

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

September 28, 2011

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Hinman, Vice Chair Franz Wiechers-Gregory, Commissioners Biethan, Flynn, Julinsey, and Miller

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Commissioners Chandorkar and O'Hara

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Stiteler, Pete Sullivan, City of Redmond Planning Department; Scott Thomasson, Jeff Thompson, City of Redmond Public Works Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lady of Letters, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

No changes to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION from Commissioner Miller to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes of September 21st, 2011. Motion seconded. Motion approved unanimously (6-0).

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

No one from the public came forward to speak to the Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Draft Water System Plan Update, presented by Jeff Thompson, Senior Engineer, and Scott Thomasson, Utility Engineering Manager, City of Redmond Public Works Department.

Mr. Thompson and Mr. Thomasson noted that there was no one from the audience to take part in the public hearing on this topic. Staff commented that the City is required to update this plan every six years; this update will replace the 2003 plan. The plan is a tool to maintain, operate and expand the water system to meet existing and future needs. The plan is also a way to identify short-term capital improvements while defining long-term system planning goals. The plan is consistent with City policies and regulations. The City Well Service Area began in the early 1900s. The City began serving the Overlake/Viewpoint area in the 1950s. The City took over the Rose Hill Water District in 1994, and began serving the Novelty Hill area in the late 1990s. The service area is now 16.85 square miles, with more than 60,000 people served by more than 16,000 water connections. There are five wells that can supply up to 3,700 gallons per minute. There are seven Cascade Water Alliance connections, and many connections through Bellevue and Kirkland.

The City has nine reservoirs; one is shared with Bellevue, two are shared with Kirkland. There are 320 miles of pipe and 77 PRVs, or pressure-reducing valves. Those valves create a pressure zone, allowing the City to keep plumbing pressures between 30 and 80 pounds. In terms of water demands, the City's average daily use is seven million gallons. The maximum daily demand is about 14.5 million gallons. A projection of possible water demands at build-out would be about 15 million gallons for an average daily demand, with a maximum daily demand of 31 million gallons. The City has upgraded Wells 1, 2, 3 and 5. There is a new pump station at Reservoir Park, and the water facility security system has been upgraded. The City has a water conservation program through the Cascade Water Alliance. The water quality program is required by the Environmental Protection Agency and Washington State Department of Health to comply with dozens of quality regulations. There is a Wellhead Protection Program and Financial Program, in which the City analyzes rates every two years. If a rate hike is needed, the City Council must make that decision.

Future Capital Improvement Program projects include a SE Redmond transmission main between Avondale and Union Hill Road. Some improvements are also planned in the Education Hill/565 zone, which will provide better fire flow to the south of Education Hill. The City is planning on a PRV and meter vault replacement program in the future, as well as a water system replacement program and telemetry system upgrades every so often. Staff has provided comment letters from the Department of Health, King County, the City of Bellevue, and the Union Hill Water District. The City of Seattle and Northeast Sammamish Sewer and Water District provided emails that said *no comment*.

Chairman Hinman officially opened the public hearing and asked for any questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Flynn asked about people who leave Redmond during the year for a snowbird trip to Arizona, for example, and how they are billed. Mr. Thomasson noted that the water rates are year-round, and there is a flat monthly charge even if there is not any consumption. Commissioner Julinsey asked about the annex and transfer to Kirkland that occurred back in June. Mr. Thomasson noted that Kirkland's annexation did take place on June 1st, but the City of Redmond is still negotiating the terms of the agreement for a transfer. The plan is to have the transfer effective January 1, 2012. Commissioner Biethan asked to make sure any comment letters, in the future, could be included in the Commission members' packets before their meeting.

Mr. Thomasson noted that the comment letters received raised a few issues of clarification. Many of the issues have already been explained to the different agencies. Some of the issues will be addressed through edits to the plan, which are still in draft form. Ten pages have a few edits. Commissioner Biethan asked if there was anything controversial or anything the Commission should know. Mr. Thomasson noted that the biggest issue raised that might be a concern was about a service area question. Back in the 1920s, when Redmond purchased the watershed, which is now Watershed Park, a pipeline was built to bring water in from the creek in that area. Over time, people connected to that water pipe, which is a six-inch, cast-iron water main that is now 80 or 90 years old and not in great shape. At some point in the near future, it will need to be replaced. A state law called the Coordination Act requires that agencies should claim their future service areas to make sure they do not overlap each other.

Union Hill Water Association has claimed a portion of this area where this pipeline goes through, and Woodinville has claimed an area of it to the north. Right now, there are less than 50 customers on the pipeline, with even a smaller number beyond Farrel-McWhirter Park. Redmond's goal is to plan on how to serve those customers and, potentially, transfer them to the Union Hill Water Association. Union Hill's comments pointed out that there would be connection charges, and that the agency has not built facilities for these customers. However, Mr. Thomasson noted that it was early in the process to have those conversations. The Water System Plan speaks to this issue and clarifies some language to say that the City will not make a change in the near-term. Rather, the intent is to transfer these customers to Union Hill, in that these customers are not within the City of Redmond. Union Hill would be the more logical service provider for that area. A transition will have to be planned. If a transition does not take place, the City of Redmond would have to replace the pipe. Commissioner Biethan said that this was a function of normal growth. Mr. Thomasson said that both King County and the state asked for clarification on this issue, and Union Hill provided a comment.

The second issue raised by the Commission at its last meeting, which the state raised in its letter, was a conversation about storage over the long term, noting that there would be a future deficiency in the Overlake/Viewpoint service area. The question is how Redmond would meet that need. Mr. Thomasson said that some clarifying language has been provided to the state, and some sentences will be added in the Water Plan to make it clearer. Mr. Thomasson noted that these two issues were the main ones the Commission should be concerned about; the other questions raised were mainly ones of clarification. King County's concerns only apply to the areas outside Redmond City limits, which raised a debate over how much approval authority the county has. King County noted that the county has the right to comment in order to make sure Redmond has planned for the right land use in the areas outside City limits, especially in the Novelty Hill area. Mr. Thomasson said the water system meets all the county's needs for zoning in that area.

Commissioner Flynn asked about a comment from the City of Bellevue, talking about some capital improvement projects at NE 40th. Mr. Thomasson said that is a shared tank in Bellevue city limits. Redmond contracts with Bellevue for maintenance. This is an older tank that will need some work, including a new roof. Mr. Thomasson said these were not big budget items that were added into the CIP. Chairman Hinman confirmed this was the tank covering Overlake Village at build-out. This tank is located just north of 40th Street and a block west of 148th Avenue NE, behind a senior center. It is a ground-level tank, so every gallon in it has to be pumped out. Chairman Hinman clarified that the roof repairs and pump station rehab projects added to the text have been added since the Commission received the CIP. Mr. Thomasson said yes; this was an edit he made. There has been no written or spoken public comment on this issue other than the regulatory agencies noted.

Chairman Hinman asked how the process would happen in terms of approval, and if the Commission could approve this report with the edits mentioned, or if it would take another meeting. Mr. Thomasson said the edits were minor, and could be provided to the Commission before its next meeting. The intent is to make sure that City Council knows about those edits before any action is taken. Chairman Hinman confirmed with Mr. Thomasson that the edits in question were largely technical and not overly substantive.

Chairman Hinman went to the issue table next, starting with the suggestion of adding an executive summary. Staff's response was that such an addition would be a daunting task. Commissioner Flynn and Chairman Hinman were interested in this. Chairman Hinman was thinking of mainly an introductory paragraph of why the City is doing this and what agencies the City is dealing with, by way of context. Commissioner Flynn said he appreciates the concern over having a summary written by a consultant and the restriction around the contract budget with that. He would like a very brief summary highlighting the big issues that have changed since the last time the plan was revised. It does not need to be part of the document, but would be helpful for reviewers like the Planning Commissioners. He found that slogging through the 300 pages of material provided was nearly impossible. He noted that the City Council would appreciate the help in identifying the big issues and future concerns of the water plan.

Chairman Hinman asked if two paragraphs covering context and changes since 2003 would be sufficient. Commissioner Flynn said that could work. Commissioner Miller agreed with Commissioner Flynn in that he could not imagine having a document this large without an executive summary. Commissioner Miller said that if the Commission is supposed to be helping the public understand these types of documents, some sort of summary would be obligatory. If the contractor did not do the summary, staff should take care of it. Commissioner Gregory agreed with Commissioner Miller that he found it unusual that this document did not have an executive summary, but did take into account that the summary was not in the scope of work for the consultant. Commissioner Gregory noted that such a summary would bear a good amount of weight, and needs to be prepared professionally. He said that in future water plans, the summary should be included in the RFP on the project.

Commissioner Gregory noted that the staff presentation was a good summary that seemed to meet the needs the Commission is discussing. Chairman Hinman suggested that translating the staff report into an executive summary would help add some clarity for readers and not be too onerous a task for staff. Commissioner Gregory suggested calling such a summary an introduction simply due to the expectation of what an executive summary entails. Commissioner Miller noted that the lay reader of the introduction could understand better how the water plan fits into the Comprehensive Plan, referring to Issue 2 in the matrix, and would have been very useful to the Planning Commission, as well. Chairman Hinman asked staff if a three-page document could be drawn up based on its presentation. Mr. Thomasson said that could be done.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the PowerPoint overview of the topic could be translated into a preface and introduction. He acknowledged the Commission's recommendation that, in the future, technical documents should include an executive summary. Chairman Hinman said that Issue 1, regarding the introduction, might remain open as the Commission waits for new language. Chairman Hinman noted that the introduction should remain in the water plan itself as a preface or preamble and should not be separated. Chairman Hinman surveyed the Commission and found agreement that Issue 1 would be closed. Commission members will still want to review the new text.

Issue 2 dealt with synchronizing content and review processes. Mr. Sullivan noted that there is always a desire to coordinate internal documents. Any plan that is a subset of the Comprehensive

Plan, which the Water Plan is, reads consistently all the way through. Some of the references to a 2022 planning timeline are included in the current Comprehensive Plan. However, because the Comprehensive Plan is only in its draft form until the Council approves it December 6, 2011 and the Water System Plan is on a quicker timeline, this becomes a sequencing issue. What the City does not want to do is have data in the Water System Plan that is not current to the facilities provided. However, Mr. Sullivan noted that the Water System Plan does not appear to be deficient in terms of planning language; rather, there are some technical edits that have been taken care of. Also, the build-out study noted in the water plan was based on a build-out model, not the 2030 planning horizon model. Overall, Mr. Sullivan says the Water System Plan holds the integrity of the Comprehensive Plan, and he is not concerned that the water plan would be out of date once the Comprehensive Plan is approved. A few edits could be cleaned up in the future as needed.

Chairman Hinman asked if words to that effect could be incorporated in the preface or introduction to make the reader aware of the linkage between the Comprehensive Plan and the Water System Plan. Mr. Sullivan said that could happen. With no further comments on this issue, Chairman Hinman closed this issue, and encouraged internal coordination to work out this issue with the Comprehensive Plan update.

Issue 3 dealt with Overlake storage capacity. Chairman Hinman is concerned how the City would deal with a deficit at build-out. Mr. Thomasson noted that build-out of that neighborhood is a long time off. He added that there are no outstanding deficiencies of any magnitude. The City of Redmond will continue to work with Bellevue to address storage in this neighborhood. Neither city can build storage on its own, as both cities serve that area. Redmond has storage in the Rose Hill area that serves the Viewpoint neighborhood, and that is how the storage deficiency would possibly be made up, by moving that allocated storage. Those neighborhoods have been connected for three decades, and Rose Hill's storage could help if there were a problem with the supply system.

Chairman Hinman asked if there were a supply issue developing in the future. Mr. Thomasson noted that the Cascade Water Alliance was developing future supply sources. The Alliance is working with Seattle and Tacoma about extending their current contract. The Alliance recently bought Lake Tapps, and could develop that into a water supply. Right now, there is no concern about water supply for the region. Commissioner Miller asked about the language in the plan concerning the impracticality of Redmond to build its own water storage, in that such storage would be used by Bellevue in a standby storage situation. Commissioner Miller asked how likely or common that type of standby situation would be, and Mr. Thomasson said that it would be rare. He noted that if a major earthquake took out the Seattle supply system, Redmond would live on its own storage. The main supply of water for Redmond is from the Tolt Reservoir; the Cedar River supply system feeds the south end of Bellevue. Only a major quake would cause such a disruption, which would affect everyone, not just Redmond.

Commissioner Miller asked if the language in the plan made it sound like Redmond was taking the burden of its own water supply in the case of such an emergency. Mr. Thomasson said the state has a level-of-service standard, and the City of Redmond is above that minimum. He added that Redmond is interconnected with Bellevue, especially around the Overlake neighborhood.

Solutions of storage, therefore, have to be a joint decision between neighboring water districts. This would be a ten-to-twenty-year issue, Mr. Thomasson said, in which time another water plan would be adopted.

Chairman Hinman said he was satisfied with staff responses on all these issues. He wanted to make sure, when the Planning Commission report goes to City Council, that Issue 3 would be considered. Chairman Hinman closed Issue 3. No other issues were brought forth by the Commission. Chairman Hinman closed the oral and written portion of the public hearing on the Draft Water System Plan Update.

MOTION from Commissioner Gregory to recommend approval of the Draft Water System Plan Update, contingent on language previously discussed regarding an introduction, in Issue 1. Motion seconded by Commissioner Miller. Motion approved unanimously (6-0).

Commissioner Flynn requested that the new language be included in the next packet the Commissioners would see before their next meeting on October 12th. Mr. Sullivan noted that the report on this update would still be reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved on October 12th.

PUBLIC HEARING & STUDY SESSION, Reconciliation items, including Amendments to Introduction of Comprehensive Plan. Final Planning Commission review of outstanding amendments, 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan Update, presented by Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planner, City of Redmond Planning Department.

Chairman Hinman opened the public hearing. He asked if there had been any written communications or other public input to date. Ms. Stiteler said there had not been. There was no one in the audience to provide a comment, either. Chairman Hinman closed the public hearing and opened the study session.

Issue 1 was about if *shared Wi-Fi* should be used in the text of Policy EV18, or if more generalized, less specific language should be incorporated, as has been the case in the PARCC and Utilities Elements. Commissioners agreed to the more general language; Chairman Hinman closed this item. Commissioner Flynn noted that it will be very challenging to create policy about future, as yet unnamed, technology. He said that the main point was to make sure there were no disadvantages to anyone in the public accessing new technologies.

Issue 2 regarded parking and if it was sufficiently addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Hinman noted that this issue is well-covered in the Comprehensive Plan, but he raised this issue based on the original list of topics the Commission received. There were two aspects to his concerns: showing the light rail station at Overlake Village and showing adequate parking in that area. Chairman Hinman said the Comprehensive Plan elements are sufficient for where the City is, in that parking and station planning will happen at a functional level rather than in the Comprehensive Plan and policies. Commissioners had no further comment; Chairman Hinman closed item #2 on the issues table. He agreed to close this issue.

Issue 5, as originally raised in the earlier list of topics, was about removal of numeric years and using the terms *near*, *medium*, and *long-range*. Chairman Hinman had wanted some definition of years for those terms. After a conversation with staff, it was determined that placement of that definition would be best in FW28, as it is more introductory than the Capital Facilities portion. Mr. Sullivan noted that FW28 is linked to CF7, the Capital Facilities policy, which in turn has a connection to the City's land-use vision and a new capital investment strategy currently titled Vision Blueprint that project staff is working on. Mr. Sullivan recommended making a connection to the Planning Horizon of 2030 in the language of FW28. Chairman Hinman said he would agree with a solution from staff on clearer language, and looked forward to seeing this in the final issues matrix.

Commissioner Flynn had another parking question around urban settings, and how less parking would be needed around urban centers that have more transit. However, he asked how parking would be handled before areas develop as urban centers. Chairman Hinman agreed that this was a big issue, but noted that this might be more a functional planning issue rather than a policy issue. Commissioner Biethan asked if there were more parking strategies the Commission would discuss in the future. Chairman Hinman responded that the Commission did indeed talk about these strategies in the Urban Centers section, but he said parking would be a continuing conversation. Chairman Hinman noted that there were other edits in the package in front of the Commission that answer the concerns of Commissioners from previous meetings. He determined there were no concerns left in the reconciliation, other than the language revision mentioned in FW28.

MOTION by Commissioner Gregory to approve the reconciliation items as proposed to clarify the introduction, Vision 2040 Statement and other reconciliation items within the Comprehensive Plan Update. Seconded by Commissioner Flynn. Motion approved unanimously (6-0). This package will come back to the Commission on October 12th with a Planning Commission report.

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

Chairman Hinman asked about the recent joint meeting between the Commission and City Council. Ms. Stiteler said the meeting was helpful and enjoyable. Chairman Hinman noted that more reports were coming up for the Commission, as well as a small animal husbandry public hearing on October 12th. He recognized the departure of Commissioner Julinsey and thanked her for her service to the Planning Commission.

ADJOURN

Chairman Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:05 p.m.

Minutes Approved On: Planning Commission Chair