

Minutes of Meeting
Environment Committee Meeting
December 12, 1996
6:30 P.M.

Attendance:

Scott Thomasson, Mayor
Bruce Roberts, Council Member
Robert Scheckler, Council Member
City Manager, Bob Olander
Tim Heydon, Public Works Director
Loren Reinhold, Assistant City Engineer
Larry McAndrews, The McAndrews Group, Ltd.
Leslie Washburn, The McAndrews Group, Ltd.
Rhett Jackson, Pentec Environmental

Topic: Draft Engineering Report for the Barnes Creek Regional Detention Facility

The meeting started with Loren discussing the Lower Massey Creek Alternative Analysis (KCM, 1994) and the selected alternative which includes the subject site. He also explained that the 3.6 acre-foot volume of the detention site in the KCM report was based on a single storm event model for peak storms over a 24-hour period which may not be appropriate given the weather patterns in the Puget Sound region. Studies have shown that hydrologic problems in western Washington are associated with high volumes of flow from sequential winter storms rather than high peak flows from short duration and high intensity storms. Therefore, a continuous model (developed by King County) was chosen to be performed on the Barnes Creek Basin for sizing the facility that uses long-term records of observed rainfall rather than short periods of data representing hypothetical storm events.

Lieslie Washburn then proceeded to discuss the Facility Plan (Engineering Report). Several objectives were integrated into the Plan: flood control, water quality, erosion control of Barnes Creek, wetland enhancement and habitat enhancement. Using the KCRTS continuous storm model, four detention options were developed and two habitat options were developed. The recommended detention option was a compromise between optimizing the site for flood control and maximizing the site for erosion control and treating storm water. Results of the modeling and consideration of the reconstructed wetland environment suggested a strong need for the recommended 5.0 acre-foot site rather than the 3.6 ac-ft site as originally proposed by KCM.

Scott noted that the recommended size of the facility did well to address the current flow conditions within the basin but is inadequate for future flows. He also noted that a substantial amount of pollutants coming from Pac Hwy would bypass the facility and not be treated. Scott requested that the document suggest policies for including detention and water quality facilities for upstream road and highway projects (or public projects), such as the widening of SR 99 and that the policies not include just the incremental increase of impervious area but evaluate the existing surfaces as well. Larry directed the committee to a section in the Plan that suggests that the City implement such a policy but felt that developing a policy as part of the Facility Plan may not be the best mechanism. (This would be more appropriate within the City's Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan).

Scott also requested that expansion of the facility needed to be explored at this time. TMG showed the area north of the proposed facility that is currently owned by the city and is available for expansion. Further study needs to be made to determine how much detention could be obtained from the site and the additional construction costs involved.

Scott also noted that the site plan includes a number of undeveloped areas of right-of-way and that the Assessor's Map may not indicate those areas owned by private owners by virtue of the Law of 1889-90 regarding street vacation statutes. Rather than assuming that we have possession, we need to research the plat date and determine if this law applies. Tim replied that this research will be made during the design while purchasing the land.

Scott also requested that the facility outlet drainage be reviewed to determine if it is feasible to relocate the stream away or around the property immediately downstream of the facility.

Tim briefed the committee on the status of the land purchasing - that one purchase has been made and that two other owners are interested in selling. The last owner, Puget Power, has not yet been contacted regarding the sale of the property.

Loren briefed the committee on the status of the budget. We are currently on budget even though we made a purchase of additional land since some amount of additional land was thought to be needed as wetland mitigation. The budget included \$100,000 of wetland mitigation money. The proposed site plan also had deleted most of the rockery from the scope of work and the effective depth of detention was less than first figured. These changes will likely result in a substantial reduction in construction costs.

On a last note, the committee requested that the cost of expanding the facility to the north be looked into at this time and be included as part of the report. That

way, if the cost is reasonable, the construction grant application can include the costs for doing both sites.

Action Items for Staff:

- 1) Review outlet drainage.
- 2) Study the expansion area for available detention and prepare a cost estimate.

Upon completing these items, the new information will be brought to full Council for approval to proceed with the design.

p:\users\loren\winword\mn121296