

Mayor Lee Webster called the special meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Council Members present were Kris Dawson, Jerry Tretwold, Dave Freels, Bob Fateley and Art Smyth. Also present were Finance Director Pamela Olsen, Public Works Director JD Smith and Deputy Clerk Desha Dawson.

**GEBBERS FARMS ANNEXATION REQUEST:**

Mayor Webster started the meeting by stating that this an opportunity for questions and answers regarding the Gebbers Annexation request, initially presented at the September 10<sup>th</sup> City Council Meeting. Public Works Director JD Smith and Council Member Fateley were unable to attend the last Council meeting. Representatives from Gebbers Farms and Erlandsen & Associates are also present at this meeting to answer any questions Council may have. Kurt Danison from Highland & Associates was also present.

Mayor Webster first asked about the approaches at the Indian Avenue/Hwy 97 intersection, asking if this would be changed to a 90-degree approach. Roger Erlandsen, of Erlandsen & Associates, stated that this intersection would need to be changed or realigned if further development of the requested annexation areas were to be done in the future, but the current flow of truck traffic into the new pre-size facility is designated at this time to enter near the Gebbers homestead portion.

Public Works Director Smith voiced his concern about future development and who will fund any necessary studies. Roger Erlandsen stated that Gebbers will work collaboratively on the studies. Erlandsen also stated to his knowledge, the C1 annexation area (Indian Avenue/Hwy 97 triangle) will be farmed and there are no development plans at this time. The City has final say with respect to annexed land and the County cannot override their decisions.

Public Works Director Smith ask what will happen if Gebbers decides to develop the C1 triangle for commercial use, using up 100+ water connections. The City cannot consciously annex property without knowing what plans there are for future development and evaluate the impact that will have on the City. Erlandsen stated that the City is not required to provide services. Council Member Dave Freels noted that if we were to have an annexation agreement in place, it could be stated that if the area were to be developed in the futures, the applicant would be required to bring water rights to the table. Council Member Fateley stated that we need to deal with what is in front of us now. If the treatment plant is maxed out before it is due, then we will be right back where we were prior to this upgrade. We cannot save for the unknown. The City has a 20 year plan – what are Gebbers future plans? We need to know.

Erlandsen stated that the City and Planning Commission has an opportunity, through the Comprehensive Plan, to designated zoning in certain areas based on what they believe they should be designated. Kurt Danison noted, for example a C2 zoning designation is listed as mixed commercial/industrial/highway, where C1 zoning is designated central business/pedestrian or "downtown".

Kurt Danison asked if the Honda Bowl was to be "de-annexed" as indicated, would it be taken out of the Urban Growth Area. Erlandsen stated yes, it could.

Council Member Art Smyth asked what the issue was with respect to the Honda Bowl road easement to the City's water reservoir. As he understood it, the road has been "shared" between Gebbers and the City for years without any problems.

Erlandsen stated that the Honda Bowl de-annexation was placed in this request to take out or "mitigate" any further impact on the City's infrastructure. Basically by de-annexing this area, it could not be developed in the future and therefore not affect any future connections the City's current system.

Council Member Bob Fateley says he understands that Gebbers is requesting a

letter of support, but questions the two-week time frame – what if the City needs more time to discuss and review this proposal. Roger Erlandsen stated the need to get the new facility built has been moved up considerably in part due to the Apple House fire and other processing issues. Right now the current applications are filed with the County. Gebbers would like to have this new facility annexed into the City of Brewster, but whether it is annexed or not, they need to proceed forward with construction whether it is with the County or the City.

Public Works Director Smith asked what the timeframe of the transition from the old plant to the new plant would be. Eric Smith stated the goal is to have the new facility built and operational and basically start the new, shut down the old. The idea is not to have both plants running at the same time. However, during the transition they may both run at the same time, but for a very short period.

Council Member Freels stated that water and sewer impacts are the main concerns. If it were determined that the new facility's discharge to the treatment plan had a major impact, would Gebbers be willing to put in the holding or "containment" pond(s) if needed. Eric Smith, Erlandsen & Associates, stated that the County plans show two ponds; new plan shows one. It would take time to build the pond, which would more than likely be used as reclaim or irrigation, but again stated it would take time to build and Gebbers may need to discharge to the City treatment plant short-term while the pond is being constructed and testing is done. Eric Smith also stated that they are researching the idea of water recycling, ie: re-use or irrigation. This is a big issue "going green" and the potential is huge for future funding with respect to recycling water.

Public Works Director Smith noted that the City is planning on installing a 4-inch flow meter to measure exactly what the current facility is discharging back to our treatment plant. To date, Gebbers has been paying sewer rates based on their actual water consumption, even though they are not discharging the entire amount of water in back to the plant. (Gebbers has been hauling water out in trucks).

Public Works Director Smith stated that currently, our North lift station is running at 95% and he does not want to add anymore to that lift station. Where the Gebbers current facility is connected, it goes to our South lift station. Eric Smith stated that they do not want this new connection to put a burden on either one of the lift stations, and they can re-route the discharge to accommodate this as well as the steady discharge of the water back to the plant, rather than one large "flush".

Lynn Lawson, Treatment Plant Operator, asked if Gebbers has set permits on the hydraulics. The current BOD, set by the state, is 500. Council Member Fateley asked if there is any difference in the water going through the system – would "good" water count towards water discounts.

Roger Erlandsen stated that with respect to completion of the two main lines, that the completed line will be at least a 12-inch line – the current is 10-inch. A line extension will be required. The Hwy 97 line would be connected to the Indian Avenue line. Eric Smith stated that fire demand is one of the key issues for the water line size with attention to high volume/short term water usage in the event of a fire.

Council Member Freels asked what the Phase 2 portion of the new facility would be used for, possibly cherry processing? Tory Wulf, Gebbers representative, stated that the original plan for Phase 1 is only going to be used for pre-size. As for Phase 2, he does not know for sure whether it will be used for cherry processing or for storage, but due to the storage issues Gebbers has faced in the past, he believes it may be storage.

Public Works Director Smith stated that even if it were developed and used for seasonal cherry processing, that is still a future development that the City needs to be made aware of so they can determine if it is something our infrastructure can handle. Erlandsen stated that any plans for future development would be required to go through the City for approval regardless.

Mr. Danison stated he strongly recommends having an annexation agreement. This agreement could be drawn up to cover any future development by either by current owners or future owners, if any portion were sold. He also stated that when annexing any property, it is a good idea to have right away as a condition of the annexation when it comes to roads and streets and this can be outlined in the annexation agreement. Since the main concern is what the impact will be on the City utility services, this is where an annexation agreement really comes into play. As far as the building permit, the City cannot issue the permit unless the land is annexed into the City. Public Works Director Smith stated as he understands, the County will run the building permit through the date of completion for the Phase I facility.

Council Member Tretwold asked if the new facility is annexed into the City, would we be able get the point of sale revenue from the fruit sales. Finance Director Olsen stated that we would not.

Council Member Jerry Tretwold stated it is understood that the timeframe for this annexation request is on a pretty tight schedule. He asked if there were a way for Council and those present tonight to “break down” the proposal, go over the areas of biggest concern and focus on what needs to be addressed now. Roger Erlandsen agreed that the review should be done in an organized fashion.

Mayor Webster recommended going over each of the five (5) items in the proposal for review and comment, one at a time.

1. Annexation of the Western Parcels – no Council comments or concerns other than those listed above.
2. Connection to City Water/Sewer utilities – no Council comments or concerns other than those listed above. Main concern is the overall effect on our sewer treatment plant.
3. HI and C1 zoning – no Council comments or concerns other than those listed above.
4. De-annexation of the Honda Bowl – no Council comments or concerns other than those listed above.
5. Formalizing easement of Honda Bowl access road – Public Works Director Smith stated if left in the annexation request, the phrasing of “city owned vehicles only” should be taken out as sometimes City employees use their private vehicles to access this road in certain situations. No Council comments or concerns were noted, other than those listed above.

Mayor Webster also stated that JUB, City engineers, have received a copy of this proposal and would like them to review it and perform studies for the City, however we may need more time for this. JUB will be going over the proposal soon. Public Works Director Smith also stated that he would like our engineers to review this proposal as well. Roger Erlandsen stated that JUB, Gebbers, Erlandsen & Associates and the City of Brewster should be in constant contact so that no one is left out and everyone involved is aware of any changes, updates and/or progress. Hopefully the open communication between all parties will help to expedite the process. Mayor Webster stated that by next Wednesday, we should have information from JUB and would like to have another meeting next week to discuss this further. It is also hopeful that JUB would be able to attend this meeting as well.

Council Member Freels asked exactly what was needed out of this meeting tonight from the City with respect to the annexation request. Roger Erlandsen stated that what is hoped is that the City will submit a letter of recognition, which would only show City support of the idea of the submitted proposal as well as moving forward with more talks/meetings.

**MOTION:** Council Member Fateley made the motion to support the annexation request, to move forward and to process the zoning simultaneous pursuant to RCW 35A.14.330 and .340 to rezone the area to HI and C1 zoning. Council Member Freels seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With there being no further business to come before the Council the special meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

---

Mayor Lee Webster

ATTEST:

---

City Clerk/Finance Director Pamela Olsen, MMC