	Apr 12, 2011 12:36 PM
42	Paper, television, city meetings	Apr 12, 2011 12:32 PM
43	paper, television, city meetings	Apr 12, 2011 11:51 AM
44	friends	Apr 12, 2011 10:01 AM
45	newspaper	Apr 12, 2011 9:56 AM
46	newspaper	Apr 12, 2011 9:56 AM
47	Whidbey News Times & Mailed brochure	Apr 12, 2011 8:55 AM
48	local newspaper	Apr 12, 2011 7:35 AM
49	News and mailed pamphlet	Apr 12, 2011 12:02 AM
50	Whidbey News Times	Apr 11, 2011 10:26 PM
51	newspaper, recent mailing	Apr 11, 2011 9:04 PM
52	City	Apr 11, 2011 12:40 PM
53	Whidbey News Times	Apr 11, 2011 8:43 AM
54	Newspaper, Council Meetings	Apr 10, 2011 4:33 PM
55	city council meetings	Apr 10, 2011 11:45 AM
56	Whidbey News Times	Apr 10, 2011 8:15 AM
57	In the City Hall, at the Public Works Dpt. and in the paper.	Apr 8, 2011 8:40 PM

**Page 1, Q3. If yes, where do you recall hearing about Oak Harbor's wastewater treatment plans?**

58	Whidbey News Times	Apr 8, 2011 3:05 PM
59	Council members	Apr 8, 2011 10:37 AM
60	CH 10 city counsel meeting	Apr 7, 2011 9:25 PM
61	Newspaper and mailer	Apr 7, 2011 7:54 PM
62	whidbey news times	Apr 7, 2011 4:28 PM
63	A recent letter in the mail.	Apr 7, 2011 4:11 PM
64	Whidbey News-Times	Apr 7, 2011 11:02 AM
65	Channel 10	Apr 7, 2011 9:30 AM
66	Whidbey News-Times	Apr 7, 2011 8:50 AM
67	Whidbey News Times	Apr 7, 2011 8:47 AM
68	whidbey times	Apr 6, 2011 8:37 PM
69	around town	Apr 6, 2011 8:29 PM
70	Whidbey Times	Apr 6, 2011 3:52 PM
71	City Engineer discussed project during our staff meeting.	Apr 6, 2011 8:48 AM
72	paper	Apr 5, 2011 9:19 PM
73	I heard that it is why my utility bill has been going up and making life harder for us.	Apr 5, 2011 4:11 PM
74	on television, newspaper, flyer	Apr 5, 2011 3:51 PM
75	News, word of mouth,	Apr 5, 2011 3:17 PM
76	Whidbey news times	Apr 5, 2011 12:23 PM
77	Work, Whidbey News Times	Apr 5, 2011 12:23 PM
78	city council meetings	Apr 5, 2011 12:09 PM
79	Channel 10 and the WNT	Apr 5, 2011 10:27 AM
80	That we are trying to decide where to put the new site	Apr 5, 2011 10:05 AM
81	City Hall	Apr 5, 2011 9:15 AM
82	Council Meeting	Apr 4, 2011 9:14 PM
83	WNT newspaper articles	Apr 4, 2011 7:46 PM
84	newspaper,	Apr 4, 2011 4:30 PM
85	Newspaper	Apr 4, 2011 4:18 PM

**Page 1, Q3. If yes, where do you recall hearing about Oak Harbor's wastewater treatment plans?**

86	At work (City)	Apr 4, 2011 4:12 PM
87	YES	Apr 4, 2011 4:08 PM
88	My Interview ;)	Apr 4, 2011 4:00 PM
89	Newspaper, City Hall	Apr 4, 2011 3:51 PM
90	At work	Apr 4, 2011 3:42 PM
91	Work	Apr 4, 2011 3:42 PM
92	City Council Meeting	Apr 4, 2011 3:41 PM
93	Comcast #10	Apr 4, 2011 12:42 PM
94	newspaper	Apr 2, 2011 12:55 PM

**Page 2, Q5. Not listed above, but an important consideration to me is:**

1	moving it from Windjammer site- -give this area to the public for park access!	Apr 26, 2011 12:13 PM
2	preserving the health of existing wetlands, and Puget Sound	Apr 21, 2011 9:32 PM
3	Location - should not drain into Swan Lake or its environs.	Apr 21, 2011 10:15 AM
4	Is in the area annexed by the City of Oak Harbor according to the Growth Management Act	Apr 18, 2011 9:20 PM
5	Preserve open space containing natural habitat and farmland. Do not expand Oak Harbor City/Urban growth boundaries.	Apr 17, 2011 4:57 PM
6	Not in a residential area	Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM
7	Does not interfere with salmon project at marina	Apr 17, 2011 4:46 PM
8	not ruining the atmosphere of an existing family/tourist gathering spot on the island	Apr 17, 2011 4:33 PM
9	NOT ON LAND OUTSIDE THE CITY	Apr 16, 2011 5:54 PM
10	Best science available for system and least damaging to environment.	Apr 14, 2011 12:39 PM
11	don't even think about putting it near Swan Lake are you people crazy !!!	Apr 13, 2011 7:06 PM
12	This smells like an excuse to turn the Fakema Farm into a housing development	Apr 13, 2011 6:08 PM
13	Utilize existing waste water pipes, incorporates GREEN approach, provides for alternative treatment of grey water, stormwater and biosolids	Apr 13, 2011 4:40 PM
14	Is located closest to existing plant(s).	Apr 12, 2011 6:06 PM
15	Advanced technology. Small size for small footprint on community.	Apr 12, 2011 5:20 PM
16	Removing the existing facility at Windjammer Park	Apr 12, 2011 2:06 PM
17	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.	Apr 12, 2011 1:54 PM
18	Will be functional to house staff and city hall.	Apr 12, 2011 12:40 PM
19	Outside of view of the public.	Apr 12, 2011 12:37 PM
20	ECONOMICAL	Apr 12, 2011 12:34 PM
21	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 "no away". Everything put down the sewer goes somewhere and impacts the environment.	Apr 12, 2011 7:38 AM
22	Nature and habitat	Apr 12, 2011 12:04 AM
23	Aesthetically appealing to the community	Apr 11, 2011 10:34 PM
24	City Growth Planning	Apr 11, 2011 12:41 PM
25	Crescent & Oak Harbor's water quality	Apr 11, 2011 8:45 AM

**Page 2, Q5. Not listed above, but an important consideration to me is:**

26	Public Input	Apr 10, 2011 4:34 PM
27	Making sure our rural environment and wild life are preserved for the future.	Apr 8, 2011 3:10 PM
28	Appearance of the building housing the facility is extremely important.	Apr 7, 2011 7:56 PM
29	It should be an asset to the community ie. meeting areas, public art	Apr 7, 2011 9:34 AM
30	Get it off the Beach.	Apr 7, 2011 8:50 AM
31	Don't waste money on consultants.	Apr 6, 2011 8:30 PM
32	should be enclosed attractively	Apr 5, 2011 3:53 PM
33	How and where it is built should be best for the entire community, not just a select few or select few areas/neighborhoods	Apr 5, 2011 3:19 PM
34	Out of site, away from the public and high traffic areas and low odors	Apr 5, 2011 10:28 AM
35	get it away from City Beach, I do not go down there because I am not a fan of the smell of shit.	Apr 5, 2011 10:06 AM
36	Cannot overstate "lowest cost"...we already are paying more for our utilities	Apr 4, 2011 8:59 PM
37	type of facility	Apr 4, 2011 7:47 PM
38	Building aesthetics if constructed in a visible location	Apr 4, 2011 4:14 PM
39	Uses existing facilities and city owned property to greatest extent possible.	Apr 4, 2011 4:01 PM

**Page 3, Q6. 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):**

1	none of the above- -put this facility away from public view	Apr 26, 2011 12:14 PM
2	none of these things - it should be as utilitarian and simple as possible	Apr 25, 2011 1:47 PM
3	most important is to keep it low profile and returning water to the puget Sound is a clean, nontoxic state compatable with the need to maintain a healthy Sound.	Apr 22, 2011 4:36 PM
4	No odor	Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM
5	None of the above, just treat the effluent waste	Apr 17, 2011 4:50 PM
6	Huh? It's a sewer treatment plant! It isn't a library!	Apr 15, 2011 8:06 PM
7	Compatible with ecology without negative impact	Apr 14, 2011 12:40 PM
8	use the existing site	Apr 13, 2011 7:07 PM
9	Keep it inside the current city limits!	Apr 13, 2011 6:10 PM
10	Disguised ; avoids runoff into our pristine water in preparing the site	Apr 13, 2011 4:54 PM
11	Make it look like it isn't a humungous 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 constuction should be low maintenance not requiring regular painting. Make it a combination water treatment/brewery. Just kidding.	Apr 13, 2011 4:44 PM
12	Make an educational oppportunity for community and schools	Apr 12, 2011 8:08 PM
13	Lowest possible profile. Maybe even put it underground.	Apr 12, 2011 6:09 PM
14	Enhancements would depend on the final location.	Apr 12, 2011 5:21 PM
15	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.	Apr 12, 2011 2:09 PM
16	It should not be a town focal point; locate out of public eye.	Apr 12, 2011 12:39 PM
17	MAKE IT FUNCTIONAL	Apr 12, 2011 12:35 PM
18	SHOULD HOUSE CITY STAFF, MAYBE BECOME CITY HALL	Apr 12, 2011 12:09 PM
19	A public tour of the facility with explanations of how the processing of sewage works.	Apr 12, 2011 7:39 AM
20	Game area for hunters	Apr 12, 2011 12:06 AM
21	Treated water use and sludge recycle/compost	Apr 11, 2011 12:45 PM
22	Eliminating odor	Apr 11, 2011 11:51 AM
23	None, save your money	Apr 11, 2011 8:45 AM
24	The engineering department should be located within	Apr 10, 2011 4:35 PM



**Page 3, Q6. 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):**

25	Make it a treatment plant, it does not need to be an arts center.	Apr 10, 2011 11:46 AM
26	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.	Apr 8, 2011 8:43 PM
27	Guess I covered this on previous question	Apr 7, 2011 9:35 AM
28	whatever costs the least	Apr 5, 2011 4:13 PM
29	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.	Apr 5, 2011 10:30 AM
30	What the hell is an interpretive sign?	Apr 5, 2011 10:07 AM
31	Amenities are not a necessary cost....We already have trails, parks..do not charge us for more.	Apr 4, 2011 9:02 PM
32	Let's do all we can to make it more community-friendly within budgetary constraints!	Apr 4, 2011 8:52 PM
33	Commercial spaces, restaurants, merchandise	Apr 4, 2011 4:49 PM
34	answers to the questions above depend on the facility location	Apr 4, 2011 4:42 PM
35	Depending on location my answers may change....but in general, I think it should look nice, be useful, and remember its a sewer plant	Apr 4, 2011 4:41 PM
36	Trails and open space are important if built at Windjammer Park.	Apr 4, 2011 4:16 PM

**Page 4, Q7. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:**

1	Green belt and a design that is develop in a manner of a park . Buildings and the grounds should be as attractive as possible.	Apr 27, 2011 11:22 AM
2	do not locate it here!	Apr 26, 2011 12:14 PM
3	Do not site any new facility at Windjammer Park. It was a foolish idea originally and is even more foolhardy to consider this time.	Apr 25, 2011 1:48 PM
4	Shield it with native vegation 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.	Apr 22, 2011 4:42 PM
5	protect the ground water and Oak Harbor	Apr 21, 2011 9:33 PM
6	Do not allow untreated water to flow into the harbor.	Apr 21, 2011 10:16 AM
7	Use cleaner water techniques	Apr 21, 2011 9:18 AM
8	First choice. Build new facility on ball fields. Temp relocate ball fields to Ft Nuget Park. After construction completed demo old facility & rebuild one nice ball field. Benefit construction finished just turn off light on old plant and walk across street to new plant.	Apr 17, 2011 5:03 PM
9	I think we should build a nice looking building to house the facility.	Apr 17, 2011 4:57 PM
10	No	Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM
11	odor control	Apr 17, 2011 4:34 PM
12	Plant more and more and more trees	Apr 16, 2011 5:57 PM
13	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.	Apr 15, 2011 8:26 AM
14	Improved technology for cleaner effluent meeting state standards for outfall to the harbor.	Apr 14, 2011 12:42 PM
15	prefer that it NOT be at windjammer park!	Apr 14, 2011 11:41 AM
16	expand and improve the facility	Apr 13, 2011 7:08 PM
17	Playground, skateboard park, dog park.	Apr 13, 2011 6:11 PM
18	Creating a design that fits the landscape and obscures the fact that it is atreatment facility	Apr 13, 2011 4:55 PM
19	Not a good idea.	Apr 13, 2011 4:45 PM
20	Keep it adjacent to the existing facility.	Apr 13, 2011 4:36 PM
21	Esthetically pleasing and odor reduction	Apr 13, 2011 4:20 PM

**Page 4, Q7. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:**

22	I cannot imagine that a new waste facility located at Winjammer Park would somehow make the Park more appealing. NO,	Apr 13, 2011 12:34 PM
23	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.	Apr 12, 2011 8:22 PM
24	Enclose the facility in a beautiful building or surround it with a "green" wall.	Apr 12, 2011 6:10 PM
25	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.	Apr 12, 2011 5:26 PM
26	make the treated water as clean as possible	Apr 12, 2011 3:17 PM
27	Please completely remove the existing facility from Windjammer Park	Apr 12, 2011 2:10 PM
28	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	Apr 12, 2011 1:56 PM
29	Not an option - move to another location	Apr 12, 2011 1:26 PM
30	Do not place at Windjammer(City Beach) Park! This location has been the butt of jokes for long enough!	Apr 12, 2011 12:43 PM
31	Please do not place it here!	Apr 12, 2011 12:39 PM
32	DO NOT USE.	Apr 12, 2011 12:36 PM
33	DO NOT LOCATE AT WINDJAMMER(CITY BEACH) PARK! LOCATION HAS BEEN THE BUTT OF JOKES LONG ENOUGH!	Apr 12, 2011 12:27 PM
34	None	Apr 12, 2011 10:03 AM
35	More attractive plant, landscaping and less odor.	Apr 12, 2011 9:59 AM
36	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.	Apr 12, 2011 7:41 AM
37	Don't put it there	Apr 12, 2011 12:06 AM
38	To incorporate the appearance of the facility into the overall aesthetic of the surrounding neighborhood and to guarantee the elimination of odor and noise.	Apr 11, 2011 10:47 PM
39	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.	Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM
40	Make it look like it fits. Added cost not favorable	Apr 11, 2011 12:46 PM

**Page 4, Q7. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:**

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.	Apr 11, 2011 11:53 AM
42	Don't do it.	Apr 11, 2011 8:45 AM
43	Don't even consider the option	Apr 10, 2011 4:35 PM
44	Why not put it out on crescent harbor rd, it is a low point, and close to the current water treatment pond.	Apr 10, 2011 11:47 AM
45	not locate it there. It's our city's central park!	Apr 10, 2011 8:20 AM
46	Don't put it here!	Apr 8, 2011 8:44 PM
47	Build a treatment plant in an attractive building like in Blaine, WA MBR treatment facility.	Apr 8, 2011 3:16 PM
48	Small footprint, effective landscaping, location that leaves unimpeded park space (put it off to the side).	Apr 8, 2011 10:38 AM
49	not to put it there	Apr 7, 2011 9:26 PM
50	It should not block water views and be an attractive design that blends with the surroundings.	Apr 7, 2011 7:58 PM
51	Nothing. Don't do it at Windjammer.	Apr 7, 2011 11:03 AM
52	Cover process areas and provide odor control. Make the building design blend with the area.	Apr 7, 2011 9:37 AM
53	Do not put it here.	Apr 7, 2011 8:51 AM
54	Do not build there. Use it as a park.	Apr 6, 2011 9:00 PM
55	Don't build it there.	Apr 6, 2011 8:31 PM
56	Return it to the public. Play area, picnic areas.	Apr 6, 2011 3:54 PM
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....	Apr 6, 2011 8:52 AM
58	To not put it near our park and put it where the other plant is. Keep it away from our kids	Apr 5, 2011 4:15 PM
59	Not sure. Sounds silly, but how about inside a windmill?	Apr 5, 2011 4:14 PM
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	Apr 5, 2011 3:34 PM
61	Make it look like it belong there	Apr 5, 2011 12:26 PM

**Page 4, Q7. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:**

62	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.	Apr 5, 2011 10:32 AM
63	Don't put it there you idiots!	Apr 5, 2011 10:08 AM
64	Not to relocate there unless an MBR.	Apr 5, 2011 7:09 AM
65	event center and lots of public art	Apr 4, 2011 9:28 PM
66	I think it's the wrong location.	Apr 4, 2011 9:16 PM
67	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.	Apr 4, 2011 9:08 PM
68	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!	Apr 4, 2011 8:57 PM
69	Not do it there	Apr 4, 2011 7:48 PM
70	Not put it there	Apr 4, 2011 4:50 PM
71	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	Apr 4, 2011 4:43 PM
72	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:42 PM
73	Fitting building Architecture No odor Low Noise Preserve as much park/green space as possible. Consider building a plaza on top or using a "green roof" for aesthetics	Apr 4, 2011 4:18 PM
74	No suggestion----move it	Apr 4, 2011 4:10 PM
75	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:06 PM
76	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.	Apr 4, 2011 3:54 PM
77	Attractive exterior building design	Apr 4, 2011 3:44 PM
78	Don't put it there.	Apr 4, 2011 3:37 PM

**Page 4, Q7. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Windjammer Park more appealing is:**

79	Do not locate the entire treatment facility in the park. A pumping station may be needed.	Apr 4, 2011 12:45 PM
80	reduce the smell	Apr 2, 2011 12:56 PM

**Page 5, Q8. My suggestion to make a new facility located at the Marina/Seaplane Base more appealing is:**

1	Using the Marina/Seaplane Base site is almost as bad as using Windjammer Park. Go further afield.	Apr 25, 2011 1:49 PM
2	Do not allow untreated water to flow into the harbor.	Apr 21, 2011 10:17 AM
3	Sounds complicated to acquire property rights. Still require pump station at old plant.	Apr 17, 2011 5:04 PM
4	I think we should build a nice looking building to house the facility.	Apr 17, 2011 4:57 PM
5	No	Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM
6	this is a good option	Apr 17, 2011 4:36 PM
7	DON'T PUT IT THERE!!!!	Apr 17, 2011 8:59 AM
8	Plant more trees	Apr 16, 2011 5:57 PM
9	This is an easy site to blend architecture with the surroundings but there will a subltantial cost to alter the collection system. The outfall will be easy however.	Apr 15, 2011 8:29 AM
10	Avoid legal entaglements with the military.	Apr 14, 2011 12:43 PM
11	This is better than windjammer. However, it should be located as far south of the marina as possible. As this is a more "industrial" area, screening could be minimal.	Apr 14, 2011 11:41 AM
12	nothing	Apr 13, 2011 7:08 PM
13	Walking paths	Apr 13, 2011 6:12 PM
14	same as above	Apr 13, 2011 4:55 PM
15	Not a good idea.	Apr 13, 2011 4:46 PM
16	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.	Apr 13, 2011 4:38 PM
17	same as previous	Apr 13, 2011 4:21 PM
18	This is more appealing to me than Windjammer Park. Possibly one of the better choices, as it effects less homeowners.	Apr 13, 2011 12:37 PM
19	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	Apr 12, 2011 8:23 PM
20	Enclose it in a beautiful building or surround it with a "green" wall.	Apr 12, 2011 6:11 PM
21	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).	Apr 12, 2011 5:27 PM

**Page 5, Q8. My suggestion to make a new facility located at the Marina/Seaplane Base more appealing is:**

22	Please do not put the treatment plant by the water, if possible.	Apr 12, 2011 2:12 PM
23	NO smell or pollution... empty into other bay..not oak harbor	Apr 12, 2011 1:56 PM
24	Use MBR process with attractive building	Apr 12, 2011 1:28 PM
25	Do not locate here!	Apr 12, 2011 12:43 PM
26	Must be the smallest footprint possible and hidden from view by trees. Ensure space remains for future expansion.	Apr 12, 2011 12:41 PM
27	DO NOT USE!	Apr 12, 2011 12:28 PM
28	Build it here where the populus is low and any odors generated will impact the least amount of people.	Apr 12, 2011 10:33 AM
29	Not sure about using non-City-owned property for this facility.	Apr 12, 2011 10:00 AM
30	Poor Choice. Limited space, Marina, like Windjammer Park is the most important water-oriented space the city owns.	Apr 12, 2011 8:57 AM
31	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.	Apr 12, 2011 7:41 AM
32	Great spot if they maintain the public boat ramp	Apr 12, 2011 12:08 AM
33	...to not consider this site	Apr 11, 2011 10:47 PM
34	This site is not acceptable.	Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM
35	Make it fit - added cost a negative	Apr 11, 2011 12:46 PM
36	An attractive building with educational oportunities for the public. Safe for the environment.	Apr 11, 2011 11:54 AM
37	Don't put it here.	Apr 11, 2011 8:45 AM
38	Don't even consider the option	Apr 10, 2011 4:35 PM
39	Build it low, and with attractive northwest themed architecture.	Apr 10, 2011 8:21 AM
40	If you want to screw up the Marina this is right where you'd put it..... Don't site it here!	Apr 8, 2011 8:45 PM
41	Same suggestion as #7.	Apr 8, 2011 3:18 PM
42	Transfer ownership from the navy to the City. It's not a good idea to locate this on federal property.	Apr 8, 2011 10:39 AM
43	don't put it there either	Apr 7, 2011 9:26 PM



**Page 5, Q8. My suggestion to make a new facility located at the Marina/Seaplane Base more appealing is:**

44	It shouldn't take up too much space in an already crowded area.	Apr 7, 2011 7:59 PM
45	Somehow I feel if it's on Federal land it will be more properly maintained.	Apr 7, 2011 4:15 PM
46	Nothing.	Apr 7, 2011 11:04 AM
47	Very easy to design a nautical themed building.	Apr 7, 2011 9:38 AM
48	Do not put it here.	Apr 7, 2011 8:51 AM
49	If it will be used as a park and Marina.	Apr 6, 2011 9:00 PM
50	Don't build it there.	Apr 6, 2011 8:32 PM
51	Less concrete, more trees.	Apr 6, 2011 3:55 PM
52	Not really a good site in my opinion.	Apr 6, 2011 8:53 AM
53	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
54	Do not like it, it is the marina and a spot where people sail into, this proposal is not appealing at all and nothing would make it appealing	Apr 5, 2011 3:34 PM
55	Make it look like it belong there	Apr 5, 2011 12:26 PM
56	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
57	Better than Windjammer.	Apr 5, 2011 10:08 AM
58	Not to locate there unless an MBR.	Apr 5, 2011 7:09 AM
59	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
60	I think this is the wrong location.	Apr 4, 2011 9:16 PM
61	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

**Page 5, Q8. My suggestion to make a new facility located at the Marina/Seaplane Base more appealing is:**

62	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.	Apr 4, 2011 8:59 PM
63	Its away from residences, a current facility is there	Apr 4, 2011 7:49 PM
64	Not put it there	Apr 4, 2011 4:50 PM
65	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:44 PM
66	Obtain a long-term property lease or easement from the Navy prior to investing substantail community resources in this location. The facility should be odor free, quiet and visually blend into the surroundings.	Apr 4, 2011 4:42 PM
67	Fitting Architecture Incoroprate Plaza/Viewing Area (views from roof may be really nice)	Apr 4, 2011 4:20 PM
68	You said in the past there would be an impact to the Marina. This site is not good because of that	Apr 4, 2011 4:11 PM
69	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?	Apr 4, 2011 4:09 PM
70	Unique, attractive exterior building design	Apr 4, 2011 3:45 PM
71	Build a MBR	Apr 4, 2011 3:38 PM
72	Not a good option!	Apr 4, 2011 12:46 PM

**Page 6, Q9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:**

1	Again this area needs to be as attractive as possible for the surround area. Park like area.	Apr 27, 2011 11:23 AM
2	No suggestions	Apr 25, 2011 1:50 PM
3	Don't.	Apr 22, 2011 4:42 PM
4	Again protection of the Sound and local waters is paramount	Apr 21, 2011 9:35 PM
5	Do not locate the facility at Beachview Farm - it endangers the Swan Lake Habitat of Local Importance.	Apr 21, 2011 10:17 AM
6	Should not be an option! Too expensive Will ruin the pristine environment and wildlife habitat	Apr 21, 2011 9:19 AM
7	DON'T PLACE IT HERE!	Apr 21, 2011 8:01 AM
8	Cost extra piping back and forth to discharge.	Apr 17, 2011 5:04 PM
9	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.	Apr 17, 2011 4:59 PM
10	#2 Choice	Apr 17, 2011 4:53 PM
11	Incorporating the rolling hills into design possibly less farmy and more wetland like.	Apr 17, 2011 4:47 PM
12	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	Apr 17, 2011 4:39 PM
13	ABSOLUTELY N O T	Apr 16, 2011 5:58 PM
14	not use this site at all	Apr 16, 2011 2:49 PM
15	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 farm property into the city a substantial delay could be expected if this site were chosen.	Apr 15, 2011 8:39 AM
16	Guarantee clean effluent to Swan Lake watershed without obnoxious odor emmissions.	Apr 14, 2011 12:44 PM
17	Probably not the best area. Costs are a concern.	Apr 14, 2011 11:43 AM
18	if you even try to do this you will face the biggest law suit 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	Apr 13, 2011 7:11 PM
19	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.	Apr 13, 2011 6:17 PM

**Page 6, Q9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:**

20	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	Apr 13, 2011 4:56 PM
21	Who owns this property? Beachview Farm and a colocated biosolid facility. Make treated waste water available to farms, parks (Ft Nugent) and golf courses.	Apr 13, 2011 4:48 PM
22	This is the worst possible location for the facility. It is currently undeveloped(other than for farming). It	Apr 13, 2011 4:41 PM
23	Do not discharge into Swan Lake without reconnecting the lake to Puget Sound.	Apr 13, 2011 4:22 PM
24	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?	Apr 13, 2011 12:44 PM
25	This site would obviously be the less intrusive for nieghbors 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!	Apr 12, 2011 8:26 PM
26	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.	Apr 12, 2011 6:13 PM
27	Seems way out of the way . . . seems to 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.	Apr 12, 2011 5:28 PM
28	This site would be okay, but I will leave it to the designers and city to plan the amenities to make it more appealing.	Apr 12, 2011 2:14 PM
29	have extra land to plan for expansion	Apr 12, 2011 1:57 PM
30	Not an option - keep effluent lines away from Swantown lake and West Beach	Apr 12, 2011 1:29 PM
31	Do not locate here!	Apr 12, 2011 12:43 PM
32	DO NOT USE!	Apr 12, 2011 12:28 PM
33	Will devalue property in the surronding area. Westward winds will spread the odor over a gerater populus of people	Apr 12, 2011 10:34 AM
34	Not sure about remote site.	Apr 12, 2011 10:00 AM
35	Not a great choice. Expensive to plumb/pump. City will be expanding in that area in the future.	Apr 12, 2011 8:58 AM
36	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.	Apr 12, 2011 7:41 AM

**Page 6, Q9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:**

37	It's the best spot in town for this waste site	Apr 12, 2011 12:09 AM
38	Use walls to reduce noise and landscape with berms that include mature trees.	Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM
39	Water and solid use and expansion possibility. Doesn't need to be pretty	Apr 11, 2011 12:46 PM
40	Same suggestions as others.	Apr 11, 2011 11:54 AM
41	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.	Apr 11, 2011 8:47 AM
42	1\$ extended lease of the property	Apr 10, 2011 4:35 PM
43	that is a long way from the center of town... and a lot of uphill problems is it not?	Apr 10, 2011 11:48 AM
44	Drop this idea. Too expensive overall. Would threaten the beautiful Whidbey Golf and Country Club with summer wind smell from the facility.	Apr 10, 2011 8:22 AM
45	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.	Apr 8, 2011 8:49 PM
46	This location should not be considered due to on going feasibility study of Swan Lake to restore salmon habitat and has been designated a Habitat of Local Importance.	Apr 8, 2011 3:22 PM
47	Just don't do it. This is the wrong place.	Apr 8, 2011 10:40 AM
48	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.	Apr 7, 2011 9:30 PM
49	It shouldn't be too close to neighboring residents' homes.	Apr 7, 2011 8:01 PM
50	With regard I prefer this site.	Apr 7, 2011 4:33 PM
51	Use a system that produces the best possible water quality.	Apr 7, 2011 11:04 AM
52	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.	Apr 7, 2011 9:42 AM
53	MBR in an attractive building.	Apr 7, 2011 8:52 AM
54	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.	Apr 6, 2011 8:35 PM

**Page 6, Q9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:**

55	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.	Apr 6, 2011 8:56 AM
56	not to build it there	Apr 5, 2011 9:21 PM
57	Since it is a farm, why not enclose the treatment plant in a barn.	Apr 5, 2011 4:14 PM
58	I think 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	Apr 5, 2011 3:34 PM
59	THIS IS BEST	Apr 5, 2011 3:21 PM
60	Make it look like it belong there	Apr 5, 2011 12:26 PM
61	Somehow make it look like a farm so it blends into the rest of the community.	Apr 5, 2011 10:39 AM
62	No comment.	Apr 5, 2011 10:08 AM
63	No thoughts.	Apr 5, 2011 7:09 AM
64	restore the old barn and have it look like a farm	Apr 4, 2011 9:29 PM
65	A surrounding park.	Apr 4, 2011 9:17 PM
66	Probably not a good idea...have consideration for all of the local property owners out there.	Apr 4, 2011 9:13 PM
67	I'm not familiar with this area.	Apr 4, 2011 8:59 PM
68	Not to even consider it	Apr 4, 2011 7:50 PM
69	Not put it there	Apr 4, 2011 4:50 PM
70	The facility should be visually inconspicuous, odor or noise should not be noticeable off site.	Apr 4, 2011 4:47 PM
71	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:45 PM
72	Incorporate trails/green space.	Apr 4, 2011 4:21 PM
73	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:12 PM
74	Nice idea but terribly expensive when compared to others	Apr 4, 2011 4:11 PM

**Page 6, Q9. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Beachview Farm more appealing is:**

75	Farm building look to exterior - blend in	Apr 4, 2011 3:47 PM
76	surround it by parks, trails	Apr 4, 2011 3:39 PM
77	Not a good option.	Apr 4, 2011 12:46 PM
78	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.	Apr 2, 2011 12:57 PM

**Page 7, Q10. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Old City Shops more appealing is:**

1	Why downtown?	Apr 27, 2011 11:23 AM
2	Don't put the new facility in the center of Old Town.	Apr 25, 2011 1:50 PM
3	Art. A city center compatable design.	Apr 22, 2011 4:43 PM
4	Second choice Old Shops. Taps old plumbing. Still requires pumping low area up hill.	Apr 17, 2011 5:05 PM
5	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.	Apr 17, 2011 4:59 PM
6	No. Sell this property to pay for another site. The highest and best use for this property is R1 and R4!	Apr 17, 2011 4:54 PM
7	could hamper the hope for new activity downtown	Apr 17, 2011 4:40 PM
8	ARE YOU KIDDING?	Apr 16, 2011 5:59 PM
9	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.	Apr 15, 2011 8:41 AM
10	Ensure there are no negative effects to neighbors.	Apr 14, 2011 12:45 PM
11	not desirable, but with proper landscape work and screening, it could work.	Apr 14, 2011 11:43 AM
12	none	Apr 13, 2011 7:11 PM
13	Dumb. Keep it near the water.	Apr 13, 2011 6:18 PM
14	same as above..... building compliments the setting and disguises the puporse of the structure	Apr 13, 2011 4:57 PM
15	Not good idea to have in city core area.	Apr 13, 2011 4:49 PM
16	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.	Apr 13, 2011 12:49 PM
17	This location may prove the best as far as location to Out fall. 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 nieghboring properties.	Apr 12, 2011 8:28 PM
18	Enclose it in a beautiful building or surround it with a "green" wall.	Apr 12, 2011 6:13 PM
19	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.	Apr 12, 2011 5:32 PM



**Page 7, Q10. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Old City Shops more appealing is:**

20	If we can keep the treatment plant out of the city, that would be best.	Apr 12, 2011 2:15 PM
21	Not recommened due to being in town.	Apr 12, 2011 1:57 PM
22	Might be good site as long as process can be covered and is not unattractive to neighbors	Apr 12, 2011 1:31 PM
23	Could be used. Use it to house staff and City Hall. Use solar, wind, and methane as power sources. Outflow to Crescent Harbor.	Apr 12, 2011 12:53 PM
24	Smallest footprint possible, very low oder and screened by trees.	Apr 12, 2011 12:42 PM
25	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.	Apr 12, 2011 12:28 PM
26	Not here!	Apr 12, 2011 10:34 AM
27	This may be a good site, but the cost for moving the plant from the existing site is a concern.	Apr 12, 2011 10:01 AM
28	Not a great choice. Site seems too small. Poor location for future infilling/upgrading of public and private facilities within downtown proper	Apr 12, 2011 9:02 AM
29	This would be in an industial 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.	Apr 12, 2011 7:43 AM
30	It's another good site with low impact to the area as long as it's an enclosed facility	Apr 12, 2011 12:12 AM
31	Surround it with walls and berms with plantings to include mature trees.	Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM
32	Not in the gut of the city!!!	Apr 11, 2011 12:47 PM
33	I'd prefer not to have the water treatment facility in the city limits.	Apr 11, 2011 11:55 AM
34	Not a good idea.	Apr 11, 2011 8:47 AM
35	Make it a dual use facility, for example - a new City Hall	Apr 10, 2011 4:36 PM
36	get it out of the downtown.... geez, you want to make this place touristy, the smell of the treatment plant does not accomodate that..	Apr 10, 2011 11:49 AM
37	Hard to conceive we'd want a sewer plant near the center of the city...	Apr 10, 2011 8:23 AM
38	Not a good spot.	Apr 8, 2011 8:49 PM
39	Enclose most MBR equipment in an attractive building.	Apr 8, 2011 3:23 PM

**Page 7, Q10. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Old City Shops more appealing is:**

40	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
41	Still too close to down town	Apr 7, 2011 9:30 PM
42	Put it somewhere else. This area is for people and businesses.	Apr 7, 2011 8:02 PM
43	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
44	Central location, good opportunity for combined public meeting facilities.	Apr 7, 2011 9:43 AM
45	House the facility in an appropriately styled building.	Apr 7, 2011 8:54 AM
46	MBR in an attractive building.	Apr 7, 2011 8:52 AM
47	If only (MRB) process	Apr 6, 2011 9:01 PM
48	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
49	Far enough away that tsunami would not harm it.	Apr 6, 2011 3:56 PM
50	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
51	I'm really not in favor of this location	Apr 5, 2011 4:14 PM
52	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
53	Make it look like it belong there	Apr 5, 2011 12:27 PM
54	location and cost are best	Apr 5, 2011 12:13 PM
55	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
56	Perfect.	Apr 5, 2011 10:09 AM
57	No thoughts.	Apr 5, 2011 7:10 AM
58	dont know	Apr 4, 2011 9:29 PM
59	Incorporate public art.	Apr 4, 2011 9:17 PM
60	A MBR facility (like Blaines) would probably be okay, but not sure if local residents/businesses will resist.	Apr 4, 2011 9:13 PM

**Page 7, Q10. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Old City Shops more appealing is:**

61	Old City Shops? I didn't know we had such a thing.	Apr 4, 2011 9:00 PM
62	Very well hidden, out of the way....consider only if within a building	Apr 4, 2011 7:51 PM
63	Not put it there	Apr 4, 2011 4:50 PM
64	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:47 PM
65	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:45 PM
66	Incorporate meeting space and a plaza roof.	Apr 4, 2011 4:21 PM
67	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:13 PM
68	Best site so far	Apr 4, 2011 4:12 PM
69	Build a MBR with public meeting areas	Apr 4, 2011 3:39 PM
70	Design is important to make this site acceptable. Make it look like anything other than a treatment plant.	Apr 4, 2011 12:47 PM
71	not sure exactly where this location is?	Apr 2, 2011 12:57 PM

**Page 8, Q11. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Crescent Harbor more appealing is:**

1	Needs to be outside the populated areas.	Apr 27, 2011 11:24 AM
2	Any new facility doesn't really have to be too "appealing." Make it blend it somewhat so it doesn't stick out like a sore thumb and be done with it.	Apr 25, 2011 1:51 PM
3	a constructed wetland sewage treatment.	Apr 22, 2011 4:44 PM
4	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.	Apr 17, 2011 5:07 PM
5	I think this location is too environmentally critical.	Apr 17, 2011 5:00 PM
6	#1 Choice.	Apr 17, 2011 4:54 PM
7	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	Apr 17, 2011 4:41 PM
8	Descent landscaping around the facility	Apr 17, 2011 9:02 AM
9	FORGET ABOUT IT	Apr 16, 2011 5:59 PM
10	this area is away from housing, close to treatment facility already in use. This site seems like the most obvious already.	Apr 16, 2011 2:51 PM
11	This site makes little sense; it has all the problems with collection system reconfiguration and few advantages.	Apr 15, 2011 8:44 AM
12	Avoid legal entanglements with the military. Make them assume responsibility for their own pollution.	Apr 14, 2011 12:46 PM
13	Best option, minimal screening, and a good fit.	Apr 14, 2011 11:43 AM
14	none	Apr 13, 2011 7:12 PM
15	Keep it closer to the water.	Apr 13, 2011 6:18 PM
16	There is some semblance of atreatment plant nearby, would probably make economical sense to provide a site in this area for that reason and proximiity to Oka Harbor itslf.	Apr 13, 2011 4:58 PM
17	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.	Apr 13, 2011 4:53 PM
18	Do not locate it within the newly established wetland	Apr 13, 2011 4:22 PM

**Page 8, Q11. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Crescent Harbor more appealing is:**

19	This seems most appealing for location, but has the drawback of pumping "you know what" 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.	Apr 13, 2011 12:57 PM
20	The cost of this location is really unknown but appears might be the least objective from a public's view. The cost of piping to the outfall 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.	Apr 12, 2011 8:31 PM
21	I believe this site to be too environmentally fragile and too far away from the 3 closer sites to downtown.	Apr 12, 2011 6:14 PM
22	My first choice since it is out of the way from downtown OH (but not too far), is a very large site, and not too 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.	Apr 12, 2011 5:34 PM
23	This site would be okay, as well. Again, I'll leave the appeal factor to the city and designers.	Apr 12, 2011 2:16 PM
24	Best choice.. can plan for expansion for years to come..plenty of room... still needs to be state of the art and no odor	Apr 12, 2011 1:59 PM
25	Probably best location for outfall and out of site to most the community	Apr 12, 2011 1:38 PM
26	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.	Apr 12, 2011 12:58 PM
27	Good location as is, just add trees along road frontage. Still would go with smallest footprint and low odor.	Apr 12, 2011 12:45 PM
28	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.	Apr 12, 2011 12:28 PM
29	No comment	Apr 12, 2011 10:35 AM
30	Not sure about remote site.	Apr 12, 2011 10:01 AM
31	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.	Apr 12, 2011 9:03 AM
32	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.	Apr 12, 2011 7:43 AM

**Page 8, Q11. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Crescent Harbor more appealing is:**

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 evelation 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 compatable 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.	Apr 7, 2011 8:53 AM

**Page 8, Q11. My suggestion to make a new facility located at Crescent Harbor more appealing is:**

50	1st choice. Either MBR or AS process could be used.	Apr 6, 2011 9:01 PM
51	Don't build it there.	Apr 6, 2011 8:37 PM
52	Make earthquake and tsunami resistant.	Apr 6, 2011 3:57 PM
53	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.	Apr 6, 2011 9:01 AM
54	This seems like the best place - no homes around in close proximity	Apr 5, 2011 9:22 PM
55	enclose the area with lots of shrubs, trees and flowers.	Apr 5, 2011 4:14 PM
56	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	Apr 5, 2011 3:34 PM
57	NOT HERE!	Apr 5, 2011 3:22 PM
58	Make it look like it belong there	Apr 5, 2011 12:27 PM
59	This site would require that it be built to blend in. This site would be my third choice.	Apr 5, 2011 10:41 AM
60	Actually this idea is better than perfect.	Apr 5, 2011 10:09 AM
61	Excellent location perfect for either type of facility.	Apr 5, 2011 7:10 AM
62	rural architecture and low skyline don't block the view	Apr 4, 2011 9:30 PM
63	Isolation.	Apr 4, 2011 9:17 PM
64	Perfect location!!!! It is out of the way and will not bother anyone.	Apr 4, 2011 9:14 PM
65	Would anyone even see it at Crescent Harbor?	Apr 4, 2011 9:00 PM
66	Same as marina site	Apr 4, 2011 7:52 PM
67	not put it there	Apr 4, 2011 4:51 PM
68	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:47 PM
69	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.	Apr 4, 2011 4:46 PM
70	Include a wetland viewing area and/or boardwalk.	Apr 4, 2011 4:22 PM
71	Probably the best overall	Apr 4, 2011 4:12 PM
72	Farmhouse exterior look	Apr 4, 2011 3:48 PM
73	Parks and trails.	Apr 4, 2011 3:40 PM

**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):**

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



**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.**

1	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.	Apr 26, 2011 12:18 PM
2	Refrain from having this become another public boondoggle Taj Mahal. Site the thing out in Crescent Harbor and be done with it.	Apr 25, 2011 1:53 PM
3	To avoid unnecessary costs, expanding existing facilities close to the present urbanized areas seems prudent. .	Apr 22, 2011 4:46 PM
4	DO NOT PLACE THIS FACILITY ANYWHERE NEAR SWAN LAKE!	Apr 21, 2011 8:03 AM
5	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.	Apr 17, 2011 4:44 PM
6	By using the Crescent Harbor site, everything could be built into one area.	Apr 17, 2011 9:03 AM
7	Do not damage the Swan Lake eco-system or Puget Sound	Apr 16, 2011 6:01 PM
8	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.	Apr 15, 2011 8:54 AM
9	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 & its watershed, odor emissions to surrounding area are reliably prevented, and good asthetic landscaping is maintained. To Hap & Dick's surprise, we see some positive potential that needs more information to confirm Al & Barbara Williams	Apr 14, 2011 12:54 PM
10	I really prefer the Cresent harbor site. I'm sure, however, that costs would be much higher.	Apr 14, 2011 11:43 AM
11	use what you already have	Apr 13, 2011 7:12 PM
12	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.	Apr 13, 2011 6:30 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.**

13	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.	Apr 13, 2011 5:06 PM
14	as stated in my comments ref. Crescent Harbor	Apr 13, 2011 4:59 PM
15	The plant should not be located in environmentally sensitive areas, Crescent Harbor, and Fakema farm.	Apr 13, 2011 4:24 PM
16	My sincere thanks for including all of us, regardless of whether or not we live in the Oak Harbor city limits or not.	Apr 13, 2011 1:00 PM
17	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.	Apr 12, 2011 8:35 PM
18	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.	Apr 12, 2011 6:18 PM
19	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.	Apr 12, 2011 5:41 PM
20	Keep the new facility at the original site with the MBR treatment process. Thank you.	Apr 12, 2011 3:20 PM
21	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.	Apr 12, 2011 2:19 PM
22	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.	Apr 12, 2011 2:01 PM
23	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.	Apr 12, 2011 12:59 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.**

24	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.	Apr 12, 2011 12:48 PM
25	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.	Apr 12, 2011 12:29 PM
26	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.	Apr 12, 2011 10:03 AM
27	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.	Apr 12, 2011 9:05 AM
28	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 treatment facility. It is truly beautiful. A well designed facility at Windjammer Park would be a tourist attraction and a draw to the city.	Apr 12, 2011 7:47 AM
29	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.	Apr 12, 2011 12:28 AM
30	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.	Apr 11, 2011 9:06 PM
31	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.	Apr 11, 2011 12:55 PM
32	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.	Apr 11, 2011 8:51 AM
33	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!	Apr 10, 2011 4:40 PM
34	Take advantage of the Navy's generous Crescent Harbor land use offer before they change their mind :)	Apr 10, 2011 8:26 AM

**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.**

35	<p>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!</p>	Apr 8, 2011 8:58 PM
36	<p>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.</p>	Apr 8, 2011 3:30 PM
37	<p>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 "center of town" 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?</p>	Apr 8, 2011 10:08 AM
38	<p>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.</p>	Apr 7, 2011 8:08 PM
39	<p>With regard to the type of process I would prefer to see built, my preference is the Activated Sludge (AS) treatment process</p>	Apr 7, 2011 4:37 PM
40	<p>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.</p>	Apr 7, 2011 8:55 AM
41	<p>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.</p>	Apr 6, 2011 8:42 PM
42	<p>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.</p>	Apr 6, 2011 3:59 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.**

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 remian 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 desitnation 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 utilites 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 benifits 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.**

56 my biggest concern is the odor.

Apr 2, 2011 12:59 PM

Source	Comment
Email	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 is not within the UGA there would be another cost of a possible franchise and the process through the BOCC.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5 Crescent Harbor – a viable area that might be possible through a lease with the Navy and permitting could be done through them.</li> </ol> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Email and Follow-up Email	<p><i>Initial Email</i></p> <p>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.</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>Thanks for your all your work and time.</p> <p><i>Follow-up Email</i></p> <p>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.</p>
Mail	<p>I suspect my concern and desire to do the right and best thing regarding the proposal site for the new Clean Water Facility is comparable to your own as well as the City's. That would mean make 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.</p> <p>Crescent Harbor is my recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ <b>Out of sight:</b> The Navy property meets this in spades.</li> <li>❑ <b>Available for quick emergency fixes (with minimum interruption of services and street compromises):</b> 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 miles of pipe, installing it, holding the city's waste in overflow conditions.) Here, a much shorter and, 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: If another water contamination were to occur like this past summer's to Oak Harbor Bay, the Crescent Harbor Bay would absorb the damage more quickly</li> <li>❑ <b>Minimize its intrusion visually and environmentally:</b> 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 purchases 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.</li> <li>❑ <b>Situate it where future expansion would be readily available:</b> 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.</li> <li>❑ <b>Effective:</b> 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 Clean Water Facility would be meeting the other criteria above.</li> <li>❑ <b>Keep costs within reason:</b> Bonus benefits to the Crescent Harbor choice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Windjammer Park absorbs into park the site of the former facility—adding to the continuity and beauty of the park.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ 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."</li> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>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.</p>
Website	<p>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.</p> <p>Yes?</p>