

EIS San Juan Island
---[P 1]---

PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR SAN JUAN ISLAND TRANSFER STATION

BEFORE HEARING EXAMINER) VERBATIM RECORD/PROCEEDINGS
TOM MOSER)
)
) September 11, 2008
)
)
)

=====

A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S:

HEARING EXAMINER
Tom Moser

SOLID WASTE PROGRAM MANAGER
Steven M. Alexander

SENIOR PLANNER
Shannon Fitzgerald

UTILITY MANAGER
Ed Hale

AMEC
ENVIRONMENT PLANNING MANAGER
Gary Harshman

ALLEN R. EMERSON & ASSOCIATES
Court Reporters
1226 McGarigle Street
Sedro Woolley, WA. 98284
(360) 856-2618/Skagit County
(360) 734-2262/Whatcom Count

---[P 2]---

	I-N-D-E-X OF SPEAKERS IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE	
	NAME OF SPEAKER	PAGE NUMBER
1		
2		
3		
4	Opening Statement/Moser	3
5	Mike MacDonald	7, 48
6	Bill Hamilton	11
7	Marc Islam	13
8	Frank Fagan	14
9	Gordy Petersen	17
10	Jack Yelverton	21
11	Juniper Mass	24
12	Claudia Mills	28
13	Sean Mercer	29
14	Vick Packard	35
15	Dave Cable	36
16	Roger Bennett	41
17	Chris Clarke	43
18	Barbara Marrett	44
19	Virginia Beaudon	46
20	Dan Miller	49
21	Mack Douglas	50
22	Sherry Sweet (Phonetic)	51
23	Jenny Roberts	52
24	Closing Statement/Moser	53
25		

---[P 3]---

1 VERBATIM RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS regarding the
2 above entitled matter held at the Mullis Community
3 Center, 589 Nash Street, City of Friday Harbor,
4 County of San Juan, State of Washington before Tom
5 Moser and reported by Allen R. Emerson, notary
6 public and Court Reporter in and for the State of
7 Washington, commencing at the hour of 4:30 o'clock
8 PM on Thursday, September 11, 2008

9 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had
10 and commentary given, to wit:

11 MR. MOSER: Well good afternoon.
12 Welcome to this meeting, public hearing to discuss
13 this document, San Juan Island Solid Waste Transfer
14 Station Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Today
15 is September 11, 2008 and it is now just a few
16 minutes past 4:30 and we are in Friday Harbor. My
17 name is Tom Moser and not that that matters but to
18 let you know why I am here and who I am. I am a
19 former prosecuting attorney for San Juan County
20 several decades ago. Former prosecuting attorney for
21 Skagit County. I am a deputy hearing examiner for
22 San Juan County, a hearing examiner for the City of
23 Mount Vernon and a hearing examiner for the City of
24 Sedro-Woolley and I do language law but I am not
25 making any decisions here today, my job is just

---[P 4]---

1 simply to conduct this public hearing and facilitate
2 things for you. I am not going to be weighing in at
3 all on this decision or this process.

4 The meeting today is the last opportunity you
5 will have to make comments here in public about this
6 document. This has been a process as you know that
7 has gone on for some period of time and we are here
8 to listen, more of a listening program than anything
9 else. I can't answer any of your questions. I
10 reviewed the document just very briefly. I am not
11 here to help you understand it but there are people
12 here who are on staff for San Juan County Community
13 Development and Planning and there are also people
14 who are here who authored the document,
15 environmental consulting people, and they again are
16 not here to answer your questions but to listen to
17 your comments.

18 We have got about twenty-five (25) people out
19 there and I don't know how many more will show up
20 but what I would like to do, we have a couple of
21 hours this afternoon to call the people that have
22 signed up that wanted to be speakers and give
23 everybody at least three minutes to speak. If you
24 want more then wait until everybody has had an
25 opportunity to speak and I will open it up again for

---[P 5]---

1 more comments and that is not because we don't want
2 to hear you or because I am tired of listening to
3 you, it's just that we want to give everybody an
4 opportunity to be heard. So just to be fair we will
5 keep it to three minutes or so and then if you would
6 just yield the floor and somebody else can have
7 their turn and if at the end of the day you feel
8 like something hasn't been said or you want more
9 time, we will certainly give it to you.

10 There is still time to make written comments
11 and you can do that by submitting those and I
12 understand that period expires tomorrow at 4:30 and
13 you can submit those to the planning department in
14 writing. I have done these hearings for thirty (30)
15 years and I can tell you that three minutes may not
16 seem like a very long period of time but sometimes
17 if you haven't organized your thoughts or you are
18 not used to public speaking, it is a long three
19 minutes. You feel like boy I'll never get out of
20 here. For other people, maybe you have got prepared
21 thoughts and you read this thing and you have
22 analyzed it and you have got a lot of comments to
23 make about it and you want more time and if three
24 minutes isn't enough just ask if you can come back
25 and share more thoughts with us. That does not

---[P 6]---

1 preclude you, of course, from putting things in
2 writing and I would encourage you to do that.

3 Let me see, what else. Okay, we are not going
4 to swear people in, this is just your time to
5 comment on this document. So you don't have to be
6 under oath. There is a microphone here. Allen
7 Emerson is a court reporter and he is taking down
8 everything that you say so that the people who are
9 going to look at the comments can refer to that
10 transcript if they want. If you do ask a question it
11 probably will not be answered today but in the
12 responses, there is going to be a response time in
13 the Final Environmental Impact Statement and then
14 the people who are the authors of that, seeing your
15 questions, will attempt to give you some answers.
16 But really, this is an opportunity for you to
17 comment about what has already been said about the
18 environmental impacts of this project. You can see
19 how this is outlined here and if you think something
20 is not contained in here, this is your opportunity
21 to say so. If you see something that isn't quite
22 right, this is your opportunity to say so. So feel
23 free to focus your comments. I guess I will say
24 this, if you show that you have read it the more
25 attention your comments will have.

---[P 7]---

1 So the first person that signed up is Mike
2 MacDonald and I apologize if I have mispronounced
3 your name but I'll do my best to read these and
4 again come up to the microphone and make your
5 comments.

6 MR. MacDONALD: My name is Mike
7 MacDonald for the record, M-a-c-D-o-n-a-l-d
8 (spelling).

9 MR. MOSER: If you want to give your
10 address too that would be helpful.

11 MR. MacDONALD: Address is Box 1571,
12 Friday Harbor. I believe the facts presented in this
13 DIS were cherry-picked. There is a pattern of
14 omitting what favors leaving the transfer station
15 where it is and including what favors building the
16 new station on Beaverton Valley Road.

17 I begin on the first page. The
18 general state environmental policy act is cited but
19 not the specific code which is WAC 197-11-440 that
20 spells out what this EIS must contain. It appears to
21 me there are ten areas that this DEIS does not
22 conform with in state law in general because of lack
23 of specific detail and analysis. An environmental
24 consultant hired by the planning department wrote
25 "This EIS is not explicit enough in comparing

---[P 8]---

1 alternatives." The law requires the EIS to address
2 major conclusions, significant areas of controversy
3 and uncertainty, if any, and issues to be resolved
4 including environmental choices to be made among
5 alternative choices of action. There are a few
6 conclusions here, just a shapeless lump of mud.
7 There are few analyses and no comparisons of
8 environmental choices. According to this DEIS, there
9 are no significant areas of controversy. No
10 significant areas of controversy. This approach is a
11 lie by omission. Here are two of many subjects of
12 heated community debate and protest not addressed as
13 the law requires. Should public works make the
14 biggest traffic diversion in county history. Is that
15 diversion safe? There are no facts in the EIS to
16 judge the alternatives. Neither the current
17 condition nor the proposed alternatives are
18 described, mapped or analyzed. What effects will
19 moving the site have on the accident rate on
20 intersections, on congestion in the town, on the
21 quality of life, on the safety of pedestrians and
22 bicyclists. There are insufficient details here to
23 make a determination.

24 The second example. Should public works
25 environmentally degrade a new piece of property or

---[P 9]---

1 rebuild on land already degraded? Neither question
2 is asked in the EIS, no facts or evidence presented
3 pro or con as the law requires. The question, like
4 so much in this process is just ignored. The
5 relevant law reads, significant impacts on both the
6 natural environment and the built environment must
7 be analyzed and relevant. This involves impacts upon
8 and quality of the physical surroundings, whether
9 they are in wild, rural or urban areas. A discussion
10 of significant impacts shall include the cost of and
11 effects on public services such as utilities, roads,
12 fire and police protection.

13 Cost. How many times have we been told by
14 county officials that state law forbids any
15 discussion of costs in the EIS. Myself multiple
16 times. In fact the law requires a certain discussion
17 of costs. There are none in this EIS. You can spend
18 five million dollars on Beaverton Valley Road and it
19 still would be less safe than Roche Harbor Road
20 where the traffic is now by accepted traffic
21 standards. Yet public works wants to move the trash
22 site to the most dangerous road under consideration.

23 I ask Mr. Hendrickson, (phonetic) ultimately
24 responsible for the accuracy of this EIS, why he was
25 not analyzing the specific details to determine

---[P 10]---

1 which road was safest. We don't have to pick the
2 safest road" he said, we will study mitigation
3 measures after a site is selected. The law reads,
4 devote sufficiently detailed analysis to each
5 reasonable alternative to permit a comparative
6 evaluation of those alternatives. It was not done
7 here. The law also says we may discuss the technical
8 feasibility and economic practicality of mitigation
9 measures and none are contained here. The county's
10 own Comprehensive Plan was also cherry-picked with
11 selected quotations omitting key elements about
12 siting the transfer station.

13 Finally, and I am nearly done here, the account
14 of the removal of the transfer station roof
15 contained in this EIS, reads: The building around
16 the existing transfer station was condemned by the
17 town of Friday Harbor Building Inspector for safety
18 reasons. The town building official who made that
19 determination said that statement is false. He did
20 not condemn the building but issued a remove or
21 repair order. He said he had been pressured by
22 public works staff to condemn the building but did
23 not, as the damage could be repaired. This false
24 statement must be corrected in the EIS and the
25 destruction of public property without engineering

---[P 11]---

1 study or bid to repair the facility should be
2 investigated. Thank you for your time.

3 MR. MOSER: Bill Hamilton.

4 MR. HAMILTON: I have written
5 materials.

6 MR. MOSER: You can give them to me if
7 you want and I will make sure they get in the
8 record.

9 MR. HAMILTON: Thank you. I will be
10 very brief because having submitted the written
11 statements I just want to summarize a few points
12 contained in this. My name is Bill Hamilton and I
13 live at 272 Ivan Road. Five key points I want to
14 make about my impression of this EIS. One is that
15 for all the data it contains it seems remarkably
16 generic and as far as I can see does not
17 differentiate in any significant way among the
18 sites.

19 Secondly it seems to me that the question of
20 mitigation is central to the analysis that has to be
21 undertaken in making this decision. If the site is
22 to be acceptable in any location people need to
23 understand what mitigation is going to be necessary
24 to ensure that the county doesn't place a nuisance
25 in some neighborhood. The discussion of mitigation

---[P 12]---

1 here seems to be perfunctory at best. Something much
2 more comprehensive seems to be required here. Some
3 key differentiating characteristics among the sites
4 seem not to have been considered. Among them might
5 be, for example, no effort to quantify how many
6 parcels, residences, businesses might be affected at
7 a particular site. No serious discussion of the
8 relevance of wells in the vicinity of proposed
9 sites, how many there are, what the risk is to
10 ground water. Fourth, there are some key
11 topographical issues that don't seem to be
12 addressed, one of which is the effect of topography
13 on sound, on noise and how that might either
14 exacerbate or diminish the problem with noise
15 pollution. No discussion of the fact that with the
16 Beaverton Valley site in particular it straddles two
17 watersheds and any risk of contamination there could
18 in fact affect both of those watersheds and not just
19 a single one.

20 And finally, a discussion of noise pollution,
21 talks a lot about decibel levels and the technology
22 of noise and sound but really doesn't deal with the
23 pragmatics that seem to me important here too and
24 that is that even at lower decibel levels noise can
25 be a nuisance and really does not tackle that

---[P 13]---

1 question at all. So these points are made more
2 specifically in the written materials and I'll leave
3 it at that.

4 MR. MOSER: Thank you. Is it Marc
5 Islam?

6 MR. ISLAM: Yes. I am Marc Islam and I
7 live at 531 Cosandra Circle and I am actually here
8 as a concerned citizen and a member of a Safe Route
9 to School Organization trying to promote safe
10 biking, pedestrian activity within the town of
11 Friday Harbor. I would applaud the attention given
12 to cycling and pedestrian activity around the sites.
13 I would ask the committee drafting the EIS proposal
14 to look at all areas along the route specifically
15 within the Town of Friday Harbor, the Beaverton
16 Valley Road site passes right by the county library,
17 a popular spot for drop-off and pick-up of
18 elementary school students and citizens in general.
19 There is no safe way to cross the road at that
20 location and we will most likely see an increase in
21 pedestrian traffic in that location given the
22 sidewalk on the north side of the road and nowhere
23 is that called out in the Beaverton Valley analysis.
24 The Beaverton Valley analysis seems to focus on
25 pedestrian activity right within the vicinity of the

---[P 14]---

1 actual site. The only other comment I would have
2 seems to echo the previous respondent. The impact on
3 ground water was immediately interesting to me given
4 that some of the sites included green waste,
5 composting and I am assuming there is a large amount
6 of groundwater that they use to enhance that
7 activity. I don't know if there is or not but it
8 would be great to see that culled out, others having
9 no impact or no usage or increased usage and if
10 there is increased usage to make sure there is
11 sufficient water available for that activity. Thank
12 you.

13 MR. MOSER: Frank Fagan.

14 MR. FAGAN: My name is Frank Fagan and
15 I live at 11 Indian Beach Lane and I have been a
16 resident for ten years and I have read the plan and
17 in particular I have studied the details in Section
18 3.1.1 and Appendix D which concerns traffic and
19 because of the time limit I am not going to read all
20 of this, I will just give it to you. If Mr. Davies
21 is here I want him to know based on his comments in
22 the paper that I do not consider myself an expert on
23 traffic, rather I am a resident who travels on that
24 road sometimes several times in a day. I will try to
25 be brief and I have one question for the record.

---[P 15]---

1 Appendix D states that Cattle Point Roads'
2 shoulders are often used for bicycle touring but are
3 below the standard width for a bicycle lane. The
4 Summary Matrix states that Golf Course Road, Daniel
5 Lane and Cattle Point Road are not sufficient for
6 use by cyclists and pedestrians, however use is low.
7 On that matrix there is no mitigation measures
8 proposed even though they note deficiencies.

9 A portion of the traffic analysis report
10 mentions that there are seasonal variations in
11 traffic counts up twelve (12) to thirteen (13)
12 percent during the summer but that's about vehicles.
13 There is no mention in this study about bicycle,
14 moped and three wheeled scooter volume of traffic.

15 I asked the gentleman at the hearing at the
16 fire station who authored Appendix D if anyone on
17 their team had observed Cattle Point Road in that
18 area on a summer weekend and I was told that the
19 project had started late and most of the work was
20 done earlier in the year and he mentioned February.
21 I have seen a summer volume of bikes, mopeds, three
22 wheeled scooters greatly increase over the past ten
23 years and for me as a driver, that section of Cattle
24 Point Road from along the airport and around the
25 curve and up the hill has moved from a dangerous

---[P 16]---

1 stretch to a very dangerous stretch and it's not
2 only because of the increase in the volume, it's
3 because of the number of those who ride bikes who
4 have to get off the bike after they go around the
5 corner near where Site Elements is and walk all the
6 way up that hill past Daniel Lane up to about
7 Elizabeth Lane before they can get back on their
8 bike. For me as a driver for either of these sites
9 to be continued to be considered and kept on the
10 list as viable without major mitigation measures
11 means moving from a very dangerous situation to
12 something that is truly unsafe. You are going to
13 have people crossing on both sides of the road. I am
14 not a traffic engineer. I don't know if doubling the
15 width of the road, building a special bike lane or
16 even banning bikes and scooters from that part of
17 the Cattle Point Road is the solution but not doing
18 something major or recommending something major
19 means that we are keeping on the list something that
20 I would call a disaster waiting to happen.

21 I thank you for listening and I have one
22 question. When you go to page twenty-six (26) in the
23 full book, Figure 2.6, which is a layout of the Golf
24 Course Road Site, if you go down to that site today
25 and you take that picture of the aerial photograph

---[P 17]---

1 with the schematic of the layout, it appears to me
2 that over the last two months that site has won the
3 competition. There is a new retention pond that is
4 put in, there is protective view landscaping that is
5 put in, the interior roads have been done in the
6 last two weeks and there is extensive re-grading, a
7 flattening of the top which shows in the diagram of
8 what the site would be there. So my question is, has
9 the site already been selected? If it is, we are
10 wasting time and money. Thank you for listening.

11 MR. MOSER: Gordy Petersen.

12 MR. PETERSEN: Gordy Petersen and I
13 am from Friday Harbor. I have four specific areas
14 that I would like to discuss and one compliance with
15 the Comprehensive Plan and UBC, questions about the
16 level of service, costs and other incentives for
17 privatization. First of all in compliance with the
18 Comprehensive Plan I had one question about why some
19 of these items in the Comprehensive Plan were not
20 brought out in the EIS and I would hope that in my
21 written comments these plans and policies my
22 questions would be answered regarding the
23 Comprehensive Plan, especially where there is, in
24 the UBC where it says--and basically I am
25 paraphrasing but you can put a facility like this

---[P 18]---

1 anywhere you want if there is no reasonable
2 alternative and from what I see in the DEIS, there
3 are reasonable alternatives. The Sutton Road site
4 is actually studied as a reasonable alternative and
5 yet there is no finding that it's a reasonable
6 alternative. So if we comply with that particular
7 law it seems to me that you can't move the site. So
8 I would like to have a discussion of that in the
9 DEIS.

10 Level of service. There are lots of confusing
11 things that I found in this document about level of
12 service. In the Comprehensive Plan, level of service
13 F arbitrarily was put on the level of service for
14 solid waste facilities. Now throughout the document
15 I see things over there that the Department of
16 Ecology has rated this--that we are at one hundred
17 and eighty-five (185) percent capacity. I really
18 don't know how that was figured and I would like to
19 know--for that claim I would like somebody to show
20 the work and how is the one eighty-five (185), that
21 number arrived at. Also the level of service B and
22 F it says when the level of service falls below B
23 that that would trigger some kinds of things that
24 would cause us to look at locating a new facility
25 and I don't think we are anywhere near that level of

---[P 19]---

1 service but I would like to see it defined.

2 How do we compare any of these alternatives
3 without cost? I think that is a real problem and in
4 the WAC, as Mike MacDonald previously said, there is
5 a WAC 197-11-440 where it says some of these costs
6 should be quantified. Now for one example, there is
7 an off-hand sort of remark about the Number Two
8 Schoolhouse Road, it says it is unpaved and would
9 need to be upgraded to handle expected traffic. Well
10 if that is true and we want to compare these
11 alternatives and the state law says an EIS must
12 contain these kinds of costs, I would like to see
13 what the cost is because if we are talking about
14 choosing a site like Beaverton Valley Road and we
15 don't know what the cost is to pave the Number Two
16 Schoolhouse Road, how do we compare the
17 alternatives? So that is a question that I have.
18 Also I talks about left turn lanes and different
19 routing for bicycles and shoulder widths and with
20 those kinds of things it seems to me that the law
21 specifically says that you have to come up with some
22 costs for those things in order to compare the
23 alternative. So I would hope that in the final EIS
24 we would see some of that.

25 The last thing I would like to ask about and

---[P 20]---

1 see if we can get a discussion on the final EIS is,
2 I know that mandatory curbside service and recycling
3 was something that was discussed in this WAC but
4 what about the incentives to provide more curbside
5 service with the private contractor and it seems to
6 me the county can do things. They can control the
7 costs to the contractors like San Juan Sanitation
8 and they can control the cost of tipping fees and
9 tipping fees should be discussed in this because it
10 seems to me that tipping fees are included in the
11 definition of the cost of public service. So if you
12 are going to set tipping fees really high for self
13 all customers and set fees lower if people get
14 curbside service, it seems we can save a lot of
15 trips per day at the site, whichever site we pick,
16 because one garbage truck can compact and carry the
17 waste of three hundred (300) homes. So if we had
18 more people using that curbside service and there
19 was an incentive to use it, we can save a tremendous
20 amount of traffic at any of the sites that we pick.
21 So I would like to see a discussion of incentive-
22 based curbside service. Okay, thank you very much.

23 MR. MOSER: Jack Yelverton.

24 MR. YELVERTON: Hi, I am Jack

25 Yelverton and I live at 1661 Lampard Road. Let me

---[P 21]---

1 apologize, my thoughts are not as well put together
2 as some of the previous speakers because I have been
3 engaged in this process a very short period of time.
4 I was appointed to SWAC two weeks ago and I've had
5 the study in my hands for about ten days and I am
6 just really getting to grips with some of the
7 issues. As a result I have tried to concentrate on
8 some issues that seem to be of greatest relevance
9 and some that contain what I consider to be
10 substantial errors. Let me say that I spent a good
11 deal of my life as a consultant and I know something
12 about putting together consulting reports. This
13 report is a work of cutting and pasting with very
14 little original work in it but some of the things
15 that I would like to address have to do with the
16 noise pollution and the well water situation.

17 In terms of noise pollution, the report makes
18 some very solid statements about acoustical
19 engineering and measurements of sound, to put such
20 design assisted acoustical design and acoustical
21 engineering are more art than science and so
22 reducing it to a set of numbers is very difficult.
23 On the other hand the consultant has included a
24 comment here which I find very difficult to digest.
25 On page fourteen (14) of Appendix E, and I'll quote

---[P 22]---

1 here: "Other less intrusive sources of noise
2 including clanging from public dumping of waste and
3 recycle materials and miscellaneous on-site
4 equipment were not included in the noise modeling
5 because they are typically minor sources of noise."

6 I don't understand that one. There is another
7 couple of statements there discussing the sound
8 levels on various studies that they made and they
9 point out that the model calculated for sound levels
10 on on-site noises associated with the proposed
11 facility and this is the Sutton Road facility, are
12 well below applicable WAC limits on all model
13 receptors. On the other hand they point out that on
14 Beaverton Valley Road noise and resulting sound
15 levels would exceed the L25 sound level limit but
16 they don't comment on how any of that could be
17 effectively remediated or changed. One of the
18 suggestions is that you re-orient the dumping pads
19 so the noise goes north rather than south so it
20 affects the people living to the north of the site.

21 I was also interested in subterranean water,
22 the well water logs, and I was trying to put
23 together the reality of the situation with maps that
24 they have included in the appendix and I noted that
25 on the areas in which I am familiar, which is the

---[P 23]---

1 Beaverton Valley area, a few wells were included but
2 a great many exclusions and those wells that were
3 logged are all to the east and the west of the
4 proposed site, none to the north and south. They do
5 make a comment that the hydrology that they
6 understand says that the movement of groundwater is
7 to the northwest even though they recognize the
8 movement of the groundwater is from the north to the
9 south. So why there is that difference between
10 surface hydrology and underground hydrology is
11 something I just don't understand.

12 On the matter of traffic, I was interested in
13 trying to follow their logic and conclusions on
14 traffic and find that the studies they did were
15 highly subjective and inconclusive and inconsistent.
16 For example they point out that on Roche Harbor Road
17 there are twelve (12) foot traffic lanes and four
18 (4) foot curb lanes, bicycle and pedestrian lanes,
19 but that same data doesn't exist for any other piece
20 of roadway in the study. The only thing they say is
21 that the Beaverton Valley Road has a number of
22 traffic hazards where they have not discussed a
23 means of remediation nor have they included any data
24 as to what it might cost.

25 And then finally we go to the full area of cost

---[P 24]---

1 and I find it very difficult to try to understand
2 any of this in the absence of any kind of cross
3 data. Clearly with infinite amount of money any of
4 these sites could be made workable and any of these
5 sites could be done to state of the art, most modern
6 design, but I think we all know that San Juan County
7 has some severe budget restrictions and I think
8 without an evaluation of the cost of some of these
9 things there is no way of really understanding, of
10 finding a way to draw conclusions. Thank you.

11 MR. MOSER: Juniper Maas.

12 MS. MOSS: My name is Juniper Maas and
13 I own an inn on Beaverton Valley Road just past the
14 town and county border and I am on the north side of
15 Beaverton Valley Road and I have also grown up, I
16 was born and raised here on the island and for
17 thirty-two (32) years have been driving Beaverton
18 Valley Road and probably those first five to ten
19 were pretty carefree and I don't really remember
20 anything but I do remember many times in the winter
21 driving with my family from Egg Lake Road onto
22 Beaverton and it's a very icy, dangerous road and
23 the entrance to the proposed site for the Beaverton
24 Valley site is actually at a low point that has
25 black ice every winter and I have done many a three-

---[P 25]---

1 sixty (360) over the years at that exact spot.

2 I also have a more bullet point eloquent thing
3 that I am submitting but these are just a few of the
4 things I wanted to talk about in front of everybody.
5 So yes, Beaverton does have the ice markers on the
6 road, which Roche Harbor during the current site
7 doesn't have any of those before the station where
8 the current site is now and so that is something
9 that seems obvious that that road is a lot more icy
10 and dangerous. My inn, I promote myself as having a
11 green hotel and inn and I encourage walkers. I live
12 exactly 1.3 miles from the ferry landing and I have
13 many guests that choose to walk or bicycle and
14 typically the guests that enjoy my place are green-
15 minded people and again there are a lot of walkers
16 and bikers and I myself walk on a weekly basis and
17 should walk on a daily basis, but I walk that road
18 quite often. So I think one of the things that
19 should be really important in the continuation of
20 this process is putting money into--the real problem
21 when we talk about a facility to be able to handle
22 the future for ten (10) to twenty (20) years from
23 now, the amount of people that are going to be using
24 it, hopefully there will be a shift in the thinking
25 of people when it comes to waste regarding the

---[P 26]---

1 products they buy. So I think something is very
2 important with whatever site we choose and with that
3 movement there is a serious consideration for
4 putting money into education for people.

5 Let's see, again I agree with the gentleman
6 talking about the study that was done for traffic in
7 February and we all know that is the difference
8 between February and July, pretty much totally
9 opposite and we are a feast or famine island, it
10 depends on the tourism and during those busy months
11 there are a lot of people that are walking and I
12 fear for myself, my future children maybe or my
13 guests that do walk on that road and if the amount
14 of traffic increases to the potential that it could
15 if the transfer station is relocated on Beaverton
16 Valley Road, it will definitely be for the worst and
17 be very dangerous.

18 Something that is--I have been following this
19 process since the Fall of 2005 and going to most of
20 the SWAC meetings and at one point there was a
21 discussion, if this potential dream site could have
22 all the bells and whistles and composting, yard
23 waste and tree waste being one of them and then
24 potentially being able to sell it and during that
25 discussion there was somebody from an off-island

---[P 27]---

1 study that was there talking about it and basically
2 when the question was asked about these other
3 facilities in the state that had composting, pretty
4 much it ended up that nobody even bought it and it
5 was a moot point and most people that are very
6 serious about composting, they are purchasing
7 organic compost or they are making it themselves
8 because who knows what could be in the compost that
9 you buy from the transfer station.

10 Let's see, I also question--right now the
11 public works is running their yard from the current
12 site that the county does own and I was just
13 wondering if they need any Conditional Use Permit
14 because it seems to me that under RGU, you don't get
15 to plot out how the commercial enterprise--anything
16 that you do there you have to go through the
17 Conditional Use Permitting process and I wasn't
18 aware that they had done that or not. That's all I
19 have to say for now.

20 MR. MOSER: Thank you. Can you spell
21 your first name for the court reporter.

22 MS. MILLS: You just can't read my
23 writing. I am Claudia Mills, C-l-a-u-d-i-a.

24 MR. MOSER: Thank you.

25 MS. MILLS: I am a neighbor to the

---[P 28]---

1 Sutton Road site and I have here eight pages of
2 comments but only three that I am going to raise.
3 The first one is that it is kind of disappointing
4 that none of the cost figures came out and I thought
5 they were supposed to come out before this hearing
6 and it is really impossible to make a choice without
7 some sort of a cost basis which has already been
8 said.

9 The second point is that this facility is going
10 to be very expensive almost no matter what we do and
11 I don't know about costs but I am just ball parking
12 it at five to ten million dollars and the county is
13 extremely eager or happy to assume a new debt, they
14 just spent three million dollars I think on the
15 Orcas Dock and I am concerned about the amount of
16 money that the county is spending and I hope as a
17 taxpayer regardless of what parcel is chosen that we
18 go for a minimal and not a maximal development with
19 costs in mind as well as use.

20 My other comment is, no matter which site we
21 choose including the no action alternative,
22 neighbors are going to be affected and that is the
23 only reason this room is full because I suspect that
24 almost everyone in this room thinks that in some way
25 they could be affected by the site choice and I hope

---[P 29]---

1 that both in the site selection and especially in
2 the development phase that the effects on neighbors
3 are one of the primary things considered by whoever
4 is making these plans. This is probably the biggest
5 hot button in the whole thing. Thank you.

6 MR. MOSER: Sean Mercer.

7 MR. MERCER: My name is Sean Mercer
8 and I also grew up on San Juan Island and I have
9 lived here off and on for forty-two (42) years and I
10 live on Beaverton Valley Road. I just made kind of a
11 broad list of things that have been bothering me
12 since I have been following this issue of moving the
13 dump or not to move the dump, so please bear with my
14 free-form thought on this.

15 A transfer station is a government facility
16 created to serve the public and the most important
17 function is to move garbage in the most economic and
18 safe way while being sensitive to the environment.
19 Creating two dumps does none of these and actually
20 creates more costs, more construction, and more
21 hazard than keeping it where it is and making it
22 work better. I know of no person ever waiting longer
23 than half an hour at the dump. No one has ever been
24 injured at the dump due to the current state. Even
25 after the biggest holidays of the year I have waited

---[P 30]---

1 ten minutes or less on the average to use the
2 facility, peak season etcetera. This is without ever
3 trying a staggered day system by address or any
4 other idea to appease the people who need it to be
5 faster.

6 There is currently recycling at the dump and it
7 runs smoothly, you recycle without waiting as long.
8 Very few usable items ever make it to the dump
9 because they are usually given to the local
10 charities and non-profits first. If they ever do
11 show up they are usually taken before anyone can
12 even see them, often by dump employees. The current
13 dump site is all ready, and has been for many years,
14 of course, a dump. Although the property has many
15 problems with its ownership and management none of
16 these even, when added altogether, put in the worst-
17 case scenario, seem insurmountable compared to the
18 litany of issues surrounding the moving and creating
19 a whole new facility with its scores of real and
20 seemingly impossible issues.

21 After the building over the tipping floor was
22 demolished due mainly to poor driving from backing
23 up the trucks and no system in place to protect the
24 structure from the end use it was designed for in
25 the first place, no effort was made to rebuild and

---[P 31]---

1 still no effort has been made to address the idea of
2 reconstruction with improved design for trucks,
3 etcetera. This negligence has inspired this all or
4 nothing idea of moving to greener pastures instead
5 of fixing up what has been abused and is clearly in
6 need of some maintenance as is typical of any
7 transfer station, new or old. Public buildings must
8 have a budget for maintaining the integrity of the
9 original intent.

10 Where is the accountability for the destruction
11 of a perfectly functioning structure that was
12 destroyed by the very trucks it was designed to
13 house? Moving the dump from the current site will
14 only result in two properties spoiled in an already
15 sensitive, space limited environment not to mention
16 all the new and very real potential problems, many
17 of them health related for the island as a whole,
18 many unavoidable and un-mitigatable.

19 No effort has been made to fully realize the
20 environmental and community impacts that moving the
21 dump to any site may have. Only limited, unrealistic
22 haphazard attempts have faithfully led to where we
23 are now in the whole and no closer to any solution
24 than ever before.

25 The original dump could have been upgraded to a

---[P 32]---

1 multi-story building with a swimming pool with the
2 time and energy that has been spent.

3 The island aquifers, watersheds and wells are
4 the most important issue here and almost zero effort
5 has been made to study the effects of the
6 alternative sites in this EIS, which is supposed to
7 be the authoritative final study on this most
8 controversial issue. Not even a comprehensive list
9 of potentially affected residents and businesses at
10 the alternative site has been made, only a bizarre,
11 incomplete and hardly even close inconsistent
12 partial list has been created that varies in its
13 scope and criteria with each alternative. It seems
14 that the EIS is full of holes on this most important
15 subject and many others and should be redone before
16 going any further but at what cost?

17 Finally, dumps and transfer stations are
18 garbage facilities and not meant to be beautiful,
19 expensive or convenient and people who buy property
20 at a reduced rate in the vicinity of these
21 facilities have no right to complain about the
22 existence of them if they are run properly. It seems
23 that if we move it we will have not only a
24 gargantuan cost with little to no proper planning
25 but we will also have no end of complaints and legal

---[P 33]---

1 quagmires due to the lack of any real effort to
2 address the obvious, unavoidable future unrest of
3 the people who have made their livelihood and life
4 in a place that they knew was free of this kind of
5 intrusion.

6 One would think that the public officials could
7 have the foresight to see this kind of situation on
8 the horizon and save the taxpayers some valuable
9 money that could go to the more important, already
10 burdened causes such as the local education system
11 for instance. Who is accountable for the cost of
12 meandering of the public programs on this tiny
13 island? Why do we need a high tech transfer station
14 that dwarfs the facilities of many of the mainland
15 sectors with populations hundreds if not thousands
16 of times greater in numbers at the expense of proper
17 public programs that we really do need.

18 It is ironic that the Beaverton site, obviously
19 the favored site of the EIS and powers that be, was
20 illegally purchased out of session for a price above
21 market value and is currently operating illegally
22 without an EIS for its use an erected building.

23 In summary moving the dump to a new property
24 whether it's Beaverton, above the largest aquifer on
25 the island, a designated wetland and in very close

---[P 34]---

1 proximity to many wells, residences and businesses
2 is something that the EIS plainly overlooks and
3 almost denies. Or Daniel Wade (phonetic), many of
4 the same issues, an individual who was sued by the
5 Friends of the San Juans over his limited, far less
6 intrusive violation of the so-called wetland there,
7 now unnoticed as a wetland by the EIS.

8 The FAA potential ongoing resistance, spoilage
9 of one of the major rural views headed out from the
10 island, etcetera, is a bad idea. What is a good idea
11 is putting a halt to the giant waste of money and
12 effort that is currently headed in the obviously
13 wrong direction and reeling it in to develop and
14 implement realistic and feasible plans to improve
15 upon the current site, this is the only alternative
16 and one comes to this conclusion quite easily after
17 going to only a few SWAC meetings and talking with a
18 few people who know the history of the dump. This,
19 the only option in many long-term residents' eyes is
20 not a non-action alternative as is mis-worded by the
21 EIS but rather an action alternative with
22 intelligent, thoughtful, humane consideration of all
23 the options and the deduction of a plan of action
24 towards the solution of the real current problems
25 facing the dump. Thank you.

---[P 35]---

1 MR. MOSER: Jenny Roberts? Vick
2 Packard.

3 MR. PACKARD: My name is Vick Packard
4 and I live at 329 Golf Course Road and my comments
5 primarily refer to the proposed Golf Course Road
6 property. Number one, I am a cyclist and I totally
7 disagree with the report that said traffic is light.
8 As has been said many, many times, in the summertime
9 it's very high and in fact the local cycle shop and
10 the moped place direct people down this road as it
11 is the only viable route to the south end of the
12 island and it's dangerous now and if we add traffic
13 to the site it would be tremendous and I think we
14 are opening ourselves up to lawsuits and a potential
15 disaster.

16 Secondly and again I am worried about
17 groundwater also. This particular site I know has a
18 well basically located right in the center and it is
19 an operating well used to water the property. I know
20 for a personal well I am required to have a one
21 hundred (100) foot exclusionary where I can't put
22 any garbage or any kind of a dump and in fact when
23 they look at well sites they look at a six hundred
24 (600) foot exclusionary for possible--not that you
25 can't put something on it but they look for

---[P 36]---

1 potential contamination. My question is what is
2 going to be done and there is nothing in this report
3 that addresses what is going to be done with the
4 groundwater.

5 The other question, they keep saying that they
6 can't talk about costs. Well how can you do a study
7 and end up choosing a site when the city doesn't
8 have an option to buy and no idea what it's going to
9 cost and in fact the owner may not even sell it to
10 the city. You can't do a study on various sites
11 without first knowing can you obtain this land and
12 use it. Thank you.

13 MR. MOSER: Dave Cable.

14 MR. CABLE: My name is Dave Cable and
15 I live at 173 Golf Course Road. I am here this
16 evening, my wife regrets that she is not able to
17 attend, and we have lived at Golf Course Road for
18 the last three years. However we have visited and
19 been owners of the property through our family for
20 about forty (40) years and I have been trying to
21 search for something new and different to add to
22 this conversation tonight. Perhaps a little more
23 focus on intersection safety and bicycle and
24 pedestrian safety and maybe I'll be boring you with
25 my comments. Intersection safety, the DEIS indicates

---[P 37]---

1 that site distance requirements at the Golf
2 Course/Cattle Point Road intersection are not met to
3 the west and we agree with that. Furthermore, the
4 left turn from Cattle Point Road to Golf Course Road
5 is extremely dangerous and this is due to the lack
6 of adequate site distance. Our experience indicates
7 that traffic for the most part exceeds the forty-
8 five (45) mile limit, speed limit on the road, but
9 more importantly exceeds the reduced speed limit of
10 thirty-five (35) miles an hour traveling east and
11 around the corner to the north as this is a
12 significant downhill slope and this also causes
13 significant problems in the wintertime when there is
14 ice on the road.

15 Excessive speed of the eastbound vehicles
16 compound this problem for those turning left on Golf
17 Course Road to the north. As we all feel pressure
18 from vehicles following close behind to get out of
19 the way and turn or before another vehicle
20 approaches from the west. This further is
21 exacerbated in spring and fall and right now in the
22 next few weeks we are all going to be able to
23 experience it because what happens is, the sun is
24 beginning to set behind the hill right there at Golf
25 Course Road as you are trying to turn left and this

---[P 38]---

1 makes that turn absolutely blind.

2 Relocating the transfer station to Golf Course
3 Road will also make Mullis and Cattle Point Road the
4 most heavily traveled in the county by increasing
5 the traffic approximately--and this is from the
6 DEIS, three thousand and thirty (3,030) trips per
7 day to between three thousand six hundred and fifty
8 (3,650) and three thousand eight hundred and fifty
9 (3,850) trips per day on weekends and this doesn't
10 include bicycles and mopeds, walkers and runners,
11 etcetera, which leads me to my next concern.

12 The statement in the DEIS that the Golf Course
13 Road and Cattle Point Road are insufficient for use
14 by cyclists and pedestrians, however this use is
15 low. This is--well we have already said how we feel
16 about that statement. Let me give you some
17 statistics. First off we disagree with the findings
18 and conclusions and this is on the top of page
19 forty-one (41) regarding the Golf Course Road site.
20 Our observations indicate that during high tourist
21 season, June, July and August and actually September
22 that bicycle, moped and pedestrian traffic is very
23 high and creates significant hazards for all traffic
24 at the intersection of Cattle Point and Golf Course
25 Roads. For your information we surveyed Susie's

---[P 39]---

1 Mopeds and the Friday Harbor Bicycle Shop to get
2 some idea of the number of vehicles rented on a
3 daily basis and what directions were given to their
4 clients for touring and site-seeing on the island.
5 Susie rents more than fifty (50) mopeds per day. The
6 bike shop rents about twenty-five (25) bikes per day
7 during the summer high season. Both advise their
8 clients to proceed down Mullis Road to Cattle Point
9 Road to either visit American Camp and Cattle Point
10 and this is what Susie calls the one hour tour from
11 Susie's and/or to continue west and north from
12 Cattle Point Road over to Bailer Hill Road to Lime
13 Kiln Point and then to Roche Harbor and then return
14 to Friday Harbor. That is the all day tour from
15 Susie's. So in all cases she sends her clients south
16 down Cattle Point Road. You can do some simple math
17 and say well gee, divide fifty (50) mopeds, twenty-
18 five (25) bikes, seventy-five (75) bikes and do an
19 hourly rate but interestingly enough the mopeds and
20 bikes don't just go on a regular basis down there,
21 you typically see them in groups and that is because
22 the ferry comes in and unloads people and they walk
23 up to Susie's and they rent bikes and they go and
24 they wind up in groups of six, seven and eight
25 sometimes going down Golf Course Road.

---[P 40]---

1 In any case, it should also be noted that
2 touring bicycles don't typically travel singularly.
3 Southbound bikers attempt to turn left into the
4 intersection and are at great risk today. One thing
5 about that intersection is that it is a very
6 attractive place right by the sign for the Golf and
7 Country Club to have lunch and check directions and
8 so forth because there is such a beautiful view from
9 there.

10 So our question is, what will be done to
11 mitigate the increased risk to bikers? Mopeds,
12 pedestrians as well as automobiles with increased
13 traffic levels of six hundred and twenty (620) to
14 eight hundred and twenty (820) trips per day to the
15 transfer station at the Golf Course Road site. That
16 concludes my remarks for now but I am certainly in
17 agreement with those that have gone before that the
18 DEIS really does not make any distinction between
19 any of the sites with regards to traffic safety or
20 any of the key issues I think that concern us all.
21 Thank you.

22 MR. MOSER: Roger Bennett.

23 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Roger
24 Bennett, 491 Golf Course Road and my comments are on
25 the Golf Course Road site. First I think because

---[P 41]---

1 it's a small site and a little confined, perhaps too
2 small for the operation, there would be greater
3 effects from dust from the site from the wheels of
4 the big trucks coming in and everybody else. Also
5 any odors omitted from the site, a small site like
6 that is going to affect the neighbors right across
7 the road and the site also has wetlands and I think
8 that was on your map but perhaps you don't realize
9 that the wetlands pretty much already have been
10 covered over and I don't know if that is legal or
11 not but the wetlands appear to the north towards the
12 airport and then into the creek and then Griffin Bay
13 and then also drain directly east in a subterranean
14 drain and that would be into Griffin Bay more
15 directly.

16 We think the zoning issue, development will
17 affect existing uses, that is rather high in
18 waterfront uses that are nearby, so it would have a
19 negative impact on those uses. We think that
20 development on this small site is likely to need
21 more than ten (10) percent impervious surface that
22 wasn't directly addressed but indicated that that
23 might be the case and I believe it would be,
24 especially any growth in the future.

25 Again as other people have said there is a

---[P 42]---

1 traffic problem turning onto Golf Course Road, even
2 at this time of year but basically in the summer
3 months for about a six month period in the afternoon
4 at this time of day, if you are heading down south
5 on Cattle Point Road and you want to turn onto Golf
6 Course Road you snake around the big turn on Cattle
7 Point Road and the sun is in your eyes and that adds
8 an extra hazard there. So it depends on the time of
9 day, from the late afternoon into the evening, sun
10 in the eyes and it's the kind of thing that happens
11 even today, to try to make that left turn off of
12 Cattle Point onto Golf Course you have the sunshine
13 problem in addition to lots of traffic that is
14 already there.

15 Those are my comments for now, thank you very
16 much.

17 MR. MOSER: Chris Clarke.

18 MR. CLARKE: My name is Chris Clarke
19 and I live on San Juan Island. Dave, didn't we have
20 a bounty on mopeds for awhile because they traveled
21 in packs? My home is actually located a little more
22 than half a mile as a crow flies from the Golf
23 Course Road site and I want to reiterate or
24 reinforce some of the comments I have heard tonight.
25 I am not an acoustical engineer but I found the EIS

---[P 43]---

1 woefully lacking in the way that it studied noise
2 and with its comment that it didn't study noise
3 factors farther away because they wouldn't be
4 impacted. I am always struck when I go to Seattle by
5 the drone of traffic noise. Where I live you can
6 hear a car, an individual car driving down Cattle
7 Point Road towards town all the way from the top of
8 the hill until it passes the airport and goes beyond
9 into buildings that I can see. If you add three
10 thousand (3,000) of those trips you may not exceed
11 the decibel levels but you certainly degrade the
12 noise environment to that area and that is true for
13 all of the sites but I know that that site suffers
14 from a big openness that makes noise travel a lot
15 farther.

16 I would also like to sort of expound on Sean's
17 comments about the no option thing. We were given
18 don't do anything to the current site as opposed to
19 making it functional so that it works and I have
20 been here for twenty-seven (27) years and I have
21 never had a problem with the dump or waiting any
22 sort of excessive periods of time and studying their
23 site maps, if they simply use some of the road
24 patterns that they have when they went to the Sutton
25 Road design, traffic flow would be massively

---[P 44]---

1 improved over what it is now at that site alone.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. MOSER: Barbara Marrett.

4 MS. MARRETT: I am Barbara Marrett and
5 I live in the Hillview Terrace Three neighborhood
6 and I would like to say this has been a very
7 painful, long process for folks who live near the
8 current site and for the folks who are afraid it's
9 going to move near them. I don't want to go through
10 this process again in the next ten (10) years and I
11 really believe that the county tried very hard to
12 make the Sutton Road site work for them but if you
13 see what everyone has requested at various meetings
14 it is going to require a very large footprint. If
15 you look at the current site it may look like there
16 is a lot of available land but there are three
17 places that are extremely compromised
18 environmentally. One is the very large capped
19 landfill. There is also an area that is an uncapped
20 landfill and I feel that is unstable and would
21 require massive amounts of money to clean up. There
22 is a site to the south that is currently under
23 investigation by the DOE for dumping and I don't
24 think that was even addressed in the EIS. So it's
25 easy to say leave it where it is but there really

---[P 45]---

1 isn't a lot of room to expand at the current site.
2 So if we leave it where it is are we going to go
3 through this whole process again in ten (10) years
4 when the island has grown and this site is no longer
5 sufficient? I believe that we should plan for the
6 next twenty (20) years for a population and for what
7 islanders have stated they wanted in a solid waste
8 transfer station. Thank you.

9 MR. MOSER: We have one more person
10 signed up and then I am going to open it up for
11 anybody that feels like they need to speak who
12 hasn't and we have a request for one person to come
13 through again and we will also let that happen.

14 Daniel Miller? Hang on for one minute.

15 MR. MILLER: Actually I would prefer
16 to speak later, kind of at the end.

17 MR. MOSER: We're getting close to
18 the end. Is there is anybody that didn't sign up to
19 speak that wants to speak. Mike MacDonald has asked
20 for more time, anybody else that didn't sign up? Oh,
21 there is somebody else. Yes Ma'am, come on up.

22 MS. BEAUDON: My name is Virginia
23 Beaudon (B-e-a-u-d-o-n). I just was sitting in the
24 back and I have not read the environmental study I
25 wanted you to know but I am a neighbor to Beaverton

---[P 46]---

1 Valley and also a neighbor to the current business
2 park that is out there and what I wanted to speak to
3 you about is, someone noted that the machinery out
4 there is a minimal impact on the acoustical or noise
5 level. I bought my property because I love the
6 quiet, I really truly did and after I bought the
7 property there was development with the Beaverton
8 Business Park and they are now running basically a
9 quarry operation out there where they bring rock in
10 and they crush it and there is a lot of heavy
11 equipment and trucks running in there all the time.
12 I woke up every morning at six o'clock to the truck
13 traffic that is going down Beaverton Valley Road. I
14 think they need to really take into account when you
15 are counting the traffic there, all the trucks,
16 there is three heavy equipment people on Beaverton
17 Valley Road that go in and out of the town
18 constantly. There have been broken windshields that
19 have been complained about, the near death
20 experiences of bicyclists and the noise level that
21 would come about and I live next to that public
22 works area. I hear those trucks every morning. I
23 hear the beeping sound of them all backing up. I
24 know that the county has regulations, that they
25 don't start until seven o'clock in the morning, but

---[P 47]---

1 I can attest that those guys start at five o'clock
2 in the morning and rock crushing going on at the
3 business park and trash compacting is going to be
4 just as loud and it is annoying and it is loud and
5 it does go above the decibels that were quoted by
6 someone here that said they were in the
7 Environmental Impact Statement.

8 So I want those things taken into
9 consideration. I don't think noise levels have
10 really been encountered out there or for any other
11 site on this island with neighbors. Thank you.

12 MR. MOSER: Thank you. Mike MacDonald
13 and then we will have Mr. Miller.

14 MR. MacDONALD: It is not often that
15 you can sum up Mr. Mercer's eloquence with law but
16 here is a law, a section that was ignored by public
17 works and the writer of this document and that is
18 reasonable alternatives shall include action that
19 could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal's
20 objectives but at a lower environmental cost or
21 decreased level of environmental degradation. That
22 in one sense is what Mr. Mercer said much more
23 poetically.

24 The second thing that I am just trying to sum
25 up with the law, what several speakers have said, to

---[P 48]---

1 defend my cherry-picking comment. The bike lanes
2 where the shoulders on Cattle Point Road were
3 measured and found in adequate, they were measured
4 and found inadequate on Roche Harbor Road where they
5 are four feet which is the minimum. In front of Ms.
6 Maas' guest house they are non-existent. At the
7 widest point on Beaverton Valley they are two feet.
8 So if the traffic consultant pointed out their
9 inadequacy at four feet in two places, why was it
10 not pointed out as inadequate at zero feet to two
11 feet?

12 My request is do the measurements no matter
13 where this place is sited, if it moves, and I
14 believe that the law says that it's very hard to
15 move it and I believe the public works knows that.
16 Throughout the country moving one of these
17 established sites is not quite impossible but it is
18 nearly impossible for the simple reason that the
19 towns have grown around them and I don't believe
20 that has been shared with the public. Do the
21 measurements and equally apply the mitigation and
22 tell us what they cost. We are not babies here
23 today. It was proven that we are not ignorant of
24 this and it is time just to be flat-out truthful and
25 I thank you for your time.

---[P 49]---

1 MR. MOSER: Mr. Miller.

2 MR. MILLER: I was going to be here
3 sooner but I got stung by a wasp on my finger and so
4 it is swollen right now. What I wanted to say about
5 the dump was, several things. One is, several areas
6 where they want to put the dump is actually
7 classified as a wetland so it will be really
8 interesting to put a dump there when it's a natural
9 wetland. Also out in the San Juan Valley I have been
10 told and I don't know if it's true that if you put a
11 dump out there it will contaminate half the
12 underground water supply--anyway it will contaminate
13 the water supply out there.

14 Secondly I am curious how the county is going
15 to pay for the lowering of property values because
16 the lower the property value in the area where the
17 dump is, I am curious how the county is going to pay
18 the property owners on that. So that's all I have to
19 say right now. Thank you.

20 MR. MOSER: Thank you. Anybody else
21 who wants to speak before we close the meeting?

22 MR. DOUGLAS: My name is Mack Douglas,
23 address 951 Golf Course Road and I have been a full-
24 time resident on the island for three years and have
25 owned the property there for approximately six. I

---[P 50]---

1 would like to echo comments that have been made
2 earlier for the failure of this study to amply
3 identify the risks associated with pedestrians,
4 mopeds, bicycle traffic at any of these locations.
5 The fact remains that due to the high cost of fuel
6 we have all experienced, a lot of us are walking
7 more today and a lot of us are riding our bikes. But
8 how can we adequately measure the impact of these
9 sites in November when not only is our highest
10 travel rate on the roads during the summer tourist
11 season but ironically that coincides with the
12 heaviest use of the dump facility. I have used the
13 dump frequently and as a matter of fact I was there
14 today and I stood in line all summer long for a
15 reasonable amount of time. But today it was drive in
16 and dump. So I think that we really missed the
17 target on the impact of vehicle traffic on all of
18 these alternative sites and I would ask that through
19 this process that you go back and look more
20 professionally in assessing these risks and the
21 impact to traffic flow. Thank you.

22 MR. MOSER: Anyone else? Yes Ma'am.

23 MS. SWEET (Phonetic): Sherry Sweet
24 and I live off of Beaverton Valley two miles out of
25 town. I love to walk and I tried walking on

---[P 51]---

1 Beaverton Valley to town once in the winter and I
2 was walking in the weeds off the pavement and the
3 cars were slowing down when they came by, trying to
4 move around me because it's that narrow and I have
5 never walked it since. I am still looking for a good
6 road where I can walk and feel safe and not have the
7 drivers be so concerned. That's it, thank you.

8 MR. MOSER: Anyone else want to speak?

9 Yes Ma'am.

10 MS. ROBERTS: My name is Jenny Roberts
11 and I am on 1842 San Juan Valley Road. Just a few
12 things. First of all when I was looking at I guess
13 the traffic pattern for road operations, I just was
14 confused about a few of the sites where they talk
15 about using Number Two School House Road and then
16 Boyce Road and I am confused, how do you get
17 actually to the ferry? I don't know if they're going
18 to go down Douglas Road, San Juan or Boyce--I mean
19 School House Road and then San Juan. That is not
20 clear hear and I think that is important because
21 between Number Two School House Road and then
22 Douglas Road, San Juan Valley Road has quite a few
23 big dips in it and a couple of times a year we have
24 cars go off there and so to have big trucks on there
25 too seems not the best choice. I just think San Juan

---[P 52]---

1 Valley Road, if it is the pathway, that needs to be
2 included and looked at because I would think there
3 would definitely need to be mitigation and costs
4 involved in that.

5 Secondly I would also like to say I have a
6 great concern for the cost on the different sites
7 that are included in here and I absolutely think
8 safety is very important and the environmental
9 impact is important and more than ever the economic
10 costs to our community is so vital and we can't
11 afford the most expensive spot here and I hope that
12 is going to be taken into consideration. I also want
13 to have a plea that the people involved in this
14 reporting and making the decision that they can
15 honestly go home at night and say I have been
16 objective and honest in my viewing of all these
17 sites. Thank you.

18 MR. MOSER: Anyone else want to speak
19 before we close the record? Shannon, I think we're
20 done. Thank you very much for attending. As always
21 your civil discourse is appreciated and your
22 intelligent input, I am always amazed at the quality
23 of talent you have here in San Juan County and I
24 think it has shown up tonight. Thank you very much.

25 (ADJOURNED 6:05 p.m. 9-11-08)

---[P 53]---

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON

2 C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-

E

3 COUNTY OF SKAGIT

4 I, ALLEN R. EMERSON, a Notary Public in for
5 the State of Washington, do hereby certify: That the
6 annexed and foregoing public hearing in the matter
7 of a DIES For a San Juan Island Transfer Station
8 was held on September 11, 2008 before HEARING
9 EXAMINER TOM C. MOSER and reported stenographically
10 by me and reduced to typewritten form under my
11 direction;

12 I further certify that the Public Hearing, as
13 transcribed, is a full, true and correct transcript
14 of the proceedings in this matter including
15 questions and answers and all objections, motions
16 and exceptions that were made during this public
17 hearing;

18 I further certify that I am not a relative or
19 attorney or counsel of any of the parties to said
20 action or a relative or employee of such attorney or
21 counsel and that I am not financially interested in
22 the said action or the outcome thereof;

23 I further certify that the original record of
24 this Hearing was filed with Steven A. Alexander,
25 public Works Official for San Juan County.

---[P 54]---

1 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
 2 and affixed my Official Seal this_____day
 3 of_____, 2008.

4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

NOTARY PUBLIC in and for the
 State of Washington, residing at
 Sedro Woolley. My Commission
 expires June 27,

2012.