

SUMMARY
Stakeholder Workshop on Cost and Financing
(Stakeholder Workshop #4)

October 10, 2006, 1 PM – 3 PM
Jefferson County Courthouse
1820 Jefferson Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368-0920

In response to the 1990 Growth Management Act (GMA), Jefferson County pursued the designation of an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in the Irondale/Port Hadlock area. As part of the requirements for establishing a UGA, Jefferson County is conducting a study of alternatives for developing a sewer system. There are currently no sewer facilities in the area, and existing residences and businesses are served by on-site treatment and disposal (septic) systems.

The sewer study will enable the County to identify 1) the final preferred alternative or method of collection, treatment, and disposal/reuse of wastewater, 2) the sewer service area, 3) the phasing and implementation of sewers throughout the service area, 4) the anticipated cost for individual connections to sewer, and 5) potential revenue and funding sources. The goal of the study is to produce a sewer facility plan that will help the County plan for growth in the area over the next 20 years; that will satisfy RCW 36.94 concerning Counties' sewerage, water, and drainage system responsibilities; and that will be approved by the Department of Ecology.

Workshop Summary

A public workshop was held at the Jefferson County Courthouse on Tuesday, October 10 from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm. The workshop was open to the public.

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- Present developments & design refinements to the preferred sewer system alternative
- Present the cost estimate
- Provide information on financing strategies
- Take questions and comments

Jefferson County Commissioners, County staff, local agency staff, and several community leaders and other interested parties were invited to the workshop. The County had identified local agencies whose facilities might be sewerred and/or whose activities might be affected by the installation or operation of a sewer. The County also identified representatives of business and community organizations and citizens who had been active previously in the process to establish a UGA. These parties were contacted by mail. A notice of the workshop was available on the project website (www.porthadlocksewer.org), the County's website, and in the Port Townsend Leader.

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

County Commissioner Phil Johnson (District 1), County Commissioner David Sullivan (District 2), and County Commissioner Pat Rodgers (District 3) attended the workshop. The consultants to the County were represented by Kevin Dour, P.E. and Jim Santroch, P.E. of TetraTech/KCM, Katy Isaksen of Katy Isaksen & Associates, and Bob Wheeler, P.E. and Ellen Blair of Triangle Associates. A complete list of workshop participants is attached to this summary.

Introductions & Workshop Overview

Mr. Wheeler, workshop facilitator, opened the meeting at 1:00 pm. He led introductions and explained the purpose of the workshop. He reviewed the workshop agenda and outlined the steps that would lead to the completed sewer facility plan, including public involvement opportunities, technical work, and the development of cost estimates and funding options. He distributed a handout that defined acronyms and abbreviations used in the presentation.

Mr. Wheeler announced that project information could be found and comments could be submitted at the project website, www.porthadlocksewer.org.

Mr. Wheeler thanked the participants for their on-going participation in the sewer facility plan process. He said that the valuable input the County and the consultant team had received had helped them to identify and refine the preferred sewer system alternative.

Mr. Wheeler summarized the purpose of planning a sewer system for the Port Hadlock UGA. He highlighted the following reasons:

- Responsible, proactive planning for population growth under the auspices of the Growth Management Act
- Environmental protection
 - Chimacum Creek
 - Shellfish beds
- Allows denser development in designated areas
 - Development to planned densities

To preface the cost estimate and financing strategy presentation, Mr. Wheeler said it was important to recognize that brand new sewer systems were inherently expensive. He noted that the substantial capital cost of building a whole new sewer system was incurred in the beginning when the fewest customers were participating and sharing the cost, which made it challenging to start a new system.

Mr. Wheeler explained that sewer planning to date had produced some of the “facts” about what a sewer system might cost and what financing strategies would be available. He emphasized that the critical next step after developing the “facts” would be to investigate innovative financing strategies and to apply for funding, in other words to do the “artwork.” He explained that an approved sewer facility plan would make the project eligible for a variety of funding programs. He mentioned the following four types of funding assistance as examples:

- Grants
- Congressional/legislative line items

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

- Low interest loans
- Low income assistance

Mr. Wheeler noted that the cost estimates to be presented could change in the future as the work of detailed final design, obtaining funding, and deciding on financing strategies proceeded.

Recent Developments & Design Refinements to Preferred Alternative

Mr. Dour, consultant team project manager, briefly described the components of the preferred sewer system alternative and the reasons for their selection. The PowerPoint workshop presentation is attached to this summary. Mr. Dour reported that potential locations for the wastewater treatment plant had been narrowed to the southern portion of the UGA, in the vicinity of the Sheriff's Facility. He said that a site for the influent pump station, the station that would pump the wastewater collected from the entire system to the treatment plant, had been identified near Ness' Corner Road and Shotwell Rd. Mr. Dour displayed two maps that showed the area of the potential treatment plant locations and the approximate site of the influent pump station.

To optimize financing and development of the sewer system, Mr. Dour said that the consultant team had estimated the wastewater treatment plant costs year by year and had shifted the timing of costs further into the future whenever possible. This strategy was to attempt to lower the initial cost of the system in the earlier years when fewer participants would be connected. He said that the consultant team's hydrogeologist was continuing to work to ensure that the selected disposal method would direct the treated, Class A treatment plant effluent to a beneficial use. He said that the intent was to recharge groundwater that flowed to Chimacum Creek, thus augmenting creek flow.

System Financing & Planning Process

Mr. Dour gave an overview of the plan to phase implementation of sewer service into the UGA, with the initial service area to be centered around the Port Hadlock commercial core. He described the requirement that sewer facility plan contain identified funding sources and financing strategies.

Mr. Dour said that the County and the community would have the opportunity to decide whether or not to move forward with implementation once the sewer facility plan was approved.

Updated Capital Cost through 2018

Mr. Dour presented the updated estimate for the capital cost of sewer facilities through 2018. The facilities would serve the core commercial area and Rhody Drive during this initial phase. There would be some additional treatment facility capacity available for future residential areas. The estimate was approximately \$33.5 million.

Funding Strategies

Ms. Isaksen, financial analyst, said her intent was to identify a mix of funding that would minimize the cost of the sewer system.

Ms. Isaksen explained that sewer costs were divided into two basic types, with implications as to how they are funded:

- Capital costs
 - One-time costs to build the physical facilities
 - Mix of capital funding sources typically used to pay for capital costs
- Operation and maintenance (O&M) costs
 - On-going costs to operate and maintain the facilities
 - Distributed to users by monthly sewer rates

Ms. Isaksen said that capital costs must be paid up front, with funding typically obtained from a mix of grants, loans, bond proceeds, and/or other methods. She noted that grants were the best source of funding because they did not require repayment. Later in the presentation, Ms. Isaksen detailed the ways that sewer customers could repay funding from the other sources.

Ms. Isaksen listed several types of funding opportunities and indicated whether each one was available to pay for capital costs, O&M costs, or both. She showed that many more sources of funding were available to pay for capital costs than for on-going O&M costs. She described specific examples of capital funding sources, such as Department of Ecology and USDA Rural Development grants and low-interest loans.

Considerations for Funding Initial Capital Costs through 2018

Ms. Isaksen then explained in more detail the options for funding the estimated capital cost through 2018 of a sewer system in the Port Hadlock UGA. She said that, from a financial perspective, capital costs were divided into the following two categories:

- Common/shared costs
 - Costs for facilities that benefit multiple sewer customers
 - Typically eligible for grants, loans, bonds, and other outside funding sources
- Private/on-site costs
 - Costs for the sewer line and other equipment on private property that connect the property to the sewer system
 - Typically paid by property owner

Ms. Isaksen said that common/shared costs were further broken down into General costs and Local costs. General costs are for facilities that benefit all of the sewer system's customers. For example, the wastewater treatment facility serves all of the sewer system's customers. Local costs are for facilities that benefit a subset of the sewer system's customers. For example, a sewer line through a neighborhood street serves only the customers in that neighborhood.

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

Common/Shared Capital Costs	
<u>General</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wastewater treatment facility• Disinfection system• Solids handling• Disposal• Influent pump station• Oversizing collection pipelines (greater than 8” in diameter)	<u>Local</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gravity collection pipelines up to 8” in diameter

Ms. Isaksen said that General costs were higher because they included the relatively costly wastewater treatment facility. The estimate for each component of capital cost through 2018 was as follows:

- Common/Shared Cost
 - General: \$21,074,114
 - Local: \$8,934,800
- Private/On-Site Cost
 - On-Site: \$3,455,000

Ms. Isaksen presented a timeline (2010 to 2018) that illustrated that the majority of the common/shared costs would be incurred in 2010, with relatively smaller costs incurred in 2012, 2015, and 2018 to expand the collection and treatment systems.

Ms. Isaksen said that she had focused her analysis on how to fund the upfront costs in 2010, because new customers connecting to the sewer system could help to defray the smaller costs in 2012, 2015, and 2018.

She gave an example (see PowerPoint presentation) of a mix of funding sources that could be used for the 2010 shared/common costs. She said that while multiple funding sources were usually necessary to amass enough money, it was important to recognize the level of effort as well as the administrative and other requirements in selecting which and how many funding programs to pursue.

Strategies for Recovering Capital Costs from Users

Ms. Isaksen presented three methods for sewer customers to repay the upfront capital costs: connection charges, a Utility Local Improvement District (ULID), and assessments based upon property value.

She explained that ULIDs were defined in statute, and that to form a ULID, essentially a boundary was drawn around the properties benefiting from a project, and all of the properties

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

within the boundary were assessed a share of the capital costs based on the benefits they received. She pointed out that a sewer ULID assessment against a property was prohibited by law from exceeding the benefit received from the availability of sewer service, in other words the dollar value of the assessment could not exceed the increase in value to the property. She said customers were typically allowed to pay off the assessment on an annual basis over 10 to 20 years.

Ms. Isaksen said that a single ULID could be formed to encompass the entire sewer service area but that it was more likely that multiple ULIDs would be established for individual neighborhoods within the service area. These ULIDs could be established over time as the collection system developed and expanded. Ms. Isaksen said that a ULID could be formed one of two ways: either the property owners within a proposed ULID boundary would petition the responsible governing entity (county) or the County Commissioners would adopt a resolution.

Ms. Isaksen presented three scenarios which would likely be used to recover capital costs. These are summarized below.

Strategy	Description
<i>Connection Charges for General and Local Costs</i>	Customer pays a fee when connects to sewer
<i>Connection Charges for General Costs and a ULID for Local Costs</i>	ULID Assessment is paid off annually once sewer lines come to the neighborhood, customer pays connection charge when connects to sewer
<i>Assessed Value for General and Local Costs</i>	When sewer lines come to the neighborhood, property owners pay annually based on value of their property; undeveloped property pays much less than developed property

Ms. Isaksen noted that it is typical for monthly rates to be used to pay off long-term debt, but that this was not a likely option for a new sewer system because there are no existing sewer customers to pay monthly rates.

Ms. Isaksen said that some jurisdictions allowed sewer customers to pay connection charges off over time. Thus, both connection charges and/or Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) assessments are mechanisms available that may enable customers to spread their payments over time, rather than pay a single, large, lump sum. Ms. Isaksen said that if customers were permitted to spread their connection charges over time, some entity, for example the County, would need to guarantee that the debt service would be paid and may need to bridge the difference for a period of time before the customers can provide full repayment.

Ms. Isaksen noted that the assessed value method is used much less commonly than connection charges or ULIDs. Each property’s assessment under this method would be based on that

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

property's assessed value for real estate tax purposes. Thus an undeveloped property would pay less than a developed property of the same size.

Estimates of Capital Costs per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU)*

Ms. Isaksen presented the estimated capital cost per ERU for commercial property and for residential property. For the residential property estimate, she assumed that a grant would cover 45% of the shared/common costs. She based her assumption on the maximum grant available from the USDA Rural Development program.

Ms. Isaksen displayed two tables that illustrated how customer payments for common/shared costs could be concentrated or spread over time, depending on the financing strategy used. Using a connection charge method, the customer would pay common/shared costs as well as the private/on-site cost at the time of connection. Using a combination strategy of a connection charge plus a ULID, the customer could begin paying Local costs when the ULID comes to the neighborhood, and could pay the General and private costs at the time of sewer hook-up.

Ms. Isaksen explained that the consultant team had tried to develop realistic, but conservative, cost estimates to ensure that the actual costs would be within the estimates and to enable the County and community to make realistic plans. Ms. Isaksen said the cost estimates had been based on recent bid results on other projects and that standard estimating procedures had been used. To be conservative, a 30% contingency was included in the capital costs, which Ms. Isaksen said was customary for planning level estimates. Ms. Isaksen said she had also included a 15% financing cost and had applied a conservative interest rate when calculating the estimated debt service payments for low interest loans.

Ms. Isaksen stressed that funding agencies looked favorably on projects with realistic cost estimates. She compared the capital cost estimates for a Port Hadlock UGA sewer system to three recent sewer system expansions in Western Washington to demonstrate the Port Hadlock UGA cost estimates were comparable with actual projects.

Operations & Maintenance Cost Estimate

Ms. Isaksen presented a planning level estimate of \$60/month per residence for on-going O&M costs, which included billing, administration, and state taxes. Some assistance may be available for low income customers. Commercial properties would be charged according to their water usage where one equivalent residential unit (ERU) would be equal to 4,500 gallons per month.

How to Continue to Reduce Costs

* One ERU is 4,500 gallons of wastewater produced per month for the purposes of this analysis. A business may represent multiple ERUs depending on the amount of wastewater produced. A single-family residence is typically considered one ERU, regardless of the amount of wastewater produced.

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

Ms. Isaksen concluded by stressing that the “art” of reducing the cost to sewer customers was only beginning. She encouraged the County and the community to prepare for approval of the sewer facility plan by exploring funding and financing options as soon as possible. She recommended approaching Congressional and legislative representatives, observing that Jefferson County had successfully obtained a federal line item to renovate the clock tower at the County Courthouse. Ms. Isaksen said that Jefferson County staff would be meeting with several funding program administrators at the IACC (Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council) Conference in Wenatchee at the end of October to get advice on how best to position the Port Hadlock UGA sewer project with funding agencies.

Ms. Isaksen highlighted the importance of seeking low-income assistance, such as USDA Rural Development and/or health department loans. She said that one option was to use grant funding to create a low-income assistance program.

Ms. Isaksen also encouraged the County and the community to explore opportunities for O&M cost savings during the implementation phase.

Finally, Ms. Isaksen said that maximizing the number of customers who participated in the first phase of sewer implementation would make it easier to distribute sewer system start-up costs.

Questions & Comments

Workshop participants commented and asked questions during the discussion period at the end of the workshop. Their comments and questions, as well as the project team’s responses, are summarized and grouped by topic below.

Cost Estimates

Comment: Although a business might constitute more than one ERU, the total capital cost to the business may not equal the estimated capital cost per ERU multiplied by the number of ERUs. This is because the estimated capital cost per ERU includes the private, on-site cost of connecting to sewer. If a business constitutes multiple ERUs, there would still be only one hook-up on the property. While that hook-up may be more expensive than a hook-up to a residence because of the size of the equipment, it may still be less than multiplying the estimated private, on-site cost per ERU by the number of ERUs.

Response (Isaksen): That is true.

Question: Is the 30% contingency factor built into the on-site, Local, and General costs? Is that typical? Do the actual costs usually come in that high?

Response (Dour): The contingency factor is built into the on-site, Local, and General costs. This is standard planning procedure. It is good planning, in part, to include a contingency factor in the estimate capital costs because, at the current planning level, the preliminary design does not account for details which will be discovered in final design. For example, the collection system was developed using an aerial contour map with 10 foot contour intervals, which is

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

acceptable for planning but is a coarse scale for final design. At the planning level, we made best guesses as to where maintenance holes would be located, but perhaps in the final design phase it will turn out that there need to be 10% more maintenance holes than we have anticipated. Also, we cannot predict how prices for materials like steel, concrete, or petroleum will change by the time construction could begin.

Question: Can you tell us more about why you included a 15% financing cost in the cost estimates?

Response (Isaksen): This is a conservative estimate of the cost of financing. Say you had to borrow money during construction and you had to pay interim interest on the construction funds until the permanent financing was complete. I have assumed this may be up to 2.5% of the amount financed. If you went to the open bond market, it might be another 2.5% for the underwriter and bond counsel, along with another 10% to borrow the required reserve. However, if you are organized and well-prepared, it is typically less expensive to obtain funding through grants and low-interest loan programs.

Question: Is the 15% financing cost included in the common/shared capital cost estimates, which are about \$21 million for General costs and about \$9 million for Local costs?

Response (Isaksen): I tried not to mix the calculation of the estimated costs *per ERU* with the total capital cost estimates that the engineers developed. The engineers provided cost estimates that included a 30% contingency factor. None of their total capital cost estimates included the 15% financing cost. In my financing work, I added the 15% financing cost only to the estimated *cost per ERU*.

Question: Did you break the estimated capital costs down as monthly costs per ERU?

Response (Isaksen): I avoid presenting capital costs on a monthly basis because I don't want to set the County up to have to accept payments on a monthly basis. However, if you assume a capital cost of \$12,850 for a residence, and that you would be paying it back over 20 years with an interest rate of 3.5 %, this would be approximately \$75 per month for the capital portion. Added to the estimated \$60 per month for on-going O&M and administration, it could be \$135 per month.

Question: You've presented a variety of financial approaches, but are you recommending the most expensive sewer system technology?

Response (Isaksen): The preferred alternative has the highest initial capital costs among the technologies that the engineers evaluated. However, the life cycle costs of the preferred alternative are lower because on-site and operation and maintenance costs of the other technologies tend to increase the life cycle costs over time.

When the preferred alternative type of system is built, you don't have to redo it, and you get a higher level of treatment that anticipates future regulations. From a financial perspective, the average cost per ERU over 20 years is about \$1,500 more than the least expensive technologies of a STEP collection system with an SBR treatment plant.

Question: Are the cost estimates per ERU based on the 20-year planning boundary or the six-year planning boundary?

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

Response (Isaksen): The cost estimates per ERU were based on the average of the 20-year planning area. If the estimates were calculated only up to the year 2018, the cost per ERU would be about \$5,000 higher because there would be fewer connections to share in the cost of treatment plant. There are cost savings associated with bringing residential customers on to the system in the latter decade of the 20-year planning period.

Question: You assumed that solids handling would be contracted to a private hauler. Are there multiple companies doing this work: is there competition? We don't want to be stuck with one company if their prices rise.

Response (Santroch): There are multiple private haulers, and there are also public haulers like the City of Port Angeles. We based our cost estimates on one, stable private hauler. Also, if prices for hauling rise, the cost-effectiveness of investing in solids handling facilities in Port Hadlock could be revisited.

Question: Did you build expected growth into your per ERU cost estimates for the core area?

Response (Dour): Yes, we made planning level assumptions about growth. We used population forecasts from the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, and we used the land use map for the Irondale/Port Hadlock area, which defines densities for residential and commercial development. We checked the ratio of commercial to residential development against the ratio of commercial to residential water usage and against the ratio of development in similar communities to backcheck the ratio used in our projections.

If the sewer system is built, a comprehensive sewer plan will be developed, which must be regularly updated. The comprehensive sewer plan would contain updates to the growth projections as the area develops and the County's Comprehensive Plan changes.

Financing Strategies

Question: What political entity will pursue financing strategies, such as establishing a ULID, for the sewer system?

Response (John Fischbach, Jefferson County Administrator): It is ultimately the County's responsibility to pursue these strategies.

Question: How many years in advance of sewer availability may a ULID be established?

Response (Wheeler): That is a legal question, and we don't know for sure.

Funding Availability

Question: Why did you assume a 45% grant for residences? Would we get that grant?

Response (Isaksen): I assumed a 45% grant for residential ERUs from the USDA Rural Development, which is the maximum amount available from that program. These grants are available for hardship situations, which are defined as cases where sewer services cost more than 1.5% of monthly income. Based on the median household income of the Irondale/Port Hadlock census area, this project would clearly qualify for the maximum grant funding from the USDA Rural Development program. Grant funding is available up to a maximum of 45% of capital costs to help bring the sewer service costs down towards 1.5% of monthly income.

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

Please note that being qualified does not guarantee a grant or an amount; it is necessary to apply for the grant.

Question: Are there other grant sources for connection fees if the Housing Authority owns a residential property that is connected to the sewer system? Is there a waiver for such properties?

Response (Isaksen): A representative of the USDA Rural Development sewer system grants program mentioned to me other housing grants that are available from other administrators. As I understand it, there are other funding sources for low income residences. I don't know if only residents are eligible, or if non-resident property owners are eligible.

Question: Is there enough sewer grant funding in the current federal budget for all of the qualified applicants?

Response (Isaksen): There almost certainly is not. It is important to have a good application to get to the top of the list.

Preliminary Design

Question: Are there any land uses that are incompatible with being adjacent to a wastewater treatment plant? Are there innovative land uses adjacent to wastewater treatment plants?

Response (Santroch): People often oppose having a wastewater treatment plant nearby, but we are including provisions in the cost estimates to make this wastewater treatment plant a good neighbor. We are using the Port Townsend wastewater treatment facility, which is adjacent to homes, as a comparable model of how to be a good neighbor.

Question: You've talked about doing odor control and visual screening at the wastewater treatment facility. Are there noise issues as well?

Response (Santroch): Treatment plants can be noisy. However, noise control methods are typically used to limit the noise levels to 40 decibels, which is quieter than my speaking voice right now.

Response (Wheeler): An acceptable level of noise for a Port Hadlock treatment plant would be determined through the State Environmental Policy Act, but it is fairly easy to mitigate noise for the type of treatment facility being proposed. I would encourage anyone to visit the Port Townsend wastewater treatment plan for reference.

Question: You are proposing a pump station in the vicinity of the library. Would there also be one to pump wastewater up from the alcohol plant?

Response (Dour): Yes, there would be a few local pump stations. In terms of estimating the General costs, we planned for one large, influent pump station in the vicinity of the library because the overall collection system as laid out in this plan tends to drain towards this area. Smaller, local pump stations were included in the Local cost estimates.

Question: Do the trucks pick sludge up from the treatment facility or from the pump station?

Response (Dour): Sludge is picked up at the treatment facility.

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

Question: With contract hauling for solids handling, how many trucks would be traveling to and from the wastewater treatment facility?

Response (Santroch): In the early years, probably one truck a week. If contract disposal were continued as the sewer system expanded, you could get up to one truck per day.

Question: There have been several sewage spill accidents in the news recently. While the proposed wastewater treatment facility would be cleaner than other options, the potential sites for the facility are very close to drinking water sources. Why are you suggesting sites so close to drinking water? Is it just cheaper?

Response (Santroch): It is important to note that, by law, wastewater treatment and disposal facilities must be located a prescribed distance away from drinking water wells. One of the main drivers of the evaluation of potential disposal sites was local interest in recharging Chimacum Creek. We pursued options that would recharge the creek further upstream to be more beneficial.

Response (Wheeler): The consultant team is also studying the hydrology of the area to ensure that disposed effluent would flow towards the creek and not towards a well. That is part of our job.

Next Steps and Wrap Up

Mr. Wheeler thanked the attendees for their input. He outlined the next steps in the development of the sewer facility plan, which included a public meeting on October 25, the completion of the draft sewer facility plan by the end of 2006, a public meeting to be scheduled in February 2007, and Department of Ecology approval of the sewer facility plan in March of 2007.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Workshop Attendance

The public workshop was attended by County Commissioner Phil Johnson (District 1), County Commissioner David Sullivan (District 2) and County Commissioner Pat Rodgers (District 3). Additional attendees are listed below.

Name	Affiliation
Robert Bates	Citizen
Mike Blair	Chimacum School District
Bill Brock	Northwest School of Wooden Boatbuilding
Brent Butler	Jefferson County
Evan Cael	Peninsula Daily News
Phil Flynn	Citizen
Alan Goodwin	Community United Methodist Church
Elaine Goodwin	Community United Methodist Church
Laurie Gore	Citizen
Sandy Hershelman	Jefferson County Home Builders Association

Port Hadlock UGA – Sewer Facility Plan

Name	Affiliation
Sandra Hill	Citizen
Douglas Joyce	Citizen
Maureen Joyce	Citizen
Elizabeth Lammers	Citizen
Garrett Larsen	Citizen
Rebecca Lopeman	Citizen
Kimberly Macintosh	Citizen
Bill Mahler	Northwest School of Wooden Boatbuilding
Bob Matheson	Citizen
Margaret Matheson	Citizen
Kathy McKenna	Jefferson County Housing Authority
William Miller	Jefferson County Planning Commission
Jim Parker	Jefferson PUD #1
Frances Rawski	Citizens for the UGA
Dana Roberts	Jefferson PUD #1
H.C. Rogers	Citizen
Chuck Russell	Valley Tavern
Craig C. Smith	Peninsula Video
Bonnetta Starlin	Citizen

Consultant Team Staff in Attendance

TetraTech/KCM

Kevin Dour, Project Manager; Jim Santroch, Senior Project Engineer – Treatment

Katy Isaksen & Associates

Katy Isaksen, Financial Analyst

Triangle Associates, Inc.

Bob Wheeler, Facilitator; Ellen Blair, Public Involvement Support