City Council Special Meeting
Workshop – Wastewater Treatment Facility, Design Charrette Results
Thursday, July 12, 2012, 6:00 p.m.
City Hall – Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER Mayor Dudley called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Mayor Scott Dudley
Six Members of the Council,
Rick Almberg
Jim Campbell
Tara Hizon
Danny Paggao
Joel Servatius
Bob Severns

Beth Munns was absent and excused from the workshop.

Larry Cort, Interim City Administrator
Cathy Rosen, Public Works Director
Eric Johnston, City Engineer
Renée Recker, Executive Assistant to the Mayor

City Engineer, Eric Johnston introduced David Christensen, Christensen Design Management and Brian Matson, Carollo Engineers along with members of the design charrette team.

City Engineer Johnston gave an overview of the waste water treatment facility's history and project status and then turned the meeting over to Mr. Christensen. Mr. Christensen defined the word "charrette" which emanated from the École des Beaux Arts as an intense workshop to arrive at consensus. The term is defined on his firm's website as: *A charrette* is *an intense effort to solve any architectural problem within a limited time. From a creative standpoint, a charrette can be divided into three portions: listen, brainstorm and draw fast.* The WWTP design charrette included 14 community participants who represented property owners, business and organization members, and rate payers. The question asked for each of the two sites: If a treatment plant was built at this site, how does the site incorporate to make the City a better place to live. The facts of each site were presented with an agenda of everything that could be thought of and how the site could best be developed. The two-day charrette was a community-driven and non-binding process. It was not an adversarial charrette and the process generated a number of ideas.

Mr. Christensen gave a PowerPoint presentation which is attached to these minutes as Exhibit A and details:

- Masterplan concepts for the charrette
- Positive issues and negative issues for the Windjammer Site
- Positive issues and negative issues for the Crescent Harbor North Site
- The Blaine, Washington master plan design charrette example

- Next steps: July 31, 2012 Public open house followed by a Council workshop at the Elk's Lodge, Oak Harbor. August 14, 2012 Council meeting at City Hall, Oak Harbor

Council questions and discussion included the commercial center associated with the Windjammer site, acquisition of additional parking, Staysail RV Park at Windjammer, ballfields' reconfiguration and/or relocation, leverage of other values through Bayshore's realignment, and the lack of Windjammer negative issues not attached to financial concern. Council questions and discussion about the Crescent Harbor North site, the economy of an AS facility and state-of-the-art and smaller footprinted MBR facility, concern with pumping from the Crescent Harbor North site, wetland mitigation, reconfiguration of Torpedo Road, loss of three residences to accommodate this site, and that this site is within the Urban Growth Area (UGA).

Mayor Dudley called for public comments from the charrette participants.
Corky Bridgeford, Property Owner, Torpedo Road. Mr. Bridgeford talked about the wetlands, the tree farm location (to the north of this proposed site), and the positive education process the charrette provided which changed his opinion of the Crescent Harbor North site as a viable possibility. Mr. Bridgeford also spoke in support of the MBR alternative for this facility and the City's foresight to have built the Fire Department and City Shops complexes with room for future growth.
Joanne Hartley, Property Owner, Crescent Harbor Road. Ms. Hartley spoke in support of the charrette experience and that the WWTP charrette was non-combative and positive. Ms. Hartley felt that pumping from the Crescent Harbor site back to the park would be financially wasteful. Using the Windjammer site and suggested changes to Bayshore Drive would allow the facility and area to become a remarkable draw for Oak Harbor. Ms. Hartley felt an MBR facility is the best process and could support the Crescent Harbor site even though it would take her property noting it would be to the City's advantage to take all of the affected properties at one time. In response to people who do not want to give up park area, Ms. Hartley felt they should remain mindful of what is best for the community and she asked Council to facilitate for the people, and though difficult, not be emotional.
Jeff Trumbore, Rate Payer. Mr. Trumbore originally opposed the Windjammer site, but through the charrette process, came to see it as a viable opportunity. He had been concerned about the Crescent Harbor property owners who now seem to be supportive of that site. Mr. Trumbore felt the City has two decent options and should look toward a fifty-year horizon. Beyond the opportunities mentioned and more hidden at Crescent Harbor, an interpretative park and wetlands areas could be a positive draw to this site.

Council questions and discussion continued about the UGA and City limits, if preliminary improvement costs would be presented this evening (no), and that design charrette results were meant to take ideas, apply them to each site, and move toward a site decision. Mr. Matson spoke to questions concerning future treatment requirements which are difficult to determine at this point, that AS and MBR can effectively remove suspensions/pollutants, meeting of current regulatory requirements, and that the choice of MBR or AS becomes a balancing act for communities.

Discussion continued regarding Windjammer's existing facility as the proposed site, the acquisition of private property, rezoning, and park zoning. Master plan concepts and those ideals will need future attention but site selection is the present focus. Discussion returned to the ballfields and the increased traffic on Bayshore Drive, size of property on Pioneer to be kept commercial (30,000 sf), right-of-way for the Boyer property, pull-throughs for the RV park which is already considered a City jewel, the give and take of park area, consistency with the Windjammer Plan, that site acquisition was seen as a negative for the Windjammer site and positive (less costly) for the Crescent Harbor North site, the balancing of Pioneer improvements, and Dock Street's asphalt which extends to the water.

There were no representatives from Little League at this evening's meeting but Ken Tyler, North Whidbey Little League had participated in the charrette. City Engineer Johnston noted that moving the ballfields was discussed during the charrette with the "take away" that new fields would need to be in place first (bigger, better, lighted and able to accommodate Little League and adult leagues). The football fields at Ft. Nugent Park took eighteen months to build so there would be time to relocate the ballfields prior to the 2017 wastewater treatment facility construction date.

Discussion returned to the financial-only negatives shown for the Windjammer site and that people don't like this site, that political/social issues were addressed for both sites and that, though citizen concern about this site began as an issue, as the charrette's educational process continued, it didn't become an issue within the charrette's results for positives and negatives at this site. The charrette's results represent what was said.

Cathy Harbour, Property Owner, Bayshore Drive. Ms. Harbour spoke with concern about moving the existing ballfields since she enjoys seeing them used beyond League play.

Discussion continued about reestablishing the task force that discussed the ballfields some years ago, relocating the fields yet keeping a play field at Windjammer Park, with discussion returning to costs and if they could be presented at the July 31, 2012 meeting (plant costs and ancillary costs) and question if that would be within Carollo Engineer's purview.

More public comment was invited in response to statements made about people not wanting Windjammer as the selected site.
Joanne Hartley, Property Owner, Crescent Harbor Road. Ms. Hartley said the charrette was not a political issue. The site choice is a personal and emotional issue: I don’t know anyone more emotional (than me) about having my house taken. But, we came around and do understand now from participating in the charrette.
Corky Bridgeford, Property Owner, Torpedo Road. It was not a political issue since the plant has to be built. We were asked how we want it to look, what if we put it there (for each site), and then how we would deal with it.
Jeff Trumbore, Rate Payer. As Mr. Trumbore had stated earlier, he was adamantly against Windjammer, but as the charrette progressed, he understood; it was not

political. There are still issues and there needs to be a strong public information program. Sewer plants have changed. The technology has moved forward considerably.

Discussion followed about water quality from an MBR facility (could it be drinking water quality). Mr. Matson talked about the measure of suspended solids - the lagoon is at 40 milligrans per liter, AS would produce 30 milligrams per liter but could then be filtered, and MBR brings 1 milligram per liter. There are restrictions on how reclaimed water can be used (do not think of it in terms of drinking water) and an MBR plant will provide the highest class, Class A, of water; AS can provide such water through filtration. In terms of regulation, they are equal. In terms of perception, they are not equal. If sited at Windjammer, Mr. Matson personally commented it would be a shame to put MBR-quality water into the ocean since reclaimed water can be used.

Next steps were discussed in terms of the July 31, 2012 and August 14, 2012 meetings.

ADJOURN
With no other discussion coming forth, Mayor Dudley adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

_____
Connie T. Wheeler
City Clerk