

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Minutes of Work-Study Session and Public Hearing
July 16, 2009
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

PRESENT: Commissioners: Harris Atkins, Jill Guernsey, Jim Pasin, Michael Fisher, Jeane Derebey and Dick Allen. Commissioner Joyce Ninen was absent.
Staff Present: Jennifer Kester and Diane Gagnon.

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Harris Atkins called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of May 7th, 2009. Pasin/Fisher.
Motion passed unanimously.

5:00 WORK STUDY SESSION

Chairman Harris Atkins asked if everyone had read the June 18th letter from the City Attorney. There being no questions Mr. Atkins turned the meeting over to Senior Planner Jennifer Kester for her report. She noted that the Senior Engineers Jeff Langhelm and Emily Appleton were present. Mr. Atkins asked when they should be looking at these with the criteria and Ms. Kester said that they could do some tonight and also at the August 6th meeting.

1. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335 – COMP 09-0003)** – Transportation Element

Ms. Appleton went over the minor changes to the Chapter 11 Transportation Element. She referred them to the May 5th memo she had written and went over each of the proposed changes. Mr. Fischer asked about the master plan for the downtown and Ms. Kester said she would get a copy up on the web. Mr. Pasin asked how the plan was approved when the final version hadn't been reviewed by the DRB. Ms. Appleton said that the final plan was not adopted but the proposal had been brought to the City Council. Mr. Atkins asked about how the master improvement plan is implemented. Ms. Kester said that it is different from a policy document as it is more of a preliminary design. Ms. Kester asked if perhaps they felt the policy should be in the capital facilities element. Mr. Pasin said that when it was discussed at the DRB there were other suggestions and concerns. Ms. Kester said they will provide an outline of the review process of the plan. Ms. Appleton and Ms. Kester said that they would get together and figure out perhaps a different way of adopting the document.

Ms. Appleton then discussed making the transportation element more of a planning/policy document and then making the six year TIP separate for short range projects. Mr. Pasin noted that the DRB had discussed large plats and they believed

there was no street plan which led to disconnects between commercial and residential. He noted the need to have all these pieces connected to make sure we are all going down the same path. Ms. Kester explained the process for the adoption of the six year TIP. She noted that there was no proposal to remove items from the transportation plan; the proposal is to change the way they are referenced. Mr. Fisher noted that he didn't see any proposal to change the parking regulations. He felt there should be different standards for the downtown versus a shopping center. Ms. Kester said that there is a proposal to review private parking standards and in the capital facilities plan there is a downtown parking lot. She also noted that the Judson Street redesign results in a net increase of on-street parking. Mr. Atkins asked if there was adequate policies to implement such. Ms. Kester said that there seems to be enough for public ventures; however she was unsure if there was enough to support the private parking. Mr. Fisher noted that there are challenges to economic development of downtown due to parking issues. Ms. Kester noted that typically private standards are not in the transportation element of the city's comprehensive plan. Mr. Pasin said that the comprehensive plan should not have economics be the driving factor. Ms. Derebey said that it's the city's responsibility to still be fiscally responsible. Ms. Derebey then asked about the difference between the six year TIP and the six year transportation plan. Ms. Appleton explained the long range and short range plan stating that the comprehensive plan is the policy document used to develop the six year TIP. Ms. Appleton said they just wanted to change the title on the map and take the years out of the list. This would allow the TIP to change each year without requiring a comprehensive plan amendment. Mr. Atkins wanted assurance that the comp plan would not get ignored or become out of date. Ms. Kester pointed out that the state requires a comprehensive review and update of the Comprehensive Plan every 7 years. She then explained the function of the comp plan. Mr. Fisher said he didn't see a way of requiring that any of these goals are met. Ms. Kester said that it is an expression of vision, except for the water, sewer, storm, and transportation plan. Mr. Fisher asked if there was a process for follow up. Ms. Kester said that all development must comply with the comprehensive plan and the plan is reviewed every 7 years to see how/what we have accomplished.

Ms. Appleton then stated that they had done a 2009 traffic model. Mr. Fisher asked where the levels of service are defined and Ms. Appleton said that each LOS definitions are different depending on the type of intersection. Ms. Kester said they could get the information to the Planning Commission. Mr. Atkins referred to page 11-60 and asked if there was a plan for the sidewalk network. Ms. Kester said that they hoped to have that done in 2011 with the update of the comp plan. Mr. Pasin asked how the short term projects were arrived at. He pointed out that there was not a table of the long range projects and Ms. Appleton said that she had meant to add that and would e-mail them.

2. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335
(COMP 09-0007) – Stormwater Comprehensive Plan

Jeff Langhelm, Senior Engineer went over the different plans and noted that they can be downloaded from the web site. He explained the demographic forecast analysis model. Mr. Fisher asked about the growth projections and Ms. Kester explained how it is

determined based on what the state has required us to plan for in 2022. Ms. Kester further explained how population forecasts are determined and on what timeline. Mr. Pasin said that on page 3-15 under mixed use, he didn't think that it reflected the mixed use proposal that the Planning Commission had forwarded to the City Council and Ms. Kester said that the council chose not to adopt it and would discuss it further with the commission in October.

Mr. Langhelm said that he would like to go over the other key planning policies. He illustrated the maps showing the service areas and stated that their NPDES permit had changed. He noted that the CIP funding will now be identified in the stormwater comprehensive plan. He explained stormwater modeling and that they will be handling this in house. Mr. Atkins said that he was surprised that there were not any aquifer recharge areas within the UGA. Mr. Langhelm said that there are some within the city limits and said that he would verify that. The only other change is that there is now a stormwater connection fee. Mr. Atkins noted that on page 3-1 the city is described as a vibrant tourist stop and he felt that it was more of a regional area. He also noted that some of the areas that are written by the consultant the language need to be changed to being from the city perspective. Mr. Fisher said that on ES-5 it states that the projects that have not been completed are reflected; he asked why some of these have not been done. Mr. Langhelm said that there are various reasons; sometimes funding as in the case of Donkey Creek.

Ms. Derebey asked what the timeframe was for the 8.4 million in improvements and Mr. Langhelm replied that it was 20 years.

Mr. Fisher had a question about the service area and the soil types and asked about ways of encouraging low impact development. Mr. Langhelm went over the infiltration rates and how low impact development can be achieved. He stated that at the August 10th City Council meeting a new stormwater manual will be adopted and will have procedures for low impact development techniques.

Mr. Pasin asked if the new proposal could be given to the Chair of the Design Review Board and Mr. Langhelm suggested that they review volume six of Pierce County's stormwater manual to see what is being proposed. He also noted that it won't take effect until January 1, 2010.

3. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335
(COMP 09-0008) – Wastewater Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Langhelm explained the sewer map which shows each parcel and whether it is served by city sewer. He also noted that you must be annexed into the city in order to connect to the sewer unless there is a health issue. Mr. Pasin noted that there are developments that are 20 or 30 years old and they have had septic failures and asked how they are planning to be able to get those developments connected. Mr. Langhelm said that currently development is what triggers the extension of the wastewater system. Mr. Pasin asked about the water reclamation project. Mr. Langhelm says there is a

chapter on reclaimed water and he went over the elements of that. Mr. Langhelm then went over basin development.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0002) – Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element
2. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0003) – Transportation Element
3. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0007) – Stormwater Comprehensive Plan
4. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0008) – Wastewater Comprehensive Plan
5. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0009) – Water System Plan
6. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0010) – Capital Facilities Element
7. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0011) – Utilities Element

Chairman Harris Atkins opened the public hearing at 6:00 pm.

Paul Cyr, Barghausen Consulting Engineers, 18215 72nd Ave S., Kent WA 98032

Mr. Cyr asked a question about the transportation element regarding the extension of Hunt Street across Highway 16. Ms. Appleton said that it is listed as a short range improvement and is on the six year TIP; however the City is considering removing it from the six-year TIP and constructing it later. He voiced his support of the project in order to provide more connectivity. He then commented on the water system plan, noting that there are areas served by other purveyors. He said that there are areas that are best served by the City of Gig Harbor rather than other purveyors and also noted that with wastewater sometimes the jurisdiction can fund ULIDs rather than putting the burden on developers and he encouraged this option. He also expressed his support of the reclamation project. He also would like the policy changed that you must annex in order to get sewer service. Mr. Pasin asked Mr. Cyr if he thought that the city obtaining some of the water systems was a viable option and Mr. Cyr said that he thought that some of the systems were old or reaching capacity. He noted that in most cases it is assumed that the city is the water purveyor.

Chairman Harris Atkins closed public hearing at 6:10 p.m.

WORK STUDY SESSION

1. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0002) – Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element

Ms. Kester asked if anyone had any question regarding the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan since Associate Planner Kristin Moerler was here to answer questions. Mr. Fisher asked if there was pressure to partner with the state or county on parks. Ms. Moerler said that she understood that the city sees their parks as part of its vision and at this time does not want to combine with the rest of the parks on the Peninsula. There is no pressure to take over other parks. Ms. Moerler noted that she'll be providing some minor revisions based on the comments received from Joyce Ninen.

2. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0008) – Wastewater Comprehensive Plan - *Continued discussion*

Mr. Langhelm then spoke about the lack of capacity at the treatment plant and the expansion of the treatment plant. He continued to explain how concurrency works and the upcoming additional treatment capacity.

3. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**
(COMP 09-0009) – Water System Plan

Mr. Langhelm went over the map of the water system and noted that this plan only addresses the city's water system. He explained how the recalculation of ERUs was being proposed and why. Mr. Pasin said that the integration of water systems was important. Ms. Kester added that all water system plans must meet the city's population projections. Mr. Atkins asked about the responsibility of the city when development happens within another water purveyor's area and Ms. Kester explained that we require a water availability letter and if a purveyor no longer has capacity they may have to reduce their water system area. Mr. Langhelm then explained the 2003 municipal water law. Mr. Langhelm said that staff is proposing that the water system plan have policies which allow expansion of our water system service boundary on a parcel by parcel basis but would not allow the take over other water purveyors. He explained how taking over the private water purveyors would reduce the level of service and would be expensive to maintain. He then went over water system fire flow requirements and the proposed changes. It is proposed that if a developer cannot meet the fire flow requirement, they must bring the water line up to the city standard. Mr. Pasin said he felt that some of these restrictions were counterproductive to the benefit of the city. Mr. Langhelm explained that there were alternate methods and materials to meet the building and fire codes. The water system requirements are not site specific and are required at the street front. He noted that these are city water system requirements not a city-wide requirement, so they don't apply to other purveyors. Mr. Pasin asked if we had identified where in the system fire flow may be lacking and is the city changing the infrastructure in order to meet the standards. Mr. Langhelm said that there are projects

identified in the capital facilities element. Mr. Pasin asked why a private person should pay for what the city hasn't done for years. Mr. Langhelm said that system requirements have changed. He also noted that you can drill a well in the city limits. Mr. Fisher pointed out that this doesn't encourage economic development. Ms. Guernsey said that although she recognized that this was a policy not a regulation she didn't feel that the impact to the developer had been addressed and that could be a red flag to the courts.

Mr. Langhelm explained that the last policy change had to do with instantaneous water and pumping capacity, so that if a well goes out the city can still maintain levels in their water tanks. He said they do not have the ability to keep up with the levels so we are trying to obtain more water rights and drilling well facilities in order to meet that standard. The policy change is to maintain our capacity rather than let it fall below. Mr. Atkins asked for a specific itemized list of the policy changes.

**4. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335
(COMP 09-0011) – Utilities Element**

Mr. Langhelm stated that this change clarifies that it is the water service area not the water comp plan. Mr. Fisher asked about 8.4.1 water conservation and water consumptive landscaping. He was concerned that water conservation would become a regulation and he didn't see the need for it. Mr. Langhelm said there would be a need if we couldn't obtain more water rights. We are also required to set water efficiency goals. There is an RCW that requires us to conserve water. He said a lot of the goals are achieved through building code standards for low flow fixtures, etc. Ms. Kester explained that studies done through the WRIA 15 watershed planning found that we do not have water recharge for more than 40 years.

**5. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335
(COMP 09-0010) – Capital Facilities Element (**TAB 8**)**

Mr. Langhelm explained that this was a fairly comprehensive update of Chapter 12. Ms. Guernsey asked about where the Harbor Heights tanks were located. Mr. Langhelm noted that table 12-5 has updated lists based off of the capital improvement plan lists. Mr. Atkins asked if there were any policy changes. Mr. Langhelm said that there were changes to existing conditions and improvement lists reflect that. Mr. Fisher asked about the financial resources and references to valuations and increases in those valuations, where did the 10% increase come from. Mr. Langhelm pointed out where the major revenues had been adjusted. Ms. Kester said that the finance director would look at some of these sections again to adjust the numbers.

Chairman Harris Atkins stated that he would not be attending the July 30th meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 7:50 p.m. Derebey/Guernsey. Motion carried unanimously.