

**SULTAN CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

ITEM NO.: A - 5

DATE: February 14, 2008

SUBJECT: Water System Technical Memorandum written by
BHC Consultants, LLC
GMA Compliance – Facilities Inventory

CONTACT PERSON: Public Works Director Dunn 

ISSUE:

The issue before City Council is contracting with BHC to write Technical Memorandum for Growth Management Act (GMA) compliance for the City of Sultan Water System Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the City Staff to negotiate a contract with a consulting firm to complete the Technical Memorandum for the Water System Plan with BHC Consultants, LLC, City Engineer Jon Stack over viewing the work.

SUMMARY:

The City of Sultan under the guidance of Shockey Brent, Inc is using the "building block" approach to adopt a Capital Facilities Plan compliant 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 System and General Sewer Plans and the Engineering Report for the WWTP Upgrade into the Technical Memorandum summarizing the current facilities inventory to minimize costs.

BHC estimates the Technical Memorandum for Water System Plan Compliance will require about 60 work hours for a total cost of \$10,000, Attachment A.

Additional work may be required later to better define the facilities needed, the estimates costs, and develop a financing program. BHC will only be involved in the Water System improvements both Treatment and Distribution. Some additional assistance may also be needed in responding to the Growth Management Hearings Board, this is not a part of the scope of work and contract with BHC Consultants LLC.

January 2008

City of Sultan
P.O. Box 1199
Sultan, WA 98294

RE: Task Order No. 2008-01-01
Professional Services Agreement dated March 1, 1999 – City Engineering Services
Technical Memorandum for Water System Plan Compliance with GMA

In accordance with our Professional Services Agreement with the City of Sultan dated, March 1, 1999, the City Administrator and the Public Works Director have requested BHC Consultants LLC to produce a Technical Memorandum verifying that the City water system can be extended throughout the urban growth area to serve the population of 11,119 projected for 2025. This work would build on the Water System Plan adopted by the City in 2005 and be accomplished in a series of incremental steps as follows:

- 1. Review Current Planning Data**
 - 1.1 Map of city limits and Growth Management Area (GMA)
 - 1.2 City adopted Land Use Plan for GMA with planned development densities
 - 1.3 Projected population and employment distribution for 2015 and 2025
 - 1.4 Location and expected timing of annexations and proposed plats

- 2. Verify Current Facilities and Standards**
 - 2.1 Water main extensions and replacements since 2004
 - 2.2 Capital improvements accomplished or started in 2006 and 2007
 - 2.3 Fire flow required for existing and planned non-residential structures
 - 2.4 Status with Everett, Snohomish PUD, and Coordinated Water System Plan

- 3. Verify Water Production and Demands**
 - 3.1 Water production records by month for 2006 and 2007
 - 3.2 Water billed bi-monthly for 2006 and 2007 by residential, commercial and other
 - 3.3 Customer totals by residential, commercial, and other accounts
 - 3.4 Major water users expected to connect by 2025

- 4. Identify Deficiencies and Needed Water Improvements**
 - 4.1 Existing unit average day demands and projected demands
 - 4.2 Water main layout and pressure zone organization
 - 4.3 Updated water model inputs
 - 4.4 Model distribution deficiencies and needed improvements
 - 4.5 Storage, pressure reducing valves, and appurtenances

- 5. Prepare Technical Memorandum**
 - 5.1 Assemble draft Technical Memorandum text and graphics

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 Irelan 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