

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL AGENDA COVER SHEET

ITEM: A - 4

DATE: February 14, 2008

SUBJECT: Technical Memorandum – Compliance with GMA
General Sewer Plan
Brown and Caldwell Environmental Engineers and
Consultants

CONTACT PERSON: Public Works Director Dunn

ISSUE:

City Council to approve a scope of work with Brown and Caldwell, Attachment A, to write a Technical Memorandum verifying that the City Sewer Collection system can be extended throughout the urban growth area to serve the population of 11, 119 projected for 2025.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the Mayor to negotiate a contract with Brown and Caldwell to produce a Technical Memorandum for General Sewer Plan compliance with the Growth Management Act (GMA).

Brown and Caldwell have produced the most recent documents for the City regarding Wastewater, including:

- The WWTP Upgrade Engineering Report,
- Short-Term Improvements;
- Bio Solids Management Analysis, and
- Infill and Commercial Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum.

SUMMARY:

The City of Sultan under the guidance of Shockey Brent, Inc. is using the "Building Block" approach to adopt a Capital Facilities Plan in compliance with the Growth Management Board final decision and order in Fallgatter IX. Shockey Brent is recommending the City incorporate the knowledge of consultants used to write the existing approved Water, Sewer Plans and the WWTP Upgrade Engineer Report into the Technical Memorandum summarizing the current facilities inventory to minimize costs.

The Mayor needs to negotiate a Scope of Work with Brown and Caldwell to complete the Technical Memorandum for the Sewer GMA Compliance.

completed a Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity with Phased Improvements as part of the "building block" approach for the GMA compliance order. Additional assistance may also be needed in responding to the Growth Management Hearings Board. This work is not a part of the proposed scope of work with Brown and Caldwell.

BACKGROUND:

Sultan is required to conduct its planning under the Washington GMA (RCW36.70A) and has done so since 1994. The City updated its plan in 2004. In 2005, the Central Puget Sound Growth Hearings Board found certain inadequacies in the City's update and ordered review and modification.

The inadequacies and required modification center on the City's handling of its capital facilities planning. The City developed an approach to address the Hearings Board orders.

Part of the inadequacies and modifications to the Comprehensive Plan require verifying the Water and Sewer Plans verifying the systems can be extended through out the urban growth area to serve the population of 11,119 projected by 2025. Attachment C

FISCAL IMPACT:

Technical Memorandum for the General Sewer Plan Compliance with GMA was estimated by BHC Consultants LLC to require about 100 work hours to prepare. Brown and Caldwell have recent experience with the City's sewer system and may complete the technical memorandum in less time.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Contact Brown and Caldwell regarding a contract to complete the General Sewer Plan Technical Memorandum. Authorize the Mayor to negotiate a contract with Brown and Caldwell to write the Technical Memorandum as part of the "building block" plan with Shockey Brent, Inc. Providing GMA compliance for Capital Facilities Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.

Attachments:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment A | Update of Water System and General Sewer Plan Data Needs |
| Attachment B | Shockey Brent, Inc. Facilities Inventory |
| Attachment C | Draft Capital Facilities Inventory Report |

City of Sultan
Update of Water System Plan and General Sewer Plan

14 January 2008

General Planning Data

1. Map of city limits and Growth Management Area
2. Map of Land Use Plan with planned densities
3. Projected populations and employment for desired milestone dates
4. Location and timing of annexations and any known developments or plats

Water System Data

1. Water main extensions and replacements since 2004 shown on Figure 8-1
2. Water production records by month for 2006 and 2007
3. Water billed by month for 2006 and 2007 for residential, commercial, and other totals
4. Customer totals by residential, commercial, and other accounts
5. Capital improvements accomplished or started in 2006 and 2007 with costs or budgets
6. Projected major water users expected to be connected during planning period
7. Desired fire flows for major existing or planned structures
8. Identified deficiencies in water supply, quality, treatment, storage, or distribution
9. Status with City of Everett, Snohomish PUD, and Coordinated Water System Plan

Sewer System Data

1. Sewer main extensions and replacements since 2004 shown on Figure 7-1
2. DMR records for 2006 and 2007
3. Customer totals by residential, commercial, and other accounts
4. Capital improvements accomplished or started in 2006 and 2007 with costs or budgets
5. Projected major industrial or commercial connections expected during planning period
6. Accepted pipe design criteria (full, surcharged 1-foot, 2/3 full, or some other criteria)
7. Available guidance as to how existing on-site septic systems should be addressed
8. Any flow monitoring data collected during 2005, 2006, or 2007
9. Results from any infiltration/inflow analysis conducted during the past three years
10. Identified deficiencies in wastewater collection, pumping, treatment, disposal, or sludge
11. Facilities plan for new treatment facilities as completed, adopted, and/or approved

SHOCKEY BRENT, INC.

Land Use * Environmental Analysis



Permitting * Public Policy

2716 Colby Avenue, Everett, WA 98201 425.258.9308 fax: 425.259.4448 shockeybrent@shockeybrent.com

TO: See Distribution
FROM: Reid H. Shockey, AICP
DATE: January 28, 2008
SUBJECT: Facilities Inventory

Attached to this memo is the agenda for the February 19 Planning Board meeting. I want to set the stage for this meeting so that everyone understands his or her role. I also am asking participants to submit reports to me by February 8 so that I can prepare a briefing paper for the Board for their review prior to the meeting. I will be out of town on February 19. I'm proposing that Brad Collins facilitate the discussion.

You are all aware of the "building block" approach we are taking to construct a Comprehensive Plan, Capital Facilities Plan and TIP that comply with the Growth Hearings Board orders. I have attached to this memo a summary of our approach.

By February 19, the Board will have been briefed on population, employment and housing distribution around the community in 2025. This will be the topic discussed at the Board's February 5 meeting. The background briefing paper ("Technical Memorandum No. 1") will be sent to each of you once it goes to the Board later this week.

With the 2025 demographics agreed to, the Board next needs to understand what capital facilities the City currently has – roads, sewer, water, sewage treatment, stormwater and parks. The CFP will outline the approach to building what we need in 2025 vs. what we have in 2008. Coming out of the February 19 meeting, I would like the Board to know the current inventory of facilities. We will all work to inform it of what we need as we move through the level of service and needs assessment over the coming months. The goal on the 19th is to let the Board know what we have.

Following are some thoughts on what each presenter should cover:

Roads: Eric Ireland has been working with the Board on the transportation analysis. A recap should suffice. They will want to know that you are working on a comparison of LOS B vs. D as part of the needs assessment, but for now the emphasis should be on inventory (arterial street system, etc.). The question will come up as to why we show arterials extending outside the UGA. I have explained previously that we are attempting to coordinate with the County's arterial street plan, but you should be prepared to discuss how the two compare.

Water and Sewer: John Wilson has been tasked with reviewing the 2005/06 Sewer and Water Plans and confirming that the existing system and line sizing can be extended to the UGA boundaries. For now, this is a technical question only. Where lines are extended, how large they will be and when it happens are matters to be determined during CFP development. We just need to know now that the systems are expandable or, conversely, what the issues might be. John, for analysis purposes, please assume a residential land use at a density of 5-10 du's per acre extending to the 2007 amended UGA boundaries. Depending on the City's review of John's report, he may or may not need to be present at the Planning Board meeting; City's choice.

Stormwater: Dean Franz is handling this one. It is a bit different because the City will not do a full stormwater management plan until 2009. For purposes of CFP and Plan update, we will be looking at a planning-level analysis of 2025 stormwater needs with some specific projects ending up on the 2008 CFP. Complicating matters a bit is the current public discussion with City Council on creation of stormwater utility. The Inventory discussion on February 19 should be scaled to the level and tone of utility discussion at the time. The emphasis should be in inventory and we should avoid become the focus of any debate.

WWTF: I don't think Tadd needs to attend the Planning Board meeting. I am assuming that we are all in agreement that the planned improvements to the WWTF will handle growth at least to 2029. I would like some discussion for the briefing paper however, describing this. One issue that needs to be addressed is stormwater. The City, in developing its stormwater management plan, envisions eventual separation of its storm and sanitary systems. It would be helpful to know what the implications of this are for capacity issues at the WWTF. For instance, did the 2029 WWTF design, assume a certain percentage of stormwater volumes being treated. This would have implications for costs.

Parks: Park and recreation facilities are being reviewed by in-house staff.

Cost: If possible, I would like each of the technical people to describe an order of magnitude of facility cost (e.g. cost per lineal foot of sewer, water, roads, etc.). This

will be helpful for the Planning Board. I realize there are numerous variables that determine the ultimate cost, but "order of magnitude" will give them a framework.

If you have any questions on approach, please give me a call. Again, I would like to have technical memos from each of you by February 8 so that I can complete our briefing paper.

Reid H. Shockey
Shockey/Brent, Inc.
2716 Colby Avenue
Everett, WA 98201

425.258.9308
425.259.4448 FAX

rshockey@shockeybrent.com

Distribution via e-mail:

Deborah Knight	Tadd Giesbrecht
Connie Dunn	Brad Collins
John Stack	Eric Irelan
Andy Lane	Dean Franz
John Wilson	Brittney Baldwin

DRAFT INTRODUCTION OF CAPITAL FACILITIES INVENTORY REPORT

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM No. 2

CAPITAL FACILITIES INVENTORY CITY OF SULTAN WASHINGTON 2008

INTRODUCTION

This is the second in a series of technical memoranda describing the methodology and findings in support of the City's updated Capital Facilities Plan (CFP), Comprehensive Plan update, Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and capital budget. Sultan is required to conduct its planning under the Washington Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A) and has done so since 1994. The City updated its plan in 2004. In 2005, the Central Puget Sound Growth Hearings Board found certain inadequacies in the City's update and ordered review and modification.

The inadequacies and required modifications center on the City's handling of its capital facilities planning. While the Board did not find specific fault with the development policies in the Plan, it did rule that there had been inadequate analyses of "level of service" standards, the needed capital improvements resulting from those standards to handle projected growth, and the financial capability of the City to meet those needs. It required the City to revisit its capital facilities plan to reconcile these deficiencies.

The City developed an approach to address the Hearing Board orders which includes:

- Allocating new development among those buildable portions of the various land use districts (e.g. Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, etc.) identified on the Land Use Map
- Developing, confirming, or modifying "level of service" standards for future capital facilities through Year 2025.
- Based on adopted level of service standards, identifying what capital facilities will be needed, and when, to adequately serve the future population, housing and employment through 2025.
- Assessing the cost of providing capital facilities measured against the projected financial resources of the City.
- Developing a Capital Facilities Plan (six-year and Year 2025) that balances cost with estimated funding.
- Developing a six-year Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).
- Developing a Transportation Element and Capital Facilities Element in the Comprehensive Plan that reflect the Capital Facilities Plan and the TIP.
- Evaluating land use and growth assumptions in the 2004 Plan