

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

June 12, 2013

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Franz Wiechers-Gregory, Commissioners O’Hara, Murray, Miller, Biethan, and Sanders

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Commissioner Chandorkar

STAFF PRESENT: Pete Sullivan, City of Redmond Planning Department, Cathy Beam, City of Redmond Planning Department, Kelsey Johnson, City of Redmond Planning Department, and Kevin Murphy, City of Redmond Natural Resources Division.

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lady of Letters, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Gregory in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

There were no changes to the agenda.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no items from the audience.

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY:

Chairman Gregory asked if there were any edits, comments, or additions to the May 22nd, 2013 meeting summary. Without objection, Chairman Gregory approved the summary.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Proposed Zoning Code Amendment to raise thresholds for development-related State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) exemptions thresholds.

Chair Gregory opened the public hearing and called on Cathy Beam, City of Redmond Planning Department, for the staff presentation. Ms. Beam said this issue was before the Commission about three weeks ago for a study session. The State Environmental Policy Act was adopted by the state in 1971. Then, in 1984, new rules were adopted and those are, in general, the rules that are followed today. SEPA is intended to ensure environmental values are considered during the decision making process and it supplements a jurisdiction’s review processes on any sort of land use application. The rule making order by the Department of Ecology was adopted at the end of 2012, and allows jurisdictions to raise the exemption levels. The WAC citation, 197.11.800.1c, is titled *Minor New Construction* under the exemption sections of the SEPA rule. Jurisdictions may increase those levels provided they meet three criteria:

1. Jurisdictions need to document that the requirements for environmental analysis are adequately protected.
2. Jurisdictions need to demonstrate that there are locally established processes for project level commenting.
3. Prior to any action of adopting an ordinance, there needs to be 21 days of public notice.

Redmond's procedures are set up in this manner. Ms. Beam next reviewed the categorical exemptions under minor new construction. Single family residential and multi-family residential projects are included. She reviewed the existing threshold levels, which are in the City's Zoning Code. She presented the proposed threshold levels as well. Single-family residential and multi-family residential were formally combined as just residential, and currently, that means 20 or fewer dwelling units. The staff proposal is to increase the threshold to 30 or fewer dwelling units for single-family residential, and multi-family residential would be increased to 60 or fewer dwelling units.

Barns, sheds, farm equipment, etc. are designated as 30,000 square feet or less, and that is proposed to be increased to 40,000 square feet. Office, school, commercial recreation, and similar uses have a current exemption level of 12,000 square feet or less. Parking facilities have a threshold level of 40 or fewer automobiles. Those levels are proposed to be increased to 30,000 square feet or less and 90 or fewer parking spaces. Lastly, Ms. Beam reviewed landfill and excavation, which typically make up a standalone category. This standard is currently 500 cubic yards, and is proposed to be increased to 1,000 cubic yards. In reviewing three years of data on SEPA threshold determinations, from 2010-2012, Ms. Beam found that there were 30 determinations of non-significances (DNS) issued in that time period. No mitigated determination of non-significances (MDNS) or determination of significances (DS) were issued during this timeframe.

The City is proposing these changes because SEPA has become more of an administrative procedural tool. SEPA policies have been codified into City regulations. Redmond, comparatively speaking, has very comprehensive regulations, between the Zoning Code, the Municipal Code, and technical notebooks. SEPA review is still required if critical areas are onsite, which is a very important point. A project that otherwise would qualify as an exemption would fall under SEPA review if a critical area is involved. There are no proposals to change this situation. Ms. Beam said increasing the threshold levels helps foster legislative streamlining and improves the efficiency of the environmental review process.

Ms. Beam displayed how jurisdictions need to document how the elements of the environment are addressed through regulations, either city, federal, or state. The SEPA checklist includes several categories of questions that speak to each of these levels of regulation. Ms. Beam showed an example of a public notice process, a Type 3 permit for a preliminary plat in the City of Redmond with a subdivision of ten or more lots. She showed this example to illustrate that there is a public notice process outside of the SEPA process.

In summary, Ms. Beam said the City's tool for implementing traditional SEPA matters has essentially become the Zoning Code and other adopted codes and technical notebooks. Developments occurring on sites with critical areas are still subject to SEPA review. The City proposal is in response to the SEPA rule, and the SEPA rule is in response to Senate Bill 6406, which is often referred to as the Natural Resources Reform Bill. The City has consistently issued determination of non-significance (DNS) thresholds over the last several years. The three criteria in the revised rule are met, which include demonstrating there is a local public notice process; demonstrating that there are adopted regulations, state, local, or federal; and demonstrating that 21 days of public notice will occur prior to any adoption.

Chair Gregory asked for public testimony regarding the proposed amendment. Tom Hinman spoke to the Planning Commission and stated that he provided a written comment on the SEPA threshold matter on May 22nd as part of the public SEPA comment process for the amendment and wanted to follow up with verbal testimony. Mr. Hinman questioned that the SEPA checklist, Section D-6, for the Zoning Code amendment stated that the proposal would not increase demand on transportation, public services, and utilities. He said that impact fees in the City's comprehensive regulatory environment would exercise control over the development process that SEPA was intended to do, but he still felt uncomfortable. He said that the statewide measure that permits, but does not require, maximizing SEPA thresholds may not be entirely appropriate for a city of Redmond's modest scale.

Mr. Hinman recommended more thought be given to the values or numbers recommended by staff for multi-family residential, commercial, and parking projects. Finally, regarding opportunities for public comment, he would like to see more rather than less public engagement. He recognized the value of streamlining the development process, particularly from a staff perspective, but asserted that the SEPA checklist provides a valuable cross-check on posted developer plans and assembles valuable environmental information in a standardized and readily accessible format that is valued by the community.

Commissioner Biethan asked which information on the SEPA checklist would not be readily available and would be very useful to have. Mr. Hinman said the checklist speaks to environmental issues, including biodiversity, air quality, and water quality, and noise quality, and light as well as infrastructural issues regarding whether a particular project would impact city services, facilities, or transportation. Thus, the checklist deals with environmental concerns and overall community concerns. Commissioner O'Hara noted that he did not receive a written copy of Mr. Hinman's testimony.

Ms. Beam responded that Mr. Hinman had commented on the SEPA threshold determination that was issued for the Zoning Code amendment. Two written comments were submitted on this issue, and those comments were attached to SEPA, not the actual Zoning Code amendment. She apologized for not sending those comments forward, but promised to do so. Mr. Hinman noted that the other written public comment on this issue

had concerns similar to his, in that it asked for additional understanding of projects as well as opportunities to comment in the SEPA process.

Commissioner Biethan said that from 2004-2012, basically all of the SEPA thresholds issued were determinations of non-significance. He asked if raising the threshold would turn into a data issue or would speak to other protective issues. Mr. Hinman said it is helpful to have additional information, but how that is balanced in the public good with streamlining processes is what the Commission is wrestling with. Commissioner O'Hara confirmed with staff that in the years 2004-2012, none of the projects that applied had a determination of significance. Ms. Beam said that, in that period, the City issued 146 SEPA threshold determinations on several categories of projects. Of those, two were mitigated determination of non-significance (MDNS), meaning that 144 were determined to be non-significant. The two that were mitigated were specifically two subdivisions in North Redmond in 2006 that had transportation improvements required which, at the time, were outside Redmond city limits. In order to require the developer to complete the transportation improvements, the City issued the MDNS.

Commissioner O'Hara asked if the newly proposed thresholds would have changed the numbers on the projects reviewed from 2004-2012. Ms. Beam said there would be a few more. She said that in 2010-2012, four fewer projects would have had SEPA review, namely the Redmond Fire Station on 116th, an office building on 166th, Robert Pantley's multi-family project called The Retreat, and Brookfield Veterinary near Whole Foods. She said that the bigger projects downtown would still be subject to review. She said that many areas, such as Grass Lawn and Educational Hill, often have critical areas and, by default, would be required to have a SEPA threshold determination made.

Commissioner Biethan asked Ms. Beam if the four projects she spoke of would have had their issues reviewed as part of the zoning review process. Ms. Beam confirmed that was indeed the case, and said that those projects would have had one fewer process to go through. She said that Mr. Hinman did make a good point regarding providing information, and said that staff has spoken internally that even though some projects would be exempt, those projects are still required to submit the SEPA checklist. That way, the collective information Mr. Hinman spoke of would be included. Mr. Hinman asked if that information would be available to the public and circulated in the same way SEPA is now. Ms. Beam said that information would not be circulated. Seeing no other persons who wished to testify, Chairman Gregory closed the public testimony on this topic. He suggested that Mr. Hinman's point could be included in Issue 4 for the Commission on this topic, namely, what the City would lose by not having a SEPA checklist. Chairman Gregory said the Commission could finalize its discussion on this topic at next week's meeting and make a recommendation to City Council at that point.

Mr. Sullivan said there was a report approval scheduled for next week, and asked if further discussion would be needed next week. Ms. Beam noted that the comment from Mr. Hinman was about a SEPA threshold determination for the proposed Zoning Code amendment, which typically is not included in Planning Commission items. Commissioner Murray said the discussion period did not need to be extended, but he

would like to see Mr. Hinman's letter. Mr. Sullivan said that staff will review how SEPA comments are attached to Planning Commission materials in the future. Chairman Gregory noted that the issues regarding this topic would be resolved at this meeting, and said there should be a report approval on June 19th. Commissioner Miller said he would like to see Mr. Hinman's testimony, and if that meant holding back that report approval one week, then so be it. Chairman Gregory agreed with that sentiment and said he would see how far the Commission got on the issues matrix at this meeting.

The first issue in the matrix was an information request from Commissioner Biethan. He said his concerns were answered in the staff response. Chairman Gregory closed that issue. The second issue was an information request from Chairman Gregory about the SEPA Advisory Committee's rationale for some new exemption level thresholds. He was satisfied with the staff answer. Commissioner Miller asked about commercial projects, and said there was quite a bit of language that seemed to indicate such projects really are not linked to land use classifications. He asked how certain SEPA thresholds would support walkable communities and reduce traffic in urban areas, and he was troubled about that issue.

Ms. Beam said she could not find a definitive answer regarding the range of SEPA thresholds and how certain numbers were derived. The walkable community's language was taken, verbatim, from the SEPA Advisory Working Group. She could not find a definitive answer to Commissioner Miller's question. Commissioner Miller said he could accept the argument posed on this topic with regard to multi-family projects. He was not certain how it impacted single-family projects and was concerned about the proposed changes regarding commercial projects. Commissioner Miller wanted to know that there was some link between the SEPA values and the goals of the City. He wanted staff to have an efficient process, but also wanted a balance with regard to the City's need to fulfill its responsibilities for oversight.

Commissioner Murray agreed with Commissioner Miller that walkability and the size of a project are difficult to connect in the rationale presented by staff. However, he said some of the rationales provided are appropriate. He did not know how to justify the commercial rationale, but saw this as one small point in a larger picture. He asked if the issue matrix would be recorded as defining an ultimate answer, thus providing a point for discussion and review by the City Council. If so, then he suggested taking out the language that did not make sense. Ms. Beam said that language could be struck. Commissioner Murray supported the idea of striking this issue, in that it does not make sense how certain thresholds would support walkable communities and reduce traffic within urban growth areas. He asked what the rationale truly was and said there was a missing link in the answer to this comprehensive question.

Chairman Gregory said that the original question dealt with the SEPA Advisory Committee's rationale, and Ms. Beam did her best to answer that question. However, he noted that the City's rationale needed to be determined for a project of a certain size. Commissioner Murray said the language did not necessarily need to be struck, in that Ms. Beam did her research properly, but he said that the Commission still had a lack of

understanding about why this rationale exists. Mr. Sullivan added that the issue matrix is attached to the final report sent by the Commission to the City Council, and Council members do rely on this information as a way to track this discussion. Commissioner Murray asked if Commissioner Miller needed this rationale to be explained to make a vote on this point. Commissioner Miller said yes. Commissioner Murray said, before moving forward, the Commission would need a better understanding of what the SEPA Advisory Committee did in terms of the commercial regulations. Ms. Beam said she did not think she would find an answer to that question.

Commissioner O'Hara said the main threshold the Commission appears to be concerned about was the one that dealt with an office, school, or recreational service. Commissioner Biethan asked if there could be a way to contact the person who drafted this language to get more information. Chairman Gregory said aside from the SEPA Advisory Committee, the Commission needed to learn why the threshold in question should be recommended. He said that he shared Commissioner Miller's concerns. He asked if any details could be gleaned from the Technical Committee's reports or minutes. Ms. Beam said she would contact the Department of Ecology and a few SEPA Advisory Committee members to see if she could find any further information. She said the Technical Committee wanted to take this threshold to the maximum, in that the City's laws are so comprehensive that an application of a larger size would not be treated any differently. Commissioner Murray said he wanted Ms. Beam to do additional research to determine the rationale of the threshold. Commissioner Miller wanted to make sure the threshold was focused on Redmond rather than a statewide assessment.

Mr. Sullivan said he looked for this exact clarification back on May 22nd. With regard to issue matrix Item 2, the question was about the state SEPA Advisory Committee's rationale for the threshold. The state went through a statewide process and determined a range of available numbers to a range of available cities, so one size, by definition, would not fit all. Mr. Sullivan asked if the Commission wanted to track down the rationale or if the Commission accepted the established numbers and wanted to know Redmond's rationale for applying the numbers proposed. This also speaks to issue matrix Item 3, which asks what the City would lose by having a project slightly above the current threshold. Commissioner Miller said he was curious as to how the state determined its values. Commissioner Murray said he was mainly concerned about Redmond's values, as noted in Item 3, and how they were upheld. He said the fact that SEPA does or does not match Redmond's thresholds leads him to believe the Commission is doing its due diligence. Commissioner Murray said he did not need the information about the state that Commissioner Miller was looking for.

Chairman Gregory said the Redmond considerations were more important to him than the state Advisory Committee's considerations of SEPA. He said the legislative intent of SEPA was to give cities the opportunity to pick, within a certain range of values, the items that would apply to them. He said the overarching rationale behind the staff proposal is to streamline the process, lower costs, and reduce redundancy. Chairman Gregory said many cities are most likely dealing with this situation. He said it would be more useful for the Commission to know why Redmond picked this particular threshold

versus why the state came up with that range. Commissioner Murray asked if Chairman Gregory wanted the staff to go back and research the history behind this issue. Commissioner Murray did not think Item 3 really answered the questions regarding rationale, other than that the rationale was taken into consideration as the Zoning Code was put together for what Redmond thought was best.

Chairman Gregory asked if staff was able to determine some answers about why the state thresholds were established. Ms. Beam said her research shows the state did its work with the various interests involved, including city, county, and business representatives, among other groups. The state then came up with maximum thresholds based on whether one is in an urban growth area or if one is outside the urban growth area. She said the state has done the heavy lifting with the discussions over this topic, and Redmond has followed suit with its thresholds. Commissioner Murray asked if the City has adopted the thresholds not necessarily because of City values, but because of the SEPA Committee's work on the topic. Ms. Beam responded that the state did some valuable work. That, coupled with the City's comprehensive regulations, brings up the question again about what would be lost or gained with a streamlined process. Commissioner Murray clarified that the City has invested in adopting what the SEPA Committee has suggested. Thus, the City should know why the state adopted its thresholds if the City is going to adopt those thresholds.

Commissioner Biethan said the Commission was way down in the weeds. He said the City has a process in place with a variety of regulations. He thought, basically, raising the thresholds would create less redundancy in the land use permit process. Commissioner Murray agreed, but wanted to get Commissioner Miller's concerns answered so that the Commission could move on. Chairman Gregory said the sticking point here was over the idea that raising the thresholds would support walkable communities and reduce traffic within the urban growth areas. That did not seem to be supported anywhere. Commissioner Sanders agreed with Commissioner Biethan that the Commission is getting down in the weeds. She asked if the Commission could look at the SEPA issue from a higher level and see where there might be disagreements on specific points rather than approaching the discussion from the bottom up. She did not think a lot of staff work was necessary if there was only minor detail that needed clarification. She wanted to keep moving forward.

Commissioner Miller said major statements were being made to justify the intended action, and those statements were not justified from the material presented to the Commission. He said that is a big, high altitude issue and that was a major concern for him. He noted, echoing Mr. Hinman's concerns, that SEPA has not offered proper protection for certain properties. Commissioner Miller said loosening up the reins too much with SEPA could remove an important safety net. Ms. Beam said she believed Mr. Hinman's testimony dealt more with the environmental checklist and the information it provides. Commissioner Miller said there would be public concern if the thresholds were raised, and public confidence in the system could waiver. He wanted, basically, to understand how the state's values have been applied to meet Redmond's needs. The Commission decided to keep this issue open.

Issue 3 was raised by Commissioners Biethan, Miller, and Murray. Commissioner Murray said he was satisfied that the City has comprehensive zoning codes in place, and was satisfied with staff's work on that issue. Chairman Gregory closed the issue.

Issue 4 spoke to the issue of what the City would lose by not having a SEPA checklist. Ms. Beam asked if the category of public comment should be added to this issue. Chairman Gregory said yes, and noted that this was the point raised by Mr. Hinman. The access to particular data might be lost if SEPA checklists were not used. Commissioner Murray said Mr. Hinman's response to Issue 4 was valuable. Commissioner Murray had asked if, without SEPA, the City had the ability to go in and control the process. He was satisfied that was indeed the case due to the City's comprehensive policies. He wanted to make sure Mr. Hinman's testimony would be attached to this issue.

Commissioner Biethan asked if the information in the SEPA checklist was easily accessible right now to the public. Chairman Gregory said another issue was that the SEPA checklist was a well known process, and did not know if another process would be able to replace it. Commissioner Biethan said the issue was more about information, not the type of checklist or process used. Ms. Beam said the City could modify its processes to require SEPA checklists, even if projects are exempt, to have the data that checklist provides. Commissioner O'Hara said he would like to know, mainly, that the information would not be buried. Chairman Gregory kept this issue open, and said the report approval for the matrix issues could be set for June 26th. Commissioner Biethan asked if a lot of cities have adopted the changes to SEPA regulations. Ms. Beam said Redmond is in the front of the pack on this point, but many cities are starting to deal with it. Mr. Sullivan asked about the oral and written comment period. Chairman Gregory said both were closed, but Mr. Hinman's letter and the other letter received during the SEPA comment period would be added to the record.

STUDY SESSION, Proposed Zoning Code Amendment related to Wellhead Protection regulations

Kelsey Johnson, City of Redmond Planning Department, and Kevin Murphy, City of Redmond Natural Resource Division provided the introduction for this study session. Ms. Johnson said that wellhead protection is about protecting City drinking water aquifer. She noted that Mr. Murphy works with the City's Wellhead Protection Program. She said that there are some risks surrounding the stormwater infiltration systems that can affect the groundwater aquifer. She also said she would review the wellhead protection zone performance standards with the Commission, which is in the critical areas code of the Redmond Zoning Code. The amendment proposed is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; thus, there is no Comprehensive Plan amendment associated with the text amendment. Ms. Johnson said staff believes this amendment is necessary to facilitate the protection of the City's groundwater.

Mr. Murphy, a geologist with Natural Resources for the City and the wellhead protection lead. He is often asked what wellhead protection is. He said it is the protection of the

City's drinking water aquifer, the headwaters of the City's drinking water wells. The City has five drinking water wells that supply the area east of the Sammamish River. The protection areas are designated as wellhead protection zones, based on the time it takes for groundwater to reach one of the drinking water wells. Wellhead Protection Zone 1 is the closest area to the wells. The closest area to Downtown is over at the Public Safety Building, which is Well #4. Mr. Murphy illustrated a six-month time of travel for the water with Wellhead Protection Zone 1. Wellhead Protection Zone 2 is the one-year time of travel, so a drop of water would take one year to reach the well from anywhere within that area. Wellhead Protection Zone 3 is the full expanse of the critical aquifer recharge area and has a ten-year time of travel. Anything outside of that, but still in the City of Redmond, is in Wellhead Protection Zone 4.

The protection zones are included in the Municipal Code and the Zoning Code as ways to protect the drinking water aquifer, and were adopted by ordinance in 2003. In that code, in 2003, there was recognition that specific land uses may be harmful to water quality. Among the many risks identified was the infiltration of untreated stormwater. Stormwater can land on a parking lot, pick up contaminants, infiltrate into the ground and carry those contaminants into the drinking water aquifer. So, in 2003, the Code required an evaluation of the risks from the various facilities that have stormwater infiltration systems and what potential modifications might need to be made to those stormwater systems to address those risks. The Code also allowed the City to require both private and public facilities to change their stormwater systems and operations if there was a risk to groundwater.

The City has identified more than 120 parcels, private and public, that have stormwater infiltration systems. Most of those systems were designed from the 1960's to the very early 1990's, at which point stormwater regulations changed and the majority of stormwater infiltration stopped throughout the City, at least infiltration without treatment. The Code required that the evaluation and modification of these systems should be completed by 2008. However, to align the City code with codes adopted by the state during this same time frame, and to work with businesses to make it more easily implemented, the City created an evaluation modification process for these stormwater infiltration systems with businesses. An assessment program was developed by the City, and a new schedule was adopted in 2010. Since that time, the City has been implementing the assessment program and the vast majority of these systems have been evaluated. The City has now made changes and is requiring facilities to change their stormwater filtration systems.

Several businesses came to the City two years ago and were very concerned about the cost of implementation and the potential impacts on their businesses, so the City is reevaluating the program and working with businesses to develop specific implementation processes. The City is working with four businesses in a pilot program to develop engineering, designs, and modifications for their sites while working them through the entire permitting process. Thus, the City should be able to find out exactly what it would take to make the modifications at these businesses. The City Council has supported this effort. Mr. Murphy is also looking at a reimbursement schedule where the

City would help to offset some of the costs of the modifications, as it is a direct benefit to the drinking water aquifer.

All of the sites in the pilot program were developed 20 or 30 years ago, and one of the challenges is the businesses have used up the majority of the space on their sites with their operations. Some of them even have existing non-conformances, such as not enough parking or no room for a small building, if a hazardous materials covered storage unit was required. Room for rain gardens or other improvements to clean up the stormwater or remove hazardous materials is not available either.

Ms. Johnson spoke to the intent of the proposed changes. In the Zoning Code, the wellhead protection performance standards specifically address non-conformities, such as parking and landscaping. The intent of the changes would be to provide more flexibility with regard to the stormwater improvements onsite, which is the preferred alternative. The current regulations specify that an existing legal non-conforming structure cannot be expanded, altered, or intensified in any way. However, staff wants to provide the flexibility to allow a structure to intensify, alter, or expand a legal non-conformance because the improvements create a net benefit to City groundwater.

Commissioner Sanders asked for an example of a legal, non-conforming structure. Ms. Johnson brought up an example of a business in the MP zone, where the Code says that a business has to have one parking stall per 1,000 square feet. If the building were 10,000 square feet, 10 parking stalls would be required, but the building in Ms. Johnson's example only has eight. Back when the building was constructed, eight was allowed. So, today, this would be an existing legal non-conformance. With this example, if a rain garden was required, the City and business could determine the best alternative location would be to take up two parking stalls, reducing the parking even further. Thus, the proposed amendment would allow for the intensifying of a legal non-conformity. This would allow the business to install the rain garden and provide an environmental benefit to the groundwater.

The City has been meeting with a group of four businesses once a month for the last few months to go over not only the amendment but also other updates to the groundwater protection incentive program. The City and the business owners agreed on the intent of the language. However, the businesses are not completely satisfied with the text, so at this point, the City Attorney will talk with the businesses' attorney to go over the language itself. Any refinements to the language would be forwarded to the Commission.

Chairman Gregory asked what the concern over the language was. Ms. Johnson said the language addresses the improvements the City is requiring, and says if there is no alternative location, that the City would allow the business to increase, intensify, or expand the non-conformity. The businesses agree on the intent, but they think the language does not address this properly and did not explain exactly why. Chairman Gregory asked about where the City got its drinking water. Mr. Murphy confirmed that the wells he mentioned earlier supply the east part of the City. The west part of Redmond, west of the Sammamish River, is supplied Cascade Water Alliance, the Tolt supply.

Commissioner O'Hara asked if the changes proposed apply throughout the City or just to the areas supplied by the wells. Mr. Murphy illustrated the wellhead protection zones again to show the parcels affected by the amendment proposed. Commissioner O'Hara noted that Overlake Village was not within the wellhead protection zones, and confirmed that the amendments were not applicable to them. Mr. Murphy said the text change proposed would indeed apply only to facilities within Wellhead Protection Zones 1 and 2 and only to facilities that are affected by this particular piece of code. This is limited to, generally, those 120 parcels noted on the map and a few others recently inspected that were found to have infiltration systems.

Commissioner Biethan asked about the pilot program and if its intent was to find ways to encourage property owners who are not helping the groundwater in the wellhead areas to mitigate any contamination. He asked if the proposed amendment would give the City more flexibility in how a business would be allowed to mitigate water that is running off, potentially, into the wells the City uses. Mr. Murphy said that was correct. Commissioner Biethan asked which businesses were involved. Ms. Johnson said Olympian Pre-Cast, IDD Aerospace, Bear Creek Shopping Center, and Redmond Office Center were the businesses involved. Mr. Murphy said these were large, established businesses. Bear Creek Shopping Center did not have a stormwater filtration system. IDD Aerospace had hazardous materials handled outside, but created a program so that the materials never go outside and would eliminate the risk of contamination. To do that, however, a small structure would need to be built, which would not be possible in their current non-conforming situation. The amendment would allow them to build that structure.

Chairman Gregory noted that there would be some costs involved for property owners, and asked why the stormwater issues are a concern now versus in the past. Mr. Murphy said that the code requirement has been in place since 2003. The requirement is recognized by the City, the state, and federal agencies as a risk to groundwater. The City has recognized this issue since 1997, and there has been a lot of diligent work to move forward on this topic for nine years. The City has hit a number of hurdles, but it is progressing. Two private businesses have completed this work as well as two City facilities. Redmond has very good groundwater quality with some isolated incidents in the past. The hope is to maintain that quality for a long time to come. Water moves in the Redmond aquifer quickly, but it is a large aquifer. Thus, the City needs to make sure that groundwater going into the aquifer is clean. With no questions from Commissioners, Ms. Johnson noted that the Commission would hold the public hearing on this issue at next week's meeting. Chairman Gregory closed the study session.

REPORTS/SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S):

Chairman Gregory noted that the Mayor met with him and with all the chairs of the various boards and commissions in the City a few weeks ago to discuss the annual boards and commissions dinner to recognize the civic service involved in these groups. Attendance for this event has been dwindling. The Mayor asked if the dinner should continue, and how it would be best to recognize the public service of board and commission members. The chairs and the Mayor discussed some basic objectives:

1. Recognizing and offering gratitude for the volunteer work being done.
2. Raising public awareness about the different boards and commissions.
3. Creating a recruiting tool to bring more people into volunteer public service.

Chairman Gregory asked for some input from the Commission about these topics. Commissioner O'Hara said he enjoyed the dinner, but was disappointed that others have not shown up. Commissioner Biethan noted that he sat with the Arts Commission, which was far more interesting than sitting with the Planning Commission. Commissioner Murray said the dinner is not really a recruiting tool. About raising awareness, he noted that few people watch the Commission on television, and he said the dinner would not significantly impact awareness of public issues.

Chairman Gregory asked what would be more effective to reach those goals. One idea was to have a reception during Derby Days, in that a lot of members of the public show up to that event and might be impacted more with a booth or some other public display for boards and commissions. Chairman Gregory said the event that One Redmond does each year could involve some recognition for board or commission members. He agreed that the dinner was not as effective as it could be. He asked for ideas from the Commission. Commissioner Biethan said he did not truly care about the recognition, but he would like to have an event that would help the Commission network with people. Commissioner Sanders said she has been to two of the dinners, and said she gained something from each event, especially in talking with members from other commissions. She said it was valuable to see the breadth of interests and people involved in City government, and she felt reconnected and recommitted after the dinner event. She felt there were positive aspects to the dinner, but it should be more casual and shorter.

Commissioner Miller said he did not necessarily need a night for a pat on the back, but supported the idea of having a better chance to network. Commissioner O'Hara noted that he was able to sit with the Fire Chief of Redmond at the last dinner, which he would have never had the opportunity to do otherwise. He said that networking was good. He agreed with Commissioner Sanders that a three-hour dinner was not needed. A less formal reception would be a good idea, and the event could be combined with another event, such as One Redmond's gala. Commissioner Murray said he was on the board of One Redmond, and he did not believe that was the right venue to pair up with, as it is an investor and stakeholder dinner. He said having a tent up during Derby Days with a display for each Commission could be valuable, with the possibility of co-sponsorship with One Redmond. Making the work of the commissions and boards more visible would help draw in public interest.

Chairman Gregory summarized that interacting with other commissions and other boards, as well as other City leaders, was of interest to the Planning Commission. He said he would tell the Mayor that the dinner was not a great idea, but the City should continue to have the boards and commissions get together in some way. Chairman Gregory asked for more input from the Commission in the future, and said he would pass along the main points of this discussion to the Mayor.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the City Council held a study session on the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) the night before the Planning Commission meeting. Some members of the Commission were there. Commissioner O'Hara said Commissioner Miller did a great summary of the Commission's discussion of the TMP. Commissioner Miller said Commissioner O'Hara did a good job of explaining the process and how the Commission reached out to the community. The Council members, as a whole, have a lot of work to do in the coming weeks, but Commissioner Miller said they were better for the effort the Commission put into the process.

Mr. Sullivan said he would follow up with the Commissioners for the second study session on the 2013-14 Comprehensive Plan amendment docket next Wednesday. The agenda on that day will show that it is a study session for the SEPA exemptions, not the report approval. On July 10th, the Commission will hear from staff member Sarah Stiteler on two items, not three, because one privately initiated Comprehensive Plan amendment still on the 2012-13 docket, has been withdrawn by the applicant. The amendment request that was withdrawn involved a proposal to allow standalone restaurants with drive-through service in the Manufacturing Park zone. The applicant's property is on Willows Road near 91st. That applicant has since rented that property to a new tenant, and therefore no longer seeks the proposed amendment.

Commissioner Miller asked if the wellhead protection regulations report approval, public hearing, and recommendation could happen on June 19th instead of going over two sessions, on the 19th and 26th. Mr. Sullivan said that it would be unusual to go through all of those processes in one night. There will be two report approvals on the 26th, SEPA as well as wellhead protection. Chairman Gregory said next week's meeting could be shortened, and some items could be moved to the following week to balance out the meeting times. Mr. Sullivan said the briefing on administrative changes to land use notice boards could likely be rescheduled to balance topics across upcoming meetings.

ADJOURN

MOTION by Commissioner Miller to adjourn the meeting. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Murray. Chairman Gregory adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:47 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Planning Commission Chair

July 10, 2013
