Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
1. Risk associated	Planning Commission Discussion	Opened 11/14
with placing sewer	Commissioners requested a staff response to points 1-5 in the applicant's 11/13 letter.	
lines over water		
mains. (Applicant	Staff Response/Recommendation	
11/13 letter /	The risk that exists when placing sewer lines over water lines is that under abnormal circumstances	
Murray)	sewage could contaminate the water system. The "Criteria for Sewage Works Design", a requirements manual published by Washington State Department of Ecology, has 4 pages of criteria regarding proximity of water and sewer pipes.	
	As a general rule sewer shall not cross over water mains. Extension of the sewer main in accordance	
	with the existing General Sewer Plan allows the sewer to be deep enough that service to the property	
	will pass under the water main meeting the state and city design standards. Redmond is a joint owner of the water main. Redmond's design standards for vertical clearance between the water and sewer mains	
	apply.	
	When the applicant talks about depth of the water pipe there is confusing information. Some	
	measurements are based on depth of cover to the top of the water main (4 feet as shown on Redmond	
	drawing) versus measurements to the bottom of the water main (7.2 to 8 feet deep in applicant's letter).	
	When allowing for the 24 inch pipe there would be about one foot difference between what is shown on Redmond's sketch and what the Kirkland as-built drawing shows.	
	While Rob Jammerman from Kirkland was trying to be helpful responding to the applicant's requests for	
	information he would not have the authority to commit the City of Kirkland to provide service to this	
	property. Sewer service would only be available based on the terms of an Interlocal Agreement approved by both Redmond and Kirkland City Councils.	
	Redmond received a recent email from Rob Jammerman stating that he had recently shared with the	
	applicant that Kirkland supported Redmond's recommendation to require the property to be served by Redmond.	
	The applicant's letter discusses that the crossing of the water main would be by "side-sewers". The	
	applicant has not made formal application of his development plan but it is almost certain that a sewer main will need to be extended into the property, not a number of side sewers.	

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for November 28, 2012

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	Public Comment Applicant's 11/13 letter states that the Technical Committee's concerns about drinking water are "pure hyperbole".	
2. Redmond's utility design requirements. (Applicant 11/13 letter / Murray)	Planning Commission Discussion Commissioners requested a staff response to points 1-5 in the applicant's 11/13 letter. Staff Response/Recommendation The applicant's letter mischaracterizes Redmond's Design Standards. The standard is as follows: "The preferred cover over sewer mains is seven (7) feet in order to assure gravity service and provide normal vertical separation between water and sewer mains. The minimum cover over ductile iron sewer mains is three (3) feet in both paved and unpaved areas; Minimum cover over other sewer mains is five (5) feet in both paved and unpaved areas." The applicant focusses on the word "preferred" and argues that because of the use of the word preferred that this is not a standard. This is a standard and the applicant's argument does not change that fact. This standard goes on to explain the reason for the 7 foot depth to assure that the vertical separation between water and sewer mains can be achieved. The 3 feet and 5 feet minimums are the exceptions to the general rule of 7 feet. The other standard that applies is the one that addresses vertical separation between water and sewer mains and it states: "Locate water mains over sanitary sewers, providing a minimum of 18 inches of vertical clearance between the walls of these pipelines" Extension of the sewer main in accordance with the existing General Sewer Plan allows the sewer to be	Opened 11/14
	constructed in accordance with both standards. The new sewer main will be deep enough that service to the property will pass under the water main meeting the state and city design standards. Due to the depth of the water main the sewer may need to be slightly deeper than the 7 feet.	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	Public Comment Applicant's 11/13 letter states that the Technical Committee Report "gives false impression" of utility design requirements.	
3. Feasibility of proposal. (Applicant 11/13 letter / Murray)	Planning Commission Discussion Commissioners requested a staff response to points 1-5 in the applicant's 11/13 letter. Staff Response/Recommendation The applicant's letter discusses that the crossing of the water main would be by "side-sewers". The applicant has not made formal application of his development plan but it is almost certain that a sewer main will need to be extended into the property not a number of side sewers. Construction of a sewer pipe may be possible. But it is not feasible to construct a sewer pipe that meets Redmond Design Standards in this location. The other major issue of feasibility is that both the Redmond and Kirkland City Councils would have to approve an Interlocal Agreement that would accommodate service from Kirkland. The two City Councils would consider whether serving this area from Kirkland's sewer is in the best interests of the communities as a whole and if yes, what the appropriate terms of that agreement would be. Extension of the sewer main in accordance with the existing General Sewer Plan allows the sewer to be constructed in accordance with Redmond design standards and does not rely on the outcome of negotiations between the two cities. Public Comment Applicant's 11/13 letter states that the proposed connection to the Kirkland sewer main is feasible.	Opened 11/14
4. Past Technical Committee actions on proposal.	Planning Commission Discussion Commissioners requested a staff response to points 1-5 in the applicant's 11/13 letter.	Opened 11/14
(Applicant 11/13 letter / Murray)	Staff Response/Recommendation The Technical Committee reviewed potential alternatives to the existing sewer plan in April 2009. The	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	applicant considers April 22, 2009 meeting notes to be "conceptual approval" of the applicant's current	
	proposal. However, the Technical Committee did not then, and does not now, have authority to approve	
	such changes to the General Sewer Plan. In April 2009, Comprehensive Plan Policy CF-5 restricted	
	administrative review to changes that "are consistent with and do not impede the implementation of the	
	Comprehensive Plan." In the Technical Committee's opinion, this proposal exceeds what could be	
	accomplished through administrative review, and thus decisions on the proposal are not within the purview of the Technical Committee. (During the recently completed update of the Comprehensive Plan,	
	this policy was renumbered to CF-4 and slightly revised; the revised policy still would not allow the	
	Technical Committee to approve a sewer plan change like this one.)	
	Since the Technical Committee does not have approval authority, a more accurate characterization of	
	the Committee's position on April 22, 2009 is that the Committee considered potholing an important	
	step to establishing precise depths of existing utilities, and that it acknowledged the fact that an	
	interlocal agreement with the City of Kirkland would be required should the proposal go ahead.	
	This interpretation is supported by the applicant's letter, and by email records from the time. A June 2,	
	2009 email from Bob Franklin (retired engineering manager) reads in part:	
	I would consider the five-foot depth to be reasonably sufficient at NE 73 rd Street. Since the	
	depth of a water main could easily vary along its length and the five-foot figure only	
	represents one point, I still believe pot-holing is necessary in several other locations to	
	establish the feasibility of the alternate comprehensive sewer plan for the area. It is very	
	important to establish the feasibility of the plan before changing the plan and expending the	
	resources that will be involved in the inter-local agreements and official actions that are required.	
	Note that Mr. Franklin considered it essential to establish the depths of the existing utilities before	
	proceeding with a plan amendment. To date the applicant has not completed this step. As stated in the	
	Technical Committee Report, based on what we know today, the proposal cannot be accomplished while meeting City standards.	
	Public Comment	
	Applicant's 11/13 letter states that the Technical Committee "conceptually approved" use of the Kirkland	

Rose Hill Heights South Sewer Plan Amendment (L120162)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for November 28, 2012

Discussion Notes	Status
sewer main in April 2009.	
Planning Commission Discussion Commissioners requested a staff response to points 1-5 in the applicant's 11/13 letter.	Opened 11/14
Staff Response/Recommendation Staff believes this discrepancy comes from using two different sets of contours. The applicant appears to be using contours that are displayed on a site survey that was conducted in 2009 or earlier. Staff relied on GIS contours in drafting the Technical Committee Report. In general, a site survey is more accurate than area-wide information, and so staff accepts the applicant's information on topography for the applicant's property.	
The applicant's site survey indicates that the elevation at 132 nd Avenue NE is 456 feet, rising to 464 feet at the east (back) end of the properties. While this would increase the odds that the properties could be served by gravity sewer, it would not mitigate the depth and separation issues that are equally critical. Public Comment Applicant's 11/13 letter states that the Technical Committee Report "misstates facts regarding slopes" on the applicant's properties.	
Planning Commission Discussion Commissioners asked about how reimbursement agreements typically work. Staff Response/Recommendation Staff provided a summary of how reimbursement agreements work at the 11/14 meeting. In essence, a developer pays for a sewer extension, and then by agreement with the City, can collect pro rata shares of the cost from those who connect to the sewer over the next ten years. The applicant's 11/13 letter states that there is risk in this arrangement to the developer; staff acknowledged that there is no assurance that the developer will be fully reimbursed. Public Comment	Opened 11/14
	Planning Commission Discussion Commissioners requested a staff response to points 1-5 in the applicant's 11/13 letter. Staff Response/Recommendation Staff believes this discrepancy comes from using two different sets of contours. The applicant appears to be using contours that are displayed on a site survey that was conducted in 2009 or earlier. Staff relied on GIS contours in drafting the Technical Committee Report. In general, a site survey is more accurate than area-wide information, and so staff accepts the applicant's information on topography for the applicant's property. The applicant's site survey indicates that the elevation at 132 nd Avenue NE is 456 feet, rising to 464 feet at the east (back) end of the properties. While this would increase the odds that the properties could be served by gravity sewer, it would not mitigate the depth and separation issues that are equally critical. Public Comment Applicant's 11/13 letter states that the Technical Committee Report "misstates facts regarding slopes" on the applicant's properties. Planning Commission Discussion Commissioners asked about how reimbursement agreements typically work. Staff Response/Recommendation Staff provided a summary of how reimbursement agreements work at the 11/14 meeting. In essence, a developer pays for a sewer extension, and then by agreement with the City, can collect pro rata shares of the cost from those who connect to the sewer over the next ten years. The applicant's 11/13 letter states that there is risk in this arrangement to the developer; staff acknowledged that there is no