

## Kitsap Wastewater Infrastructure Taskforce Interview Compilation

	<i>Charge</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Major Issues</i>	<i>Immutable Positions</i>	<i>Mistrust</i>	<i>Commitment</i>	<i>Your Advice</i>
	What do you understand the WIT is charged with doing?	What do you expect this effort to "look like" when it's complete?	What are the big issues you think will be challenging to resolve?	Do you have any positions which you feel absolutely cannot be bargained?	Are there individuals or organizations whom you do not trust?	Are you ready to stick with this until there is agreement, even if the only agreement is there can be no agreement?	Is there any advice you want to give me?
1	Lack of infrastructure is due to lack of planning - so the WIT goal is to figure out what it takes to provide infrastructure for the next 20 years. Sewers "leap frogged" existing development - the County needs to consider broader GMA requirements. Cost is huge constraint. Cost-effectiveness has to be viewed in long-term. "Leave no home behind" is a goal. We're done when: We can answer "what does it take to comply with the GMA? Where do sewers go? What are the costs? Do we have sufficient information for the Commissioners to figure it out?"	WIT results will be put in the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan - for Cities. 20 year and 6 year - It should have sufficient detail to suggest prioritization. we need a substantive 20 year plan, with costs, so if there is a UGA addition we know how it fits. We need to think in terms of an "adoptable" Comprehensive Plan amendment. Action plan is necessary too.	Big issues: cost of service resources; who/where goes first?; how to determine the easiest path for purveyors, developers, existing homes. Things can't be 100% developer funded; we've got to deal with existing development too.	The entire existing UGA needs a 20-year plan - including existing development. Next time the County looks at expanding UGAs, we need to know the impacts of that expansion. Historically, Kitsap has had lower-density development. We don't have a multi-family constituency.	There are good trust levels. It is in my interest to have this work. I am not dishonest. We know each other. We don't want to fail. We want success. We're tired of failing.	I have scheduling difficulties. Evening works better. Very committed.	Stick with staff.
2	Commissioners called the Taskforce together in response to GMMHB decisions. UGAs - needed attention. Barb is working on 20 yr. Facilities Plan for Wastewater. Cities doing similar. Not sure we will know when we're done. Taskforce role is to make recommendation (or multiple recommendations) and devise options on how to proceed.	WIT should ideally develop a list of projects over next 20 yrs, including their schedule and funding sources. It should be consistent with individual planning documents. Maybe we need a uniform approach established. It's possible WIT is the start of a continuing planning process.	Challenges: 1) Identify how to coordinate our planning for infrastructure. 2) Funding: Who pays, and how. (Developers want to promote development, as opposed to having governments doing planning, avoiding future environmental problems.	I think we need to do whatever is reasonable from an engineering perspective. I would dig in against sprawl.		Highly committed.	Intervene with practical ideas and solutions.
3	Identify what's there now and what should be our sewer system for future = WIT goal. Also, identify capacity needs, and put a price on completing the system. We need different eyes to look at issues (examples: legacy lots, small lots). Tom wants public sewers - both ownership and maintenance. In Kingston, the County reduced density and expanded the area.	People must understand interrelationships of the issues - there will be no deal until the whole deal is worked out. I have good comfort with staff; we have a short schedule, we know the questions - let's get working on it.	Challenge: Where will the lines go? (ownership). How much do they cost? Who pays? And accompanying land use challenges.	No immutables.			

Appendix A

	<i>Charge</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Major Issues</i>	<i>Immutable Positions</i>	<i>Mistrust</i>	<i>Commitment</i>	<i>Your Advice</i>
	What do you understand the WIT is charged with doing?	What do you expect this effort to "look like" when it's complete?	What are the big issues you think will be challenging to resolve?	Do you have any positions which you feel absolutely cannot be bargained?	Are there individuals or organizations whom you do not trust?	Are you ready to stick with this until there is agreement, even if the only agreement is there can be no agreement?	Is there any advice you want to give me?
4	Our goal, defined broadly is to take a deliberate look at infrastructure; how to meet our upcoming needs. This will set the stage for transfer if sewer infrastructure to the cities. We need a strategic plan replete with responsibilities clearly identified. Kitsap is the state's 2nd or 3rd most densely populated county. County could be at risk of default. We need to develop 6 year capital facilities plan. Kitsap revolving fund - could incentivize in-fill. We should establish guiding principles - what is regional (County) role, what is not?. We should develop a phasing plan. We should not need to establish ground rules for the WIT - we should operate on the basis of <u>consensus</u> .	See previous. OK to tease out how to resolve.	Challenges = Greenfield vs. infill development. Who pays / when? Developing the data to evaluate our choices: the real costs and benefits associated with infill; costs are solid, but benefits are not so clear. Another challenge: growth allocations. Builders want certainty.	Open.	Suspicion of county by the cities. Developers distrust certain individuals.		Keeping it <u>on-point</u> .
5	WIT goal: Solve sewerage issues for Gorst, other areas; address the concerns of SKIA. Find an economically feasible way to accomplish the sewerage issue. We should operate together as a task force and collaborate to find the best way forward. Consider SKIA issues for Port Orchard and Bremerton. The SKIA Plan is for the Port to provide sewer, Bremerton to purvey water. The Commissioners have cut deals. Annexation is only at about 10%. People want to be part of Bremerton.	I think we should end with a sense of the plan, and a road map on how to complete it. We should develop goals and objectives, and a financial plan. We should identify steps and a schedule. Our attention needs to be focused. We should "Do something." - it should be an Action Plan. The Port uses all its taxing authority. We have an anti-tax Commission due to <b>IDD</b> for Marina. There are prints on the knife @ Commission level.	Challenges: Who does what? And Costs - who pays capital and operating costs? We need to consider life cycle costing. Where will the lines go? Public involvement.	Open. Like to play together. Phasing/cost.	Folks have been upfront.	Port of Bremerton is <u>in</u> .	Find money. Transportation funding models may be helpful.
6	Kitsap had planned unit development rules in place. Bangor started the rural sewerage - County wouldn't expand mains. should this be all the developers' responsibility? <b>The County has had no</b> long range plan; infrastructure has been project driven. The W.I.T. is working on "Smart Growth" - How to make UGA work, considering all infrastructure needs - sewer/water/storm. Would like to operate by consensus, but we need to develop an alternative to how things are being done. We need to figure out how to fund a plan that facilitates sewers. We need to understand financing tools and options. We need to look at phasing. We need to make the law work.	At completion, we should get approval of what's been done. Local governments will be engaged in funding. I don't know how it will look.	Challenges: Turf Wars. Money. Coordination.	No shrinking of existing UGAs. Possibility - maintain the same acreage for overall UGAs.	Get out of the box. Don't re-hash.		

Appendix A

	<i>Charge</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Major Issues</i>	<i>Immutable Positions</i>	<i>Mistrust</i>	<i>Commitment</i>	<i>Your Advice</i>
	What do you understand the WIT is charged with doing?	What do you expect this effort to "look like" when it's complete?	What are the big issues you think will be challenging to resolve?	Do you have any positions which you feel absolutely cannot be bargained?	Are there individuals or organizations whom you do not trust?	Are you ready to stick with this until there is agreement, even if the only agreement is there can be no agreement?	Is there any advice you want to give me?
7	WIT needs to validate/consider current facility plans and advise the County on what's needed for UGA-compliant sewers. We need to consider ways to fund what's needed and advise County on how to move forward (what is supposed to be done; what do we HAVE to do to meet UGA requirements?). WIT is an Advisory group to the Commission. There is no co clear process for us to get to success. We should develop maps of our existing infrastructure systems, so we get an integrated picture (who/what/when etc.). WIT should be involved in vetting of funding opportunities.	County needs to be serious about UGAs and fill in the plans. We need the County to have serious commitment. We should end with information that points out all possible/legal approaches - pros/cons/potentials. Need County to act and reflect in CFP and Comp Plans.	Challenges: Funding. Commitment to achieving 20 year infrastructure.	We have to get the Comp Plan congruent with UGAs - Developer driven is not good enough. I'm very open to alternative systems ideas.	Old appeal struggles have not gone away.	Solid.	Facilitate. Watch for openness and honesty. We may need more from wastewater engineers. Pay attention to estimates and estimating protocol.
8	People do not think this will provide workable results - we are just facing huge cost numbers. Not sure what we're supposed to do as a Task Force. We may not be there to solve a problem. Often things are ignored at the County. PBRC may struggle. Bauer is untested, and his vocation may dictate a different solution. Our problem: Sewers need to be provided. Some want to stop things - density is not desired here. In Kitsap County, we have shallow wells. We're facing a \$2000 impact fee for parks/roads/school. Four areas of concern: Bainbridge, NK, CK, Bremerton-SK. Central funding KRCC. Sitting at the table implies good intent. I'd like to see up/down votes, but will we have too many ? It would be good for WIT to define a solution. But who is available to do the work?	We should end with ordinances requiring cooperation: for example, GIS network that indicates where the sewers are, where they need to go, and how much they will cost. We should aim for central funding - a consolidated grant/lending agency. The Buildable Lands Committee was a worthy effort. Zoning should match infrastructure.	Challenges: Money - we have got solve this one. We cannot wait. People are not passing the levies - we've got to provide assurance that the money will be used wisely.				
9	Do we have an overall Sewer Plan? There is great ambiguity concerning sewer service areas. Is it realistic to hope that WIT will solve these issues? The Task Force has been sort of imposed by the County. There are real estate interests, commercial interests.	Consensus. See issues.	Challenges; Money. Certainty. Annexations. Urban levels of service. "Concurrence" per GMA. Revenue Sharing.	Open.	Reservation about commercializing the plan.		
10	The WIT goal? That is the question I've been asking. I think they want a sewer plan and funding for 25 years. If that's the real goal, we can't do it. So the goal is not clear. We should have better guiding principles. Developers should build sewers. There should be no grants to build new sewers - no gifts. Who's going to pay?	Given the info I have, we can't achieve success. We don't have cash. This is a land use issue.	Challenges: Money - who pays. Land use questions. Design Engineer needs to be there.	Cannot bend on expanding Karcher Creek. - Won't allow independent package plant. Debt service is \$1,000,000. Got to cover.	Well entrenched positions - not so much lack of trust issue, just hard positions.	This is important - in it to stay.	Do not take wastewater out of context - WW is the topic, not the agenda. Our confidence in the planners is limited. Be careful with verbatim transcripts.

Appendix A

	<i>Charge</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Major Issues</i>	<i>Immutable Positions</i>	<i>Mistrust</i>	<i>Commitment</i>	<i>Your Advice</i>
	What do you understand the WIT is charged with doing?	What do you expect this effort to "look like" when it's complete?	What are the big issues you think will be challenging to resolve?	Do you have any positions which you feel absolutely cannot be bargained?	Are there individuals or organizations whom you do not trust?	Are you ready to stick with this until there is agreement, even if the only agreement is there can be no agreement?	Is there any advice you want to give me?
11	The WIT charge is to develop a plan to fully sewer our UGAs. We should identify the scopes of projects, phasing and funding. Comp plans lead to sewers. But how the County can complete a plan to sewer our UGAs hasn't been made clear. I guess it will be jurisdiction by jurisdiction. Should Poulsbo handle it? Operations - should be out of the County's hands.	We should end with affordable sewers, leading to affordable housing. we should address rates; connection charges. Kitsap Co. can handle Poulsbo capacity needs. Mains should be provided by the public agencies; the rest is by developer extension.	Challenges: Money. Capacity. Jurisdictional Responsibility. Prioritization. Density vs. Sprawl. Alternative technologies.	Most issues open.	Good. No hiddens.	Watch interests, stay involved. Watch \$ - affordable sewers.	Keep on schedule. Have objectives. Donuts & coffee.
12	WIT goal is to bring stakeholders together to address sewerage in UGA. I see our products as: 1) Review/mapping existing and new sewers on one map. 2) Identify funding mechanisms, including those allowed and not allowed, and potential new funding sources.. 3) Prioritize a sewer phasing kick-off-point. Prioritizations should include area-specific funding and best bang for the investment. We should operate via <u>consensus</u> . All viewpoint should be heard.	The end product should be clear, concise, not a county document. All the stakeholders will make progress toward concepts. It will be a guidance document toward decision. A Foundational Element.	Challenges: Money. Location of infrastructure. Forced connections. Size of urban growth areas. Size of facilities. GMA compliance. Continue to develop onsite. Decide how we decide when existing development needs sewer. Silent majority that does not want density. How do we do this?			Don Quixote - with it forever.	Develop a WIT <u>document</u> with an independent feel. Keep things collaborative.
13	WIT should identify a Capital Facilities Element in the Comp Plan for sewer. Really we should identify how to fund and prioritize our sewer investments. UGAs are meant to plan for 20 years. If WIT figures it out, great. Some ideas may be developed for how to move forward. We have some conflicts we will have to deal with - related to both personality and past history. We should have common goals. The facilitator has to figure out how to resolve conflicts. We'll be done when: We've got to know about costs - how expensive will it be, and what are our options to fund the costs? Developers? Public funds? Public Works has failed to date to provide leadership for sewer infrastructure.	At the end, we should set up funding mechanisms - like Art talks about. Maybe a LIRT ? We should have a system to prioritize actions. We should be "area centric" - not County wide. South Kitsap may not have political connection. WIT will do work - But will County implement? That's my question.	Challenge: Hard funding - folks are of open mind on this. Prioritization. Implementation has to be brought to higher level. Help Mark implement plan. County rule on 2001 connection - enforce or not?	No place to go but up - Not much has happened. No immutables. In 14 yrs - a dozen 5 acre lots. Provide incentive to create urban lots. There is enough growth.	Can't be stuck in past.	No problem - Motive is to give back.	Keep on point. Be efficient in use of time.

Appendix A

	<i>Charge</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Major Issues</i>	<i>Immutable Positions</i>	<i>Mistrust</i>	<i>Commitment</i>	<i>Your Advice</i>
	What do you understand the WIT is charged with doing?	What do you expect this effort to "look like" when it's complete?	What are the big issues you think will be challenging to resolve?	Do you have any positions which you feel absolutely cannot be bargained?	Are there individuals or organizations whom you do not trust?	Are you ready to stick with this until there is agreement, even if the only agreement is there can be no agreement?	Is there any advice you want to give me?
14	WIT goals: 1) Provide forum for affected/involved entities to address WW infrastructure. This opportunity does not happen here much. 2) Provide a focal point/source/support for future WW infrastructure decisions - this should not be left just to the county. We should establish a 10-person board. Eric laid out some ground rules. All have played together before - we should strive for consensus (not yet defined), then folks in charge will have to decide. The Health District can't have consensus impede public health. There will likely be disagreement on where sewers should be located, but this should be minor. Prioritizing is difficult, and funding (finding sufficient money) will be a challenge.	When we're done, we'll have maps showing sewerage with a plan and timelines for infrastructure. Super gold star is a funding plan. I'd like to see recommendations for everyone to sign on. WIT should help facilitate future decisions. The County has too many too small lots - we should consider a community drainfield. We have a political disconnect on GMA, but no assistance; stormwater regs are not coordinated with health. It doesn't seem to fit. Locals get no help. Places where we can rely on infiltration are limited. Kitsap is 85% reliant on ground water - over 1000 small group E waters and a 100 group A system. Watch the water.	Challenges: Hardest - funding. Infrastructure to areas where its needed. Prioritizing. Couple of anti-growth reps on WIT, but most will agree. If you build it, they will come.	Most any idea is OK. Health won't budge on sewage failure. They will not be compromised on effluent surfacing, drainfield plugged. Others on the WIT may be immovable. Fear of density, inspired by density. If I help pay, I should get max density despite what others may think.	Everybody in there knows everybody. No mistrust issues - most capable of compromise. Everyone.	Be sure the people get adequate notice. Give good notice.	Make sure agenda, times are announced. Don't drive the meeting.
15	WIT goal is to rubber stamp something. We are just being used - We're supposed to look at the stuff and help figure out the best places to locate sewers. They want to use local knowledge - want to get details- Everything is being done to satisfy the GMHB.	We should identify a design capacity for the future in "steps." We should establish thresholds/triggers for each step. We should identify what we mean by "buildable." Need to use common sense.	Challenges: Funding - provisions for expansions of treatment. Plant is overbuilt, borrowing from Navy. Capacity - Public Works' planning for the future is good on plant capacity. Logical Pump Station Locations - they need to be reasonable.	No immutable position. Property owners rights need to be respected. Avoid the attitude that developers are bad people and it's time to punish them.	No lack of trust issues from a group perspective.	I bail if this turns into a complete washout.	Use common sense. Be practical.
16	WIT's goal? The impetus came from an appeal to GMHB on Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Everybody likes the mapping. WIT's charge is to help the County move closer to having wastewater infrastructure planned and phased for UGAs. Pump stations that make sense. However, Cities can't afford to fund the needed infrastructure. WIT should develop a framework for costs and accommodations for individual developments. WIT should develop an organization of utilities and other jurisdictions are not congruent. WIT should develop visions of some solution suites that get growth into urban zones. It's a good idea to get different interest groups together to have conversations. I like to listen. We do have access to Olympia now. If WIT reaches consensus, then Olympia will be happy.	When complete, our baseline level should be to make GMA work. I prefer infrastructure. We could use Transfer of development rights to make areas outside UGAs securely rural. We should plan for "windows" of finance. We should make UGAs attractive. Developers want to pay the minimum. We should consider Impact fees - currently charge 1/3 of what we need to charge for impact fees.	Challenges: Hardest: 1) Funding - who pays, who loses (roads/congestion). 2) Feasibility of sewer locations in UGAs. Where can we locate? 3) Identify problems that are thwarting incorporation of UGA by Central City. 4) Identify what is possible - we should do something. County needs to get out of providing urban (sewer) services.	Don't degrade Puget Sound. I like Purple Pipe (reclaimed/reused wastewater). We have to stay inside the GMA lines. I don't have to say my thought to have thought. Tom was not invited - he inserted. Pay attention to sewerage.	Government employees have hardest role. Have to be neutral.	Long term interest. Committed to GMA compliance. Lack of sewers is preventing growth of urban areas. Minimize cost, environmental degradation, make for happiness, avoid sprawl.	Write down what has been spoken. Follow up.

Appendix A

<i>Charge</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Major Issues</i>	<i>Immutable Positions</i>	<i>Mistrust</i>	<i>Commitment</i>	<i>Your Advice</i>
What do you understand the WIT is charged with doing?	What do you expect this effort to "look like" when it's complete?	What are the big issues you think will be challenging to resolve?	Do you have any positions which you feel absolutely cannot be bargained?	Are there individuals or organizations whom you do not trust?	Are you ready to stick with this until there is agreement, even if the only agreement is there can be no agreement?	Is there any advice you want to give me?
17 To date, the County's infrastructure needs have been handled in fits and starts without everyone at the table. This is a real challenge, and conversations with different stakeholders should be continued. The County has been using military-paid staff since 80s. But now the County is on its own. Now reality is at hand - we have no sugar daddy. We need to figure out how to pay, and how to make that manageable in a 4-yr term. If WIT can develop schedules for needed infrastructure, it would be very valuable. "Consensus" model - as opposed to mediation or weighted voting - I think we need to consider various means for resolution of disagreements. Maybe we write a draft interlocal agreement. We could help create a new framework.	WIT has evolved into real process to fix things - this is good. Mapping alone will be helpful. We should develop a Tool kit for ULID - incorporations; multiple jurisdictions. We should plan based on "basins." We should have GIS info that is easily downloaded; we should identify a standard for as-builts - uniform process. We should have a unified grant authority - something like community development block grant. Uniform funding. Setting up appropriation efforts. Increased backing.	Everything is solvable with enough money and technology. Decentralized wastewater is possible - we could send solids to main plant. This is the LOTT model. Not a huge centralized plant - that is the Brightwater model. Political issues - look for phased approaches, identify and build on small successes. Take a Basin-level approach. Funding growth driven by basin. Mapping by basins. Maybe funding districts based on basins.	We want what's best for the city - we need to serve the growth of the City, not restrict it with insufficient service. Deferred maintenance has meant that annexation areas are not getting attention. We need consistency and uniform development standards.	County has been the powerhouse with the most revenue. GMA has changed that to favor the cities. County is reluctant to accept that. County budget goes down at \$2,000,000 per year. Old sewer agreements may be overlooked. Need to keep this renewed every two year. Distrust can occur - we need transparency.		The product will be the selling point. A tool kit will be celebrated. Give equal weight to all opinions. Small things - provide acknowledgment.