

MINUTES - ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETING 9/25/08

The meeting was called to order @ 6:01 PM, Thursday, September 25, 2008, in the North Conference Room @ 21630 11th Avenue South, Des Moines with the following in attendance:

Council Members

Scott Thomasson – Chairman
Bob Sheckler
Dave Kaplan

City Staff

Tony Piasecki, City Manager
Lorri Ericson, Assistant City Manager
Loren Reinhold – Presenting
Grant Fredricks - Director PB&PW
Erika Sullivan – Administrative Assistant

Meeting Agenda:

1. Final review of SWM rate proposal
2. Review of staff conclusions about Highline Water District's draft Comprehensive Plan update
3. 1st Avenue Pond

----- 1. **Final Review of SWM Rate Proposal:**

- 2009 SWM Rate Adjustment Summary – rate in 2008 is \$9.83 and staff proposes an increase to \$11.55 in 2009 (slide 2, Attachment 3).
 - Half of the \$1.72 increase is for capital.
 - The adjusted rate brings the City of Des Moines right in the middle of the SWM rates that other cities charge. Some cities are also adjusting for NPDES.
 - Committee members asked if we compared what SWM services and staff makeup we have versus the other cities. Members also asked if they see the same service (higher/lower) than Des Moines.
 - Staff commented there is a quite a mix of services/staff at other cities and assume most cities handle this the way Des Moines does.
- The current rate ordinance uses a weighted index with 40% of the rate increases going to capital, but should be 30% which is the proportion of rate revenues going to capital. The proposed ordinance adjusts the split to 70/30. Committee members inquired if we are setting aside a flat 30% or are we funding the budgeted amount (capital needs vs. flat fee for CIP).
- Staff said raising rates \$0.97 gets us to moderate level of service.
- We reached \$177,400 because NPDES costs are currently covered by grant funds, but when the grant is finished we need to budget costs. This was based on the 2008 salary assumption and does not reflect the 2% adjustment.
 - Committee members are concerned we may be shorting ourselves by not accounting for the adjustment.
 - Staff said the 2008 budgeted figures include the negotiated COLA and salary increases.
 - SWM replacement equipment – each piece of equipment has a schedule that is monitored by Finance.
 - Slide 6, Attachment 3 outlines costs for NPDES that are not budgeted.
 - Committee members requested a sheet summarizing NPDES expenses.
 - What are the phase 2 marginal costs, the public doesn't always know the costs of environmental cleanup.
- Currently all single family homes are a fixed rate. Committee members may have a policy discussion regarding houses with more than 50% impervious surface (this would require a calculation). Some condominiums and commercial properties have existing detention facilities.
 - The calculation would measure/define houses with more than 50% impervious surface and calculate the rate as commercial.

- This plays into a discussion related to development (i.e. vegetation, clear cuts, native vegetation, etc.).
- Would this be worth the 3 or 4 properties where it could apply?
- Committee members said we should write a much broader exemption or just get rid of it, however this is a policy discussion to be held at a later meeting.
- There is no incentive program or credit for existing retention facilities.
- Equity issues – if you give credits then subdivisions would need to be treated the same way. The Public Works Director can adjust.
- We don't have anything on how to bill – pay when the customer purchases the building permit.
 - How do we collect the fees?
 - Staff said we could bill out the fees (1/2 in April, 1/2 in October), and we would tell King County how much to collect. We could also send a bill when clearing starts.
 - Currently, SWM bills go out with the annual taxes.
 - Changes to SWM billing procedures could be done by Ordinance, initiated by petition or through a Local Improvement District.

2. **Review of staff conclusions about Highline Water District's draft Comprehensive Plan update**

- Staff emailed 4 comments regarding the Highline Water District (HWD) Comprehensive Plan.
 - 1st comment asked if the District will be able to provide 4500 to 6500 gpm of fire flow to potential big box stores.
 - 2nd comment noted the land use is incorrect for Pacific Ridge (should be multi-family not single family residential).
 - 3rd comment requested a list of completed projects from 2002 Comprehensive Plan, projects underway and projects that are no longer planned be added to Section 7.0.
 - 4th comment noted inconsistencies in the rate table (table 8-8).
- Committee members want to push for Pacific Ridge fire flow.
- Committee members are concerned that HWD does not have the right density for the business park infrastructure.
 - PACE accurately estimated Pacific Ridge (2002 Comprehensive Plan).
 - Change 6" pipes to 12" pipes and committee members requested a pipe map.
 - Staff said the pipe on Highway 99 is good.
- Staff met with Barghausen and they showed a certificate for water.
- Staff told HWD we anticipate 2-3 big box stores for fire flow.
 - Committee members requested we check their map against ours.
 - Staff will have Steve Schunzel work with the HWD map person.
- Staff requested a list of HWD completed projects from 2002 and why projects were not completed.
 - Under the GMA, well head protection only?
 - Critical aquifer recharge areas.
 - Staff said we had positive closure on well head protection.
 - Committee members requested a map of critical aquifer recharge areas.
- HWD Financial forecast
 - HWD is forecasting a 7% increase in 2008 and a 5% increase in 2010 (this is a 6-year plan). Staff noted that HWD table 8-8 does not match up to the forecasted increases, and it looks like a 15% increase in 2010.
 - Committee members requested we confirm the figures for consistency. Do they use the same growth assumptions? What assumptions are they using?
 - Staff hoped HWD looked at our Comprehensive Plan.
 - BHC is the engineer.
- CIP – Coordinating HWD improvements with our improvements. What are they going to dig up, and ideally staff would have time to do that.

3. **Discussion on 1st Avenue Pond**

- In a letter from DOT to Normandy Park, DOT expressed an interest in offloading the pond. DOT owns the ponds and wants out of the agreement with Normandy Park.
 - Committee members said the pond has not been maintained and we want to have it maintained (remove 15 years of sediment).
 - Arrow Lake is used as the overflow and the street right-of-way is in Normandy Park.
 - Committee members requested staff check pond ownership, and if Normandy Park is responsible we have to hold them accountable.
 - DOT is saying Des Moines owns the pond because our population is 20,000+ and Des Moines owns the vacant alley that traverses the pond.

Adjourned @ 7:27 PM

Respectfully submitted by: Erika Sullivan, Administrative Assistant