

ATTACHMENT B



PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

June 9, 2021

Project File Number:	LAND 2021-00124
Proposal Name:	Draft General Wastewater Plan Update
Applicant:	Redmond Wastewater Utility
Staff Contacts:	Jeff Thompson, Senior Engineer Peter Holte, Senior Planner

FINDINGS OF FACT

Public Hearing and Notice

a. Public Hearing Date

The City of Redmond Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendments on May 26, 2021. No testimony was received during the public hearing or public comments received during the public hearing are summarized in Attachment D. Receiving no verbal or written comments, the Planning Commission closed the hearing also on May 26, 2021.

b. Notice and Public Involvement

The public hearing notice was published in the Seattle Times and posted at City Hall in accordance with RZC 21.76.080 Review Procedures - Notices. (Amend to reflect pandemic related changes) Notice was also provided by including the hearing schedule in Planning Commission agendas and extended agendas, distributed by email to various members of the public and various agencies. (Describe Involvement Here). A public comment summary is provided in Attachment D

REDMOND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT SUMMARY

The City Wastewater Utility has completed a [draft of the City of Redmond General Wastewater Plan](#) Update. This is a functional plan, required by the Washington State Growth Management Act and based on the City's current zoning allowances assuming built-out conditions. The plan ensures the City is prepared for expected growth by identifying where pipes, pumps, and other wastewater infrastructure need to be extended or replaced.

RZC 21.76.070.J.9 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA		MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET
a	Consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs);	Meets
b	Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria;	Meets

Planning Commission Report – Findings and Conclusions
General Wastewater Plan Update
 6/07/2021

RZC 21.76.070.J.9 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA		MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET
c	If the purpose of the amendment is to change the allowed use in an area, the need for the land uses that would be allowed by the Comprehensive Plan amendment and whether the amendment would result in the loss of the capacity to meet other needed land uses, especially whether the proposed amendment complies with the policy on no net loss of housing capacity;	Meets
d	Consistency with the preferred policy growth and development pattern of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan;	Meets
e	The capability of the land, including the prevalence of critical areas;	Meets
f	The capacity of public facilities and whether public facilities and services can be provided cost-effectively at the intensity allowed by the designation;	Meets
g	The proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions. In making this determination the following shall be considered:	Meets
	i. Unanticipated consequences of an adopted policy, or	
	ii. Changed conditions on the subject property or its surrounding area, or,	
	iii. Changes related to the pertinent plan map or text; and	
	iv. Where such change of conditions creates conflicts in the Comprehensive Plan of a magnitude that would need to be addressed for the Comprehensive Plan to function as an integrated whole.	

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED CONCLUSIONS

The Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan provided as Attachment A to this report are **consistent with the criteria set forth in RZC 21.76.070 Criteria for Evaluation and Action.**

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Technical committee identified **no additional conditions** necessary to ensure consistency with the City’s development regulations. The full Technical Committee report and recommendation is provided in **Attachment D.**

REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION

DocuSigned by:

 DA525C34AC764BC...
Carol Helland
 Planning and Community Development Director

DocuSigned by:

 816CD0A1D16A46D...
Sherri Nichols
 Planning Commission Chair

Attachments

- A. Executive Summary: General Wastewater Plan Update

Planning Commission Report – Findings and Conclusions

General Wastewater Plan Update

6/07/2021

- B. Response to Questions from the Planning Commissioners**
- C. Planning Commission Summary Minutes**
- D. Technical Committee Report**

ES Executive Summary

ES.1 Growth

The City of Redmond (City) continues to be a leading employment center in the Pacific Northwest with companies such as Microsoft, AT&T, and Nintendo. Since the 1990s employment has more than doubled within the City and in the next 20 years it is expected to increase by more than 40 percent.

Residential growth has also increased significantly at more than 18 percent in the past 10 years. In the next 20 years this trend is expected to continue with some of the highest sectors of growth expected from multifamily residential; especially in areas of mixed-use development and redevelopment such as in the Downtown core, Overlake, and Marymoor Village.

These high levels of growth will continue to drive the need for expansion of the City's wastewater service and upgrades to its existing system.

ES.2 Capital Improvement Program and Development Projects

The improvement and development projects are grouped into three primary areas:

- Capital Improvement Program
- Developer Extensions/Development Projects
- Septic-to-Sewer Projects

Chapter 6 provides a summary of all projects. Chapter 4 and Appendix F provide more detailed information about the specific projects.

ES.2.1 Capital Improvement Program

Implementation of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects will be determined based on a number of factors, including an increase in flows and/or necessary rehabilitation of aging infrastructure. Timing of projects may also depend on coordination with other utility projects, such as transportation or stormwater improvements.

There are twelve (12) CIP projects identified in this General Wastewater Plan Update (Plan). Five of these projects (replacement and/or upgrades to Lift Stations Nos. 5, 6, 12, 13, and 15) are currently underway. It is anticipated the LS-12, LS-13, and LS-15 projects will be completed in the next 2-3 years. The remaining two stations (LS-5 and LS-6) will be completed in the next 3-5 years. Several of the projects included in the CIP are dependent on flow monitoring to confirm the need for the project. If possible, this flow monitoring should begin as soon as possible. Prioritization of projects beyond 2022 will be identified based on flow monitoring and the criteria mentioned above.

ES.2.2 Developer Extensions/Development Projects

More than 110 developer projects are identified at this time. These projects will also be driven by the rate and location of growth and development. These projects are expected to be funded primarily through developer contributions.

ES.2.3 Septic-to-Sewer Projects

The remaining type of project included in this planning document are the Septic-to-Sewer projects, that connect those homes on septic systems to the wastewater collection system. In 1998, the City implemented a pilot program (Neighborhood Sewer Replacement Program) but did not receive the necessary funding or interest on the part of homeowners to connect to the City's collection system. It is recognized that at some time in the future, it will be necessary for these homeowners to connect to the City's collection system. Each year, the City Council and the Directors team will determine if there is sufficient interest in implementing some or all of the Septic-to-Sewer projects.

ES.3 Other Recommendations

In addition to the capital improvement projects, this Plan contains a number of recommendations for the City's wastewater program. The following recommendations are not capital projects but are actions that the utility should consider.

ES.3.1 Recommended Operation and Maintenance Improvements

There are several recommended improvements included in Chapter 5, including those that the City plans to implement.

ES.3.2 Wastewater Flows and Modeling Recommendations

It is recommended that the City continue to update and maintain the City's wastewater flows and system models. These model projections and system data are contained within the City's model of the wastewater collection system.

ES.4 Funding Growth

The estimated cost of the twelve (12) CIP projects identified in this Plan equals \$43.3 million. The near-term projects (Lift Stations Nos. 5, 6, 12, 13, and 15) account for \$27.3 million of this total. All of these projects are included in the budgeting process and the City has sufficient resources to fund the planned CIP. Several of the planned CIP projects will be completed beyond the near-term projects. Implementation of many of these projects will depend on the rate of growth in specific areas.

Developer extensions will primarily be funded by developers and developer contributions. Funding for the Septic-to-Sewer Projects has not yet been determined but may include a combination of City and homeowner funding.

In addition to the CIP, developer, and Septic-to-Sewer Projects, are projects completed by the operation and maintenance (O&M) department and funded through the O&M annual budget.

ES.5 Planning and Analysis Tools

An important element in the preparation of this Plan, was the creation of the City's wastewater collection system hydrologic/hydraulic model. A City-wide model representing all of the City's wastewater basins was developed to be used as a planning tool. The model developed in conjunction with this Plan provides several important features.

ES.5.1 Industry-Accepted Modeling Platform

The wastewater collection system modeling software, MIKE URBAN, is an industry-accepted platform that will be regularly updated and maintained and provide City staff with ongoing technical support. It simulates both dry and wet weather conditions by modeling both the sanitary flows as well as inflow and infiltration.

ES.5.2 Compatibility with King County Data

One of the reasons that the MIKE URBAN software was selected by the City, was that King County uses this program for regional wastewater modeling. This provides an advantage to the City in that it can easily use the King County data that has been developed as part of the regional data development and modeling.

ES.5.3 GIS Compatibility

The wastewater collection system model and the dry weather flow database were developed using the City's GIS data, as well as other data sources. The City intends to continue to develop its GIS data over time, and to use these GIS sources for future updates to the model and the dry weather flow database.

ES.5.4 Identification of Potential Deficiencies and a More Efficient Use of Staff Time

An advantage to having this wastewater collections system model is that City staff can more easily identify potential deficiencies within the collection system.

For example, during this planning process, use of this model identified several areas where there were potential issues. Maintenance and Operations staff field verified and checked for potential capacity issues at these specific locations; in some cases, confirming problem areas. Other areas that are still questionable should be more closely monitored over time, by conducting flow monitoring in targeted areas.

ES.5.5 What-If Scenarios for Planned Improvements

The model will also provide the City staff with tools for sizing planned improvements where deficiencies exist or where new growth is planned.

ES.5.6 Improved Reliability and Accuracy of Data Sources

The process of creating the dry weather flow database and the wastewater collection system model resulted in a detailed effort to identify missing and incorrect information. Following verification against field data, as-builts, and other data sources now provides City staff with much more reliable information.

Attachment B: Summary of Questions and Answer for Questions from the Planning Commission

The following summarizes the questions and answers taken during two study session presentations to the Redmond Planning Commission held on March 31, 2021 and April 21, 2021 regarding the *2021 General Wastewater Plan Update*.

Planning Commission Questions & Answers March 31

Question: Does the plan account for in-fill that may replace single family housing with multi-family residential housing?

Answer: Figure 3-3 in the plan shows the “development potential” for parcels within the entire City based on current zoning. The plan assumes single family residential areas are “fully developed.”

Isolated, dispersed multi-family in-fill projects in residential areas will not result in a wastewater capacity issue. Unless large areas with residential zoning density are substantially increased—for example, changing an entire plat from R4 to R7—there should not be any capacity issues with this type of in-fill.

Question: Do people want to change from septic to the municipal system? Who pays for the cost of the transition?

Answer: Generally, we find people are happy with septic systems until they fail. When they fail, people would like an immediate remedy by connecting to the City’s wastewater system.

The City requires properties that have failed septic system and are within 200 feet of access to the municipal wastewater system to connect to the City’s system rather than replace the septic system. The owner of the septic system pays for the construction and for connection fees.

Question: Are there grant programs that help transitions?

Answer: Staff research on this question found that there are financial programs to help cover the repair failing systems (see the [Craft 3](#) program). King County also provides some assistance for low income customers to help pay for the capacity charges for new customers connecting to the county’s wastewater system. This information is available in the [frequently asked questions portion of the County’s sewer capacity charge webpage](#). We did not find programs that help individuals address the cost of transitioning from septic to sewer.

The City’s Utility Strategic Plan contains a strategy aiming to replace all “high-priority” septic systems within the City. High priority septic systems are those that have a high likelihood of failure or whose failure has the high potential to create a health risk or impacts to the environment. Evaluating financial assistance needs will be one of the considerations that the City needs to address as it designs a program that aims to implement this strategy.

Question: Can extreme weather events affect our wastewater system? Can a 100-year rain-event, for example, impact the sewer system?

Answer: Redmond has separate systems for stormwater runoff and wastewater. Rainwater can enter the wastewater system at pipe joints, through manhole covers, and due to leaking pipes. The City works

to limit this infiltration of rainwater into the wastewater system. To ensure the City maintains capacity and prevents sewer overflows, the updated wastewater plan's system analysis moved from a 20-year sewage flow/rain event as used to develop previous plans, to a more conservative analysis that uses a 100-year flow/rain event.

Question: Will the transition of areas off septic to sewer, create capacity issues that makes the transition cost prohibitive? What about areas with critical areas served by septic, do these create issues with this transition?

Answer: The transition of residential areas from septic to sewer should not create capacity issues for the system. Transition in land use such as a change single family residential to multi-family, or single family residential to commercial are instances are where we could see constraints on the existing system.

Critical areas and steep slopes are not typically a factor limiting the ability to transition from septic to sewer.

Question: The developer is responsible for upsizing pipe upstream of their development?

Answer: The developer is responsible for upgrading pipe on the *downstream portions* of the system to ensure sewage flows into the City's network of pipes, lift stations, and other conveyance infrastructure.

Planning Commission Questions & Answers April 21

Question: How are capacity wastewater charge, wastewater, stormwater charge calculated?

Answer: The King County Wastewater System Capacity Charge is a charged that King County levies on new customers connecting the regional sewage treatment system. It pays for extensions to regional conveyance systems and regional sewage treatment facilities. [The frequently asked questions section of the King County Wastewater System Capacity Charge Webpage](#) provides details on fees for different types of customers and other fee setting information.

The City's wastewater fees are calculated based on the potable water coming into the residence or business. The assumption is that the amount of water coming in will be roughly equal the amount of water leaving via the wastewater systems. In some cases, properties with large irrigation systems will set up separate potable water accounts so that they are not overcharged for wastewater service.

The City's stormwater fees are a set fee for each single-family parcel. For commercial and multi-family residential properties, the City uses the amount of impervious area on each parcel to calculate fees.

Question: Properties with failing septic systems are required to connect to the City's wastewater system?

Answer: Yes. If a parcel with failing septic is within 200 feet of access to the City's wastewater system, the owner of the failed system is required connect to the City's wastewater system.

Question: How often is the sewer plan updated?

Answer: The last major update to the plan was in 2009. Edits and revisions to the plan also occur when there are major updates to the Redmond zoning requirements. Also, there are numerous minor and major amendments to the Plan in between updates to the General Wastewater Plan.

Question: Are the Marymoor lift stations considered a temporary fix?

Answer: The lift stations had to be updated to meet current zoning density in that area. The new lift stations have a 20 to 30-year life span. If the area is again up zoned within the life span of these facilities, the utility will need to upgrade these stations again to ensure wastewater capacity matches the demand.

Question: Is staff referring to the Envision Sustainability Checklist—or similar other checklists-- to help guide our infrastructure and design and building considerations?

Answer: We have not yet used such checklists. The City's new sustainability initiative is relatively new, and we expect conversations about sustainability and construction practices will increase as that program gains momentum. We welcome references and other input that will support efforts to explore this topic.

Question: Are you looking for guidance from the long-range planners to determine where growth can currently occur, and identifying where growth can occur in the future?

Answer: Wastewater Utility staff sought guidance from the Long-Range Planning during development of the plan update. Although the plan update relies on current zoning, the Utility recognizes, and is engaged with, the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan Update. We anticipate that we will revisit this plan when the population estimates and expected growth patterns in the Redmond 2050 planning effort become more certain.

Question: What programs and outreach has occurred to gauge interest and opportunity to move people off septic?

Answer: The Utility Strategic Plan calls for "high priority" septic systems to connection with the wastewater system. Utility Staff anticipates that implementing this strategy will require a separate planning process to create a focused program designed to promote the switch from septic to the wastewater system. Designing such a program will require staff seek input from people who currently have septic systems to determine: a) their willingness to transition off them, b) the factors that would motivate them to make this change, and c) the factors preventing them from making this change.

Question: How does collaboration with the other jurisdiction work? Are they on the same schedule for their WW functional plans, and are we reviewing their plans?

Answer: We communicate with both Bellevue and Kirkland and review their plans as the State requires during the development of wastewater functional plans. We are looking to create an agreement with Kirkland to address issues along the 132nd Ave NE Corridor. The City also is very close to finalizing a set of agreements with the City of Bellevue.

Question: Does stormwater runoff on the 132nd Ave NE Corridor create any issues for the septic in that area?

Answer: In Redmond, stormwater and Wastewater are collected separately. As a result, we are not seeing any stormwater caused issues with regarding to existing septic systems in this area.

Attachment C: Planning Commission Meeting Note, May 26, 2021



REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION

Sherrí Nichols, Chair | Judy East, Vice-Chair
Roy Captain | Aaron Knopf | Vidyanand Rajpathak
Denni Shefrin | Aparna Varadharajan

MINUTES

REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING Wednesday, June 9, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Nichols.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Nichols, Vice-Chair East, Commissioners Shefrin and Aparna

STAFF PRESENT: Beverly Mesa-Zendt, Jeff Churchill, Beckye Frey, Caroline Chapman, Ian Lefcourte, Planning Department; Jeff Thompson and Peter Holte, Public Works Department

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Commissioners Captain, Knopf, and Raj

RECORDING SECRETARY: Carolyn Garza, LLC

2. Approval of the Agenda

Chair Nichols recommended that items five and six be switched so that Report Approval for the General Wastewater Plan update can be addressed prior to the Public Hearing.

- **MOTION to approve the Agenda with the change** that Chair Nichols had suggested by Vice-Chair East. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Shefrin. **The MOTION passed unanimously.**

NOTE: Minutes reflect the new item order

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
June 9, 2021

3. Minutes Approval

[May 26, 2021](#)

- **MOTION to approve** the Meeting Minutes by Vice-Chair East . MOTION seconded by Commissioner Aparna. **The MOTION passed unanimously.**

4. Items from the Audience

There were no requests to speak, but two written comments had been forwarded to the Commission.

5. 2021 Annual Docket: Study Session and Potential Report Approval for the General Wastewater Plan update.

Review and consider approval of the Planning Commission Report and recommendation of approval of the updates to the General Wastewater Plan.

Attachments: [Memo](#), [Draft Planning Commission Report](#)

Staff Contact: [Jeff Thompson](#), Senior Engineer 425-556-2884
[Peter Holte](#), Senior Planner 425-556-2822

- **MOTION to approve** the Planning Commission Report and recommendation of approval of the General Wastewater Plan update by Vice-Chair East . MOTION seconded by Commissioner Shefrin. **The MOTION passed unanimously.**

6. 2021 Annual Docket: Public Hearing and Study Session for the expansion of retail marijuana.

Planning Commission to hold a public hearing and consider a recommendation to the City Council on the updates to the Redmond Comprehensive Plan related to marijuana sales, affordable commercial space and affordable housing.

Attachments: [Memo](#), [Technical Committee Report](#), [Exhibit A – Staff Analysis](#), [Exhibit B – Proposed Comp Plan Amendments](#), [Exhibit C – Proposed Zoning Code Amendments](#), [Exhibit D – SEPA Determination](#), [Presentation](#)

Staff Contact: [Beverly Mesa-Zendt](#), Deputy Planning Director 425-556-2423

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mesa-Zendt presented two options, the original proposal and a second staff-recommended proposal. A review of the Comprehensive Plan in relation to retail sales was given. A notification of Public Hearing was published in the Seattle Times, parties involved in the original 2016 were emailed, the Public Hearing was published in the Redmond E-news and on Redmond social media, and information has been posted on the Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Development Services web pages under upcoming projects. Staff recommends denial of alternative one but recommends approval of alternative two with no further conditions. The Technical Committee recommendation agreed with staff. Amendments to the LU-62 Manufacturing Park Industry designation may be necessary.

Public Hearing

Chair Nichols opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Frey stated that no requests from the public to speak had been received.

- ***Chair Nichols closed verbal comments, but written comments would remain open until the next meeting.***

Study Session

Commissioner Aparna asked for clarification regarding the staff analysis and reason for not including Manufacturing Parks. Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied designation criteria and the preferred growth pattern. Manufacturing Park and Industrial zones are for manufacturing, industrial uses and the other limited uses that support or are compatible with the activity. The designation criteria are specific regarding the allowed use. Ms. Mesa-Zendt indicated that marijuana retail sales are allowed in 16 other zones in the City.

Vice-Chair East asked if the number of marijuana sales businesses in a park can be limited. Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied that additional buffering requirements could be created in the zoning code and that it would be a different conversation if the intent was to apply this rule universally. Ms. Mesa-Zendt asked if the question should be added to the Issues Matrix and Vice-Chair East stated being satisfied. Chair Nichols recalled that setting buffers between stores had been discussed in the past and the conclusion was that competition would be limited despite the use being allowed in the zone. Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied that Minutes for the meeting, when the item was discussed would be located, and the entire list of uses allowed in the proposed zones would be added to the Issues Matrix in response to the question from Commissioner Aparna. A list identifying the allowed zones will also be compiled.

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
June 9, 2021

7. **Redmond 2050: Study Session to review policy options and alternatives for Housing and Economic Vitality.** Review and discuss policy options and alternatives for policies to be added or updated in the Redmond Comprehensive Plan.

Attachments: [Memo, Housing Options & Alternatives](#), [Housing Change Matrix](#), [Economic Vitality Options & Alternatives](#), [Economic Vitality Change Matrix](#), [Presentation](#)

Staff Contact: [Jeff Churchill](#), Planning Manager 425-556-2492
[Caroline Chapman](#), Senior Planner 425-556-2442
[Ian Lefcourte](#), Planner 425-556-2438

Study Session

Mr. Churchill presented a slide presentation regarding the process to consider Comprehensive Plan update policy options and alternatives.

Mr. Lefcourte continued with a presentation of policy tension areas related to housing.

Commissioner Aparna requested more data on green building code and costs, and housing sizes. Commissioner Aparna suggested that thought processes should be progressive considering the long timeframe. Mr. Churchill stated that an insightful comment by Commissioner Aparna had been that a policy direction could be to look for requirements or incentives that have the highest benefit-cost ratio first. Commissioner Aparna stated that an ideal situation long-term would be for Redmond to have a minimum new construction green code, but the largest impacts should also be considered.

Vice-Chair East asked what increasing density in the R-4 area would look. Mr. Lefcourte replied that many triplexes, duplexes, and multiplexes can have the same exterior form as represented by classic, single-family detached homes, and in many cases, there are regulations that require a similar character. The actual look could vary depending on the direction of the Planning Commission and City Council. Attached dwelling units and not Mother-In-Law units are the focus. Vice-Chair East asked where the automobiles belonging to two families in a duplex would have space. Another question was if there would be rows of duplexes or if that would be a restriction for the Planning Commission and City Council to set. Information from other areas that have achieved a balance in current occupancy and growing congestion and density would be helpful. Mr. Churchill replied that regarding whether rows of duplexes would be allowed would be a topic for the Planning Commission to provide the best path forward. There are provisions in the Comprehensive Plan that limit such outcomes and the question is if those provision should continue in Redmond or if a different direction should be taken. Ms. Mesa-Zendt reminded the Planning Commission that the highest concern registered from current residents was traffic and parking when changes begin.

Commissioner Shefrin stated that many older neighborhoods have limitations on density and structure size. While there may not be an active homeowners association there are still recorded covenants. The cost of imposing green methodology in terms of construction could

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
June 9, 2021

negate the ability for developers to construct affordable housing. The idea of 40% tree canopy coverage has been identified as also important to the City.

Commissioner Aparna asked if the process would allow neighbors to express opinions regarding small changes. If restrictions are removed from neighborhood plans, the neighbors should still have a say. Commissioner Shefrin stated that the issue would generate complications, and a better approach may be a decision regarding how Redmond wants to absorb densities. Regarding a public process, neighbors move.

Chair Nichols stated that regarding missing middle housing, if density is not added to single-family neighborhoods, then Redmond fails on equity and inclusion, for example, schools. Chair Nichols asked how many homeowners associations are in Redmond that limit what can be done on a lot. Chair Nichols asked if accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are not allowed as an outright use currently. Mr. Lefcourte replied that there are some areas of the city that require ADUs to be conditional, varying by neighborhood as well as the zone. Mr. Churchill replied believing that the situation is for attached dwelling units rather than ADUs, but the reply was correct for attached dwelling units. Chair Nichols asked for clarification regarding "attached" vs "accessory" units, and asked for more information regarding what standards would provide the highest impact as well as, for example, the cost of green versus insulation requirements. Mr. Lefcourte replied that a cost-benefit analysis today will be different in five years due to technology changes. When addressing regulations later in the process, additional detail will be required for specific standards.

Commissioner Shefrin asked if staff is familiar with the Master Builders Association Housing Toolkit and stated that a way to harmonize structure types in single-family zones regarding transit and single occupancy vehicles and equity needs to be looked at, as well as covenants and homeowners associations.

Commissioner Aparna stated that an approach should be to explore what green building codes exist elsewhere. There are levels of codes. A LEED system will be more expensive but there are several other lesser-known green codes. Commissioner Aparna asked when Neighborhood Plans might be upgraded or reconfigured. Mr. Churchill replied that this will not be addressed until after Redmond 2050 is finished. If a version of option one was chosen, surgical changes would need to be made to the Neighborhood Plans to implement the policy direction.

Ms. Chapman continued the presentation with Economic Vitality.

Commissioner East asked what strengthening policy protections to prevent encroachment would look like. Ms. Chapman replied that the Countywide Industrial Growth Center designation is new, smaller in size and allows the City to be eligible for Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) funding for certain transportation enhancements related to manufacturing and industrial areas. The designation would send a signal that the areas are intended for industrial uses now and into the future. Commissioner East asked if the designation would be on areas already identified as manufacturing. Ms. Chapman replied that staff had evaluated different areas and determined that the most natural fit would be the Southeast Redmond area. Commissioner East asked if development would cease, and Ms. Chapman replied that residential would not be located within the boundary. Commissioner

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
June 9, 2021

East asked for clarification that Willows Road would not be a viable area for the designation and Ms. Chapman replied that the Willows Road area pops as a potential for growth in the Centers and Corridors model, to be determined, and only the Southeast Redmond area is being considered.

Commissioner Aparna asked if there is a sense that all types of industry, for example, heavy, light and artisan would be allowed or if the definition is strict. Ms. Chapman replied that the designation includes warehousing and distribution, research and development and some associated uses with manufacturing. The biggest type to not be allowed is housing. Ms. Chapman stated that artisan and craft uses would be investigated. Commissioner Aparna stated not understanding the scale of operations desired. Another question was if PSRC will mandate small business and legacy. Ms. Chapman replied those were policy considerations that did not generate attention or a trade-off, either mandated or work in process. The policy considerations are in the change matrix for each Comprehensive Plan element.

Commissioner Aparna asked if the term incubator is not being used any longer regarding a business vision for Redmond. Ms. Chapman replied that incubator is included under a different policy, not a stand-alone, cooperative space and flexibility. Commissioner Aparna stated that more information regarding what King County is looking for would be helpful to know how much flexibility is possible. Ms. Chapman asked if the Commissioner has interest in pursuing flexibility, and Commissioner Aparna replied that no one knows what the manufacturing landscape will look like in the future. Jobs created should be flexible within manufacturing uses. Ms. Frey asked for clarification that the flexibility option being addressed by Ms. Chapman was to expand uses in areas not related to manufacturing and industry, but that Commissioner Aparna stated that as much flexibility as possible should occur with industries, manufacturing still the focus but not being flexible outside of manufacturing and industry. Commissioner Aparna replied correct.

Commissioner Shefrin asked if staff has been approached by businesses currently precluded but with an interest in the location and if so, what the businesses would look like that fall under the category of light manufacturing. Commissioner Shefrin stated being in favor of broadening the definition to something more flexible. Ms. Chapman replied that businesses outside of light manufacturing desiring the location are marijuana retail, mixed-use housing, artisan and craft businesses now in more commercial spaces and a snowboarding shop with assembly and sales. Mr. Churchill replied that in the past, a business that does not fit due to a sales footprint larger than allowed in the manufacturing park has been at issue; the difference between selling and manufacturing is on the margins if the nature of the business is more commercial than manufacturing.

Chair Nichols asked if there has been input from Genie, a large employer in the area. Ms. Chapman replied not directly on this issue, but Genie is communicating with the Economic Vitality Manager and have other connections at the City to express needs. Chair Nichols asked to know more about what the industrial center means and would look like. Ms. Chapman replied that there are four or five of the largest employers in Redmond located in the southeast neighborhood.

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
June 9, 2021

Vice-Chair East stated that the School District should weigh in on the scenarios regarding absorbing more children into the schools. Ms. Frey replied that in the next six months, there will be a lot of engagement with stakeholders, including the school districts.

8. Staff & Commissioner Updates

Ms. Frey stated that topics have been finalized for June and July 2021 and a meeting will not be necessary on June 23, 2021. The next meeting will be June 16, 2021. Meetings June 30, July 7, and July 14, 2021 will occur. Ms. Mesa-Zendt stated that the Retail Marijuana Sales Report Approval will move to July 7, 2021, with the Public Hearing remaining open.

Ms. Frey stated that a large extended agenda for August and September 2021 and a Workshop date confirmation in August or early September will be forthcoming.

Ms. Frey stated that information has been received regarding two options for the re-opening of City Hall and specific language received from the Clerk will be forwarded to Commissioners. All meetings will continue to remain remote until the specific Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA) proclamation is rescinded. If the OMPA is lifted, only City Council will hold full meetings in July with the remaining Boards and Commissions operating in a hybrid model; staff and the public would be in the building with restrictions and safety precautions in place, but Commissioners would still remote into July meetings. The situation after July has not been finalized.

Commissioner Shefrin stated having attended a class concerning a publication created by the Master Builders Association regarding affordable housing. The publication can be forwarded to anyone interested. Commissioner Aparna asked for the publication. Ms. Frey immediately emailed the publication to the Commissioners.

9. Adjourn – 8:50 p.m.

MOTION to adjourn by Commissioner East. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Shefrin.
The MOTION passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Minutes approved on:

June 30, 2021

Planning Commission Chair

DocuSigned by:

816CD0A1D16A46D...

Attachment D: Technical Committee Report



2021 ANNUAL DOCKET OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

May 19, 2021

Project File Number:	SEPA-2021-00311
Proposal Name:	General Wastewater Plan Update
Applicant:	City of Redmond Stormwater Utility
Staff Contacts:	Jeff Thompson, Senior Engineer Peter Holte, Senior Planner

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE COMPLIANCE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

Technical Committee shall make a recommendation to the Planning Commission for all Type VI reviews (RZC 21.76.060.E). The Technical Committee's recommendation shall be based on the decision criteria set forth in the Redmond Zoning Code. Review Criteria:

- A. *RZC 21.76.070 Criteria for Evaluation and Action.*
- B. *RZC 21.76.AE Zoning Code Amendment - Text*
- C. *RZC 21.76.AF Zoning Code Amendment - Map*

REDMOND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT SUMMARY

The City Wastewater Utility has completed a [draft of the City of Redmond General Wastewater Plan](#) Update. This is a functional plan, required by the Washington State Growth Management Act and based on the City's current zoning allowances assuming built-out conditions. The plan ensures the City is prepared for expected growth by identifying where pipes, pumps, and other wastewater infrastructure need to be extended or replaced.

The Wastewater Utility is bringing this forward as part of the 2021 Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket so that the Wastewater Utility can proceed with infrastructure updates in the short-term. The Utility is also working with the Planning Department to make more significant updates to the General Wastewater Plan as part of Redmond 2050.

RZC 21.76.070 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA <i>(Full staff analysis attached as Attachment A)</i>		MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET
1	Consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs);	Meets
2	Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria;	Meets
3	If the purpose of the amendment is to change the allowed use in an area, the need for the land uses that would be allowed by the Comprehensive Plan amendment and whether the amendment	NA

Technical Committee Report to the Planning Commission
2021 ANNUAL DOCKET OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
 May 19, 2021

RZC 21.76.070 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA <i>(Full staff analysis attached as Attachment A)</i>		MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET
	would result in the loss of the capacity to meet other needed land uses, especially whether the proposed amendment complies with the policy on no net loss of housing capacity;	
4	Consistency with the preferred growth and development pattern of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan;	Meets
5	The capability of the land, including the prevalence of critical areas;	Meets
6	The capacity of public facilities and whether public facilities and services can be provided cost-effectively at the intensity allowed by the designation;	Meets
7	The proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions. In making this determination the following shall be considered: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Unanticipated consequences of an adopted policy, or ii. Changed conditions on the subject property or its surrounding area, or, iii. Changes related to the pertinent plan map or text; and iv. Where such change of conditions creates conflicts in the Comprehensive Plan of a magnitude that would need to be addressed for the Comprehensive Plan to function as an integrated whole. 	Meets

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Technical Committee recommends the following additional conditions for approval as necessary to ensure consistency with the City's development regulations.

<Add any other considerations per 21.76.060 F>

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the requirements of environmental analysis, protection, and mitigation measures have been adequately addressed through the City's regulations and Comprehensive Plan together with applicable State and Federal laws. Additionally, the lead agency has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment as described under SEPA. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency.

- ❖ In accordance with WAC 197-11-340(2) an opportunity for comment and appeal period was provided from to May 5, 2021 to May 20, 2021.

Technical Committee Report to the Planning Commission
2021 ANNUAL DOCKET OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
May 19, 2021

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Technical Committee has reviewed the proposed amendments identified as **Alternative 1 (Applicant's Proposal)** and finds the amendments to be **consistent** with review criteria identified below:

- A. *RZC 21.76.070 Criteria for Evaluation and Action.*

The Technical committee identified **no additional conditions** necessary to ensure consistency with the city's development regulations.

ALTERNATIVES

Same as above

REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY

DocuSigned by:

Carol Helland

DA525C34AC764BC...

Carol Helland,
Planning and Community Development Director

DocuSigned by:

Dave Juarez

21904E32DA804E9...

Dave Juarez,
Public Works Director

Attachments

- A. Staff Compliance Review and Analysis
- B. Functional Plan Amendments–Executive Summary
- C. SEPA Threshold Determination

Attachment A—Staff Analysis of Comprehensive Plan Amendment: 2021 General Wastewater Plan Update

Criterion 1: Consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs)

Meets this criterion:

- In compliance with RCW 36.70A.130-Comprehensive plans—Review procedures and schedules—Amendments and other applicable provisions.
- In compliance with RCW 90.48.110 plans and proposed methods of operation and maintenance of sewerage or disposal systems review procedures
- In compliance with RCW 36.70A.106 that requires notification of Department of Commerce of “intent to adopt” an updated plan or regulations. I
- In Compliance with applicable King Countywide Planning Policies

Criterion 2: Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria

Meets this criterion. The General Wastewater Plan Update supports 32 Comprehensive Policies. The most pertinent include:

- CF-1 Develop and regularly update functional plans that assess capital facility needs and strategies for addressing such needs. Provide opportunities for public involvement appropriate to the nature of the update. Use functional plans to guide the development of capital priorities and investment decisions within each of the following functional areas...Waste and sewer systems;
- CF-2 Include in functional plans and supporting documents, at a minimum, the following features necessary for maintaining an accurate account of longterm capital facility needs and associated costs to the City, and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code:
 - A description of the current capital facility infrastructure and the scope and cost of its operation and maintenance;
 - A description of current capital facility deficiencies and appropriate funding strategies to remedy these deficiencies;
 - An analysis of capital facilities needed through the year 2030, at a minimum, and preliminary cost estimates to meet those needs;
 - An analysis specifying how capital facilities will be financed and maintained;
 - A description of the functional plan’s public outreach, participation and review process;
 - Criteria to be used to prioritize projects and inform the Capital Investment Strategic Plan;
 - A description of how the functional plan and supporting documents respond to Growth Management Act requirements; and Effective 1/27/18 Ord 2913 Redmond Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities 12-8;
 - An analysis indicating that the functional plan, including any subsequent revisions to or modifications of the functional plan, is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies, Zoning Code regulations, and the Capital Investment Strategic Plan.
- CF-3 Review proposed functional plans and updates to existing functional plans to ensure that the plans:
 - Focus on infrastructure needs in both developed and developing areas of Redmond,

- Are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and
- Comply with state law.
- UT-1 Ensure that adequate public utilities and facilities are planned for, located, extended, and sized consistent with the planned growth described in the Goals, Vision and Framework Policies; Annexation and Regional Planning; and Land Use Elements.

Criterion 3: If the purpose of the amendment is to change the allowed use in an area, the need for the land uses that would be allowed by the Comprehensive Plan amendment and whether the amendment would result in the loss of the capacity to meet other needed land uses, especially whether the proposed amendment complies with the policy on no net loss of housing capacity;

N/A. This criterion is not applicable to this amendment.

Criterion 4: Consistency with the preferred growth and development pattern of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan

Meets this criterion. The General Wastewater Plan advanced the preferred growth pattern as identified in Framework Policy FW-13 by providing adequate infrastructure to implement the desired intensity and general character consistent with the community's long-term vision.

Criterion 5: The capability of the land, including the prevalence of critical areas.

Meets this criterion. All actions identified by this plan will be subject to the City's development review process and must comply with shoreline, critical area, and other City environmental regulations.

Criterion 6: The capacity of public facilities and whether public facilities and services can be provided cost-effectively at the intensity allowed by the designation.

Meets the criterion.

- The plan ensures that the capacity of public wastewater system facilities match expected growth as detailed in the Redmond Zone Code.
- The plan supports Comprehensive Plan Policy UT7—Require development to pay for or construct growth-related portion of infrastructure needs.

Criterion 7: The proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions. In making this determination the following shall be considered:

- i. **Unanticipated consequences of an adopted policy, or**
- ii. **Changed conditions on the subject property or its surrounding area, or,**
- iii. **Changes related to the pertinent plan map or text; and**
- iv. **Where such change of conditions creates conflicts in the Comprehensive Plan of a magnitude that would need to be addressed for the Comprehensive Plan to function as an integrated whole.**

Meets this criterion. The plan addresses the anticipated change in conditions created by growth within the City as detailed by zoning allowances within the Redmond Zoning Code.

ES Executive Summary

ES.1 Growth

The City of Redmond (City) continues to be a leading employment center in the Pacific Northwest with companies such as Microsoft, AT&T, and Nintendo. Since the 1990s employment has more than doubled within the City and in the next 20 years it is expected to increase by more than 40 percent.

Residential growth has also increased significantly at more than 18 percent in the past 10 years. In the next 20 years this trend is expected to continue with some of the highest sectors of growth expected from multifamily residential; especially in areas of mixed-use development and redevelopment such as in the Downtown core, Overlake, and Marymoor Village.

These high levels of growth will continue to drive the need for expansion of the City's wastewater service and upgrades to its existing system.

ES.2 Capital Improvement Program and Development Projects

The improvement and development projects are grouped into three primary areas:

- Capital Improvement Program
- Developer Extensions/Development Projects
- Septic-to-Sewer Projects

Chapter 6 provides a summary of all projects. Chapter 4 and Appendix F provide more detailed information about the specific projects.

ES.2.1 Capital Improvement Program

Implementation of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects will be determined based on a number of factors, including an increase in flows and/or necessary rehabilitation of aging infrastructure. Timing of projects may also depend on coordination with other utility projects, such as transportation or stormwater improvements.

There are twelve (12) CIP projects identified in this General Wastewater Plan Update (Plan). Five of these projects (replacement and/or upgrades to Lift Stations Nos. 5, 6, 12, 13, and 15) are currently underway. It is anticipated the LS-12, LS-13, and LS-15 projects will be completed in the next 2-3 years. The remaining two stations (LS-5 and LS-6) will be completed in the next 3-5 years. Several of the projects included in the CIP are dependent on flow monitoring to confirm the need for the project. If possible, this flow monitoring should begin as soon as possible. Prioritization of projects beyond 2022 will be identified based on flow monitoring and the criteria mentioned above.

ES.2.2 Developer Extensions/Development Projects

More than 110 developer projects are identified at this time. These projects will also be driven by the rate and location of growth and development. These projects are expected to be funded primarily through developer contributions.

ES.2.3 Septic-to-Sewer Projects

The remaining type of project included in this planning document are the Septic-to-Sewer projects, that connect those homes on septic systems to the wastewater collection system. In 1998, the City implemented a pilot program (Neighborhood Sewer Replacement Program) but did not receive the necessary funding or interest on the part of homeowners to connect to the City's collection system. It is recognized that at some time in the future, it will be necessary for these homeowners to connect to the City's collection system. Each year, the City Council and the Directors team will determine if there is sufficient interest in implementing some or all of the Septic-to-Sewer projects.

ES.3 Other Recommendations

In addition to the capital improvement projects, this Plan contains a number of recommendations for the City's wastewater program. The following recommendations are not capital projects but are actions that the utility should consider.

ES.3.1 Recommended Operation and Maintenance Improvements

There are several recommended improvements included in Chapter 5, including those that the City plans to implement.

ES.3.2 Wastewater Flows and Modeling Recommendations

It is recommended that the City continue to update and maintain the City's wastewater flows and system models. These model projections and system data are contained within the City's model of the wastewater collection system.

ES.4 Funding Growth

The estimated cost of the twelve (12) CIP projects identified in this Plan equals \$43.3 million. The near-term projects (Lift Stations Nos. 5, 6, 12, 13, and 15) account for \$27.3 million of this total. All of these projects are included in the budgeting process and the City has sufficient resources to fund the planned CIP. Several of the planned CIP projects will be completed beyond the near-term projects. Implementation of many of these projects will depend on the rate of growth in specific areas.

Developer extensions will primarily be funded by developers and developer contributions. Funding for the Septic-to-Sewer Projects has not yet been determined but may include a combination of City and homeowner funding.

In addition to the CIP, developer, and Septic-to-Sewer Projects, are projects completed by the operation and maintenance (O&M) department and funded through the O&M annual budget.

ES.5 Planning and Analysis Tools

An important element in the preparation of this Plan, was the creation of the City's wastewater collection system hydrologic/hydraulic model. A City-wide model representing all of the City's wastewater basins was developed to be used as a planning tool. The model developed in conjunction with this Plan provides several important features.

ES.5.1 Industry-Accepted Modeling Platform

The wastewater collection system modeling software, MIKE URBAN, is an industry-accepted platform that will be regularly updated and maintained and provide City staff with ongoing technical support. It simulates both dry and wet weather conditions by modeling both the sanitary flows as well as inflow and infiltration.

ES.5.2 Compatibility with King County Data

One of the reasons that the MIKE URBAN software was selected by the City, was that King County uses this program for regional wastewater modeling. This provides an advantage to the City in that it can easily use the King County data that has been developed as part of the regional data development and modeling.

ES.5.3 GIS Compatibility

The wastewater collection system model and the dry weather flow database were developed using the City's GIS data, as well as other data sources. The City intends to continue to develop its GIS data over time, and to use these GIS sources for future updates to the model and the dry weather flow database.

ES.5.4 Identification of Potential Deficiencies and a More Efficient Use of Staff Time

An advantage to having this wastewater collections system model is that City staff can more easily identify potential deficiencies within the collection system.

For example, during this planning process, use of this model identified several areas where there were potential issues. Maintenance and Operations staff field verified and checked for potential capacity issues at these specific locations; in some cases, confirming problem areas. Other areas that are still questionable should be more closely monitored over time, by conducting flow monitoring in targeted areas.

ES.5.5 What-If Scenarios for Planned Improvements

The model will also provide the City staff with tools for sizing planned improvements where deficiencies exist or where new growth is planned.

ES.5.6 Improved Reliability and Accuracy of Data Sources

The process of creating the dry weather flow database and the wastewater collection system model resulted in a detailed effort to identify missing and incorrect information. Following verification against field data, as-builts, and other data sources now provides City staff with much more reliable information.

Attachment C



Determination of Non-Significance Certification of Public Notice

CITY OF REDMOND

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge a Determination of Non-Significance for City of Redmond General Wastewater Plan Update File number: SEPA-2021-00311 was sent to the Applicant and to the attached mailing list copy, by first class mail and electronically mailed to attached SEPA Agency List on or before May 5, 2021

Name (print) Gloria Meerscheidt

Date May 5, 2021

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

I, the undersigned, certify that on May 5, 2021, I posted copies of the attached

Determination of Non-Significance at:	0	Location(s) on or near the site
	0	City Hall – Building Closed – COVID-19
	0	Library – Building Closed – COVID-19

Name (print) Gloria Meerscheidt on behalf of Niomi Montes De Oca

Date May 5, 2021



STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA) DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

For more information about this project visit www.redmond.gov/landuseapps

PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT NAME: COR General Wastewater Plan Update

SEPA FILE NUMBER: SEPA-2021-00311

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
City of Redmond General Wastewater Plan Update

PROJECT LOCATION:

SITE ADDRESS: 15670 NE 85TH ST
REDMOND, WA 98052

APPLICANT: Jeff Thompson

LEAD AGENCY: City of Redmond

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the requirements of environmental analysis, protection, and mitigation measures have been adequately addressed through the City's regulations and Comprehensive Plan together with applicable State and Federal laws.

Additionally, the lead agency has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment as described under SEPA.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. **This information is available to the public on request.**

CITY CONTACT INFORMATION

PROJECT PLANNER NAME: Niomi Montes De Oca

PHONE NUMBER: 425-556-2499

EMAIL: nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov

IMPORTANT DATES

COMMENT PERIOD

Depending upon the proposal, a comment period may not be required. An "**X**" is placed next to the applicable comment period provision.

There is no comment period for this DNS. Please see below for appeal provisions.

'X' This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2), and the lead agency will not make a decision on this proposal for 14 days from the date below. Comments can be submitted to the Project Planner, via phone, fax (425)556-2400, email or in person at the Development Services Center located at 15670 NE 85th Street, Redmond, WA 98052. **Comments must be submitted by 05/20/2021.**

APPEAL PERIOD

You may appeal this determination to the City of Redmond Office of the City Clerk, Redmond City Hall, 15670 NE 85th Street, P.O. Box 97010, Redmond, WA 98073-9710, **no later than 5:00 p.m. on 06/04/2021**, by submitting a completed City of Redmond Appeal Application Form available on the City's website at www.redmond.gov or at City Hall. You should be prepared to make specific factual objections.

DATE OF DNS ISSUANCE: May 6, 2021

For more information about the project or SEPA procedures, please contact the project planner.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Carol V. Helland
Planning Director

SIGNATURE: _____

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Dave Juarez
Public Works Director

SIGNATURE: _____

Address: 15670 NE 85th Street Redmond, WA 98052

CITY OF REDMOND
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
NON-PROJECT ACTION
(Revised May 2018)

Purpose of the Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43 .21C RCW , requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the City of Redmond identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.


You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply" and indicate the reason why the question "does not apply" . It is not adequate to submit responses such as "N/A" or "does not apply": without providing a reason why the specific section does not relate or cause an impact. Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later. If you need more space to write answers attach them and reference the question number .


Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the City can assist you.


The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. When you submit this checklist, the City may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.


Review Planner Name: Niomi Montes de Oca


Date of Review: April 26, 2021


To Be Completed By Applicant	Evaluation for Agency Use Only
<p>A. BACKGROUND</p> <p>1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: 2021 General Sewer Plan Update</p> <p>2. Name of applicant: Jeff Thompson</p> <p>3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: 15670 NE 85th St. Redmond, WA 98073 425-556-2884</p> <p>4. Date checklist prepared: 3/9/2021</p> <p>5. Agency requesting checklist: City of Redmond</p> <p>6. Give an accurate, brief description of the proposal's scope and nature:</p> <p> i. Acreage of the site: <u>City wide</u></p> <p> ii. Number of dwelling units/ buildings to be constructed: <u>None</u></p> <p> iii. Square footage of dwelling units / buildings being added: <u>None</u></p> <p> iv. Square footage of pavement being added: None</p> <p> v. Use or principal activity: <u>City Planning Document</u></p> <p> vi. Other information : <u>Update existing plan</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center; color: red;">NMO</p> 


To Be Completed By Applicant	Evaluation for Agency Use Only
<p>7. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):</p> <p>Public Involvement - March & April 2021 SEPA/Tech Comm - April & May 2021 Planning Commission - April - June 2021 City Council - May & June 2021 King County Utilities - June - December 2021 Department of Ecology - June - December 2021</p> <p>8. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain.</p> <p>Revisions required by applicable comments during the public involvement and approval processes.</p> <p>9. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared or will be prepared directly related to this proposal.</p> <p>No environmental info since this is a City Planning document.</p> <p>10. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain.</p>	<p style="text-align: center; color: red;">NMO</p> 

To Be Completed By Applicant	Evaluation for Agency Use Only
<p>11. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.</p> <p>City of Redmond City Council approval King County Utilities approval Department of Ecology approval</p> <p>12. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.</p> <p>This is an update to the City of Redmond General Sewer Plan. The last plan was approved in 2009 and is due for an update. The plan evaluated the City's wastewater system for buildout of the current zoning and indicates where improvements are required by Developers and the City to meet future demand.</p> <p>13. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist</p> <p>The planning document evaluates the whole city and the Novelty Hill area where the City of Redmond provides sewer service. Chapter 4 of the plan details the potential sites for upgrades and expansions to the City sewer system.</p>	<p style="text-align: center; color: red;">NMO</p> 

To Be Completed By Applicant	Evaluation for Agency Use Only
<p>B. <u>SUPPLEMENTAL</u></p> <p>Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.</p> <p>When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise? <p>As the City grows it produces more wastewater that is sent to King County for treatment. The treated water is then discharged to Puget Sound. By evaluating the City's wastewater system for future growth and providing a list of improvements required to meet the future demand, the City is minimizing the chance of a sewer overflow event. All emergency generators at wastewater pump stations are required to meet the City's noise ordinance.</p> <p>Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:</p> <p>Wastewater system improvements described in the plan. Providing adequate sewer capacity to meet zoning buildout conditions will prevent sewer overflows that could make their way into the City's stormwater system and local streams.</p> How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life? <p>The plan minimizes the chances of wastewater overflowing and affecting plants, animals, fish, or marine life.</p> <p>Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish or marine life are:</p> <p>The plan reduces the risk of overflows by ensuring the City's wastewater system has adequate capacity and improved infrastructure. This reduces the potential that raw sewage will enter the City's stormwater system, and flow to local streams and other aquatic habitats.</p> 	<p style="text-align: center; color: red;">NMO</p> 

To Be Completed By Applicant	Evaluation for A2envc Use Only
<p>3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?</p> <p>The wastewater system includes 22 lift stations, which require electricity to run the pumps.</p> <p>Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:</p> <p>Use of a SCADA system to run the pumps efficiently and minimize their usage. Pump sizing is designed to maximize efficiency at design flows.</p> <p>4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?</p> <p>The plan minimizes the chances of wastewater overflowing to natural waterways, thereby protecting sensitive aquatic habitat. The Plan aligns with the City's critical areas regulations and other zoning codes.</p> <p>Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:</p> <p>The plan relies on City planning processes, zoning code, and environmental protection regulations to determine where extensions and improvements to the wastewater system can and need to be placed. It compares the current conditions of the City's wastewater system to what will be needed in the future, based on build-out scenarios that align with zoning allowances and City code.</p>	<p>NMO</p> 

To Be Completed By Applicant	Evaluation for Agency Use Only
<p>5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?</p> <p>The plan ensures that the wastewater system is adequately sized to serve the buildout of the current zoning. It compliments the City of Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code.</p> <p>Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:</p> <p>The plan relies on the City's Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Code, and environmental regulations to determine what areas of the City are allowed development and which areas must be protected. All potential project derived from this plan will be subject to the City's development review process, and must comply with Shoreline, Critical Area, and other City environmental regulations.</p> <p>6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?</p> <p>The plan was written using projected growth estimates supplied by the Puget Sound Regional Council. As such, it responds and supports the City's growth management activities as define by Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. It purpose is to ensure that sewer utility services keep pace with growth and can adequately meet increased demand caused increased housing and businesses densities, as defined in the Redmond Zoning Code .</p> <p>Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:</p> <p>The plan calls for the extension of sewer system in areas that are expected to receive the greatest amount of growth as per the City's Comprehensive Plan Vision and Zoning Code. This includes extensions and improvement to the wastewater system in areas with close proximity of public transit hubs and light-rail stations, such as Downtown Redmond, Overlake, and the Marymoor Sub-Area.</p>	<p style="text-align: center; color: red; font-weight: bold;">NMO</p> 

To Be Completed By Applicant	Evaluation for Agency Use Only
<p>7. Identify , if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.</p> <p>The plan helps comply with all the local, state, and federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment by ensuring that the City's wastewater system is adequately sized for buildout of the current zoning. Additional wastewater system analysis would be required if the City increases zoning in any areas.</p>	<p style="text-align: center; color: red;">NMO</p> 

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Applicant Signature: Jeff Thompson

Jeff Thompson
Name of Signee: _____

Senior Utility Engineer/City of Redmond
Position and Agency/Organization: _____

Project Manager
Relationship of Signer to Project: _____

3/9/2021
Date Submitted: _____

Chapter 1 Introduction

The City of Redmond's 2019 General Sewer Plan (Plan) updates the City's 2009 General Sewer Plan. The Plan is a tool that the City will use to maintain, operate, and expand the sewer system to meet the needs of existing and future customers. Since the 2009 Plan was approved, several changes and improvements have taken place within the City's service area.

Changes since the 2009 Plan that affect sewer system planning in the Redmond service area include:

- Continued growth in Redmond's service area, mainly in the downtown core and Overlake neighborhoods.
- The 2009 to 2011 King County Decennial Flow Monitoring Program.
- Approval and implementation of Sound Transit 2, with future light rail stations in Overlake, Marymoor and Downtown Redmond.
- Proposed King County replacement of the Lake Hills Trunk and Northwest Lake Sammamish Interceptor Upgrade.
- Proposed redevelopment on the Microsoft Campus.
- Zoning changes adopted by the City.
- City of Redmond Comprehensive Plan updates.

This Plan identifies short-term capital improvements and defines long-term system planning goals and service criteria consistent with regional land use and wastewater planning issues.

As regulations and conditions change, periodic review and revision of this Plan will be appropriate and necessary to reflect such changes. Population, growth, and development trends must be monitored to assess whether the actual trends differ significantly from projections in this Plan and whether these differences significantly affect proposed improvements.

1.1 Purpose and Objectives

The first plan to review the needs of Redmond's complete sewer system was the 1987 Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Study. This was followed by the 1997 General Sewer Plan and then the 2009 General Sewer Plan. The 1997 Plan incorporated the impacts of rapid growth that surpassed the system capacity, even with the capital improvements outlined in the 1987 Plan. The 1997 and 2009 plans included information from the state, region, and local level regarding land use and growth management.

This 2019 Plan updates the work of the 2009 Plan and is consistent with the land use designations and build-out projections under the City's Comprehensive Plan. This Plan includes 6-year and buildout planning horizons. These planning horizons account for improvements necessary to support the City's projected buildout. Adoption of modifications will take place every six to ten years as the Plan is officially updated in accordance with the Utilities chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

The objectives of this Plan are to:

- Develop population and sewage flow projections for the City's sewer service area.

- Ensure consistency of planning assumptions with the King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Treatment Division (King County WTD) and the City Planning Department.
- Update the City's sewer model using MIKE URBAN sewer modeling software and the City's GIS system.
- Establish design criteria for analyzing facilities.
- Analyze the existing sewer system with existing and future flows to determine possible deficiencies.
- Develop a capital improvement program (CIP).
- Develop implementation strategy and financial program for proposed CIP.
- Review City policies that may impact planned improvements to Redmond's sewer system.
- Summarize efforts to identify opportunities for reclaimed water use.

1.2 Ownership and Management

The City of Redmond (City) is a municipal corporation that owns and operates a public sewer collection system. The City uses a Mayor-Council form of government. The Mayor oversees the management of the Public Works Department through the Public Works Director. The collection system is managed by the Water/Wastewater Division within the Public Works Department.

The City does not own or operate a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). Rather, wastewater is conveyed to various King County owned interceptors within the sewer service area and the County is contracted for further conveyance and treatment. Wastewater generated in Redmond's sewer service area is ultimately treated at the County's Brightwater Treatment Plant.

1.3 Regulatory Requirements

Several local, state, and federal regulatory requirements guide the planning, operation, design, and construction of sewer systems, and these must be considered with this planning process. The rules and requirements that are pertinent to the Sewer Plan are described in the following sections.

1.3.1 Department of Ecology

This Plan was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) as defined in Chapter 173-240-050 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) and Chapter 90.48 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). The WAC requirements and location are addressed within this document and are shown in Table 1.1. below:

Reference Paragraph	Description of Requirement	Location in Document
3a	Purpose and need for proposed plan	Chapter 1.1
3b	Who will own, operate, and maintain system	Chapter 1.2
3c	Existing and proposed service boundaries	Chapter 2
3d	Layout map showing boundaries; existing sewer facilities; proposed sewers; topography and elevations; streams, lakes; and other water bodies; water systems	Chapter 2
3e	Population trends	Chapter 3.1
3f	Existing domestic and/or industrial wastewater facilities within 20 miles	Chapter 2
3g	Infiltration and inflow problems	Chapter 4
3h	Treatment systems and adequacy of such treatment	Chapter 1 – N/A
3i	Identify industrial wastewater sources	
3k	Discussion of collection alternatives	Chapter 4
3k	Discussion of treatment alternatives	Chapter 3 – N/A
3k	Discussion of disposal alternatives	Chapter 3.3.3
3l	Define construction cost and O&M costs	Chapter 6
3m	Compliance with management plan	
3n	SEPA compliance	Appendix C

1.3.2 Growth Management Act

Under the requirements of the state Growth Management Act, Redmond must commit to serving the sewer needs of the planned growth that will occur within Redmond's urban boundary during the next six years. This Plan includes an evaluation of the existing sewer system and identification of additional facilities needed to accommodate the planned growth to comply with the state regulations.

1.3.3 King County

The 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan is the county's land use planning document that defines growth strategies for achieving the Growth Management Act's 13 planning goals. The first plan was adopted in 1994 and the 2016 Plan was last amended October 29, 2018. Chapter 9 of the King County Comprehensive Plan addresses services, facilities, and utilities, including public sewer systems, and supports the Phase 1 Countywide Planning Policies and the Phase II amendments finalized in May 1994.

Title 13 of the King County Code sets requirements for water and sewer systems, including review guidelines and consideration of reclaimed water. Title 13 requires sewer and water comprehensive plans to consider opportunities for reclaimed water. Redmond does not operate a WWTP so providing reclaimed water through sewage treatment is not viable. Reclaimed water is available within the City limits from the Brightwater Treatment Plant. Use of reclaimed water from Brightwater is discussed in Chapter 3. This 2019 Plan Update will be reviewed by the County's Utility Technical Review Committee (UTRC) per the requirements in Title 13. This 2019 Plan Update is consistent with the strategy and policies presented in King County's documents.

1.4 Plan Organization and Contents

This Plan defines the current service area, sewer basins, and existing infrastructure; delineates the future sewer planning area, the projected service population, and resulting sewage flows; and presents proposed improvements to upgrade existing facilities and provide adequate sewer service to existing and future customers in Redmond's service area.

Specific components included in this Plan are identified below.

Introduction (Chapter 1)

- Purpose and objectives of the City's General Sewer Plan Update.
- Regulatory requirements of the sewer system and planning process.
- Overview of the Plan contents and glossary of terms and abbreviations.

System Description (Chapter 2)

- Defines the existing service area and sewer planning area boundaries and the geographical features and resources within these boundaries.
- Discusses the relationship with King County and other sewer providers.
- Documents land use and zoning throughout the service and planning areas.
- Summarizes regulations and permitting relevant to the sewer system and planning.
- Describes the existing sewer facilities and provides an inventory of the sewer basins, mains, and pump stations.
- Summarizes the City's water system and facilities.

Planning Criteria and Flow Projections (Chapter 3)

- Documents existing and future demographics.
- Estimates current and future sewage flows for Redmond's sewer system based on current usage and future zoning.
- Presents accepted design criteria standards and discusses King County WTD's policies for future regional sewer service, which include infiltration and inflow (I/I), conveyance system improvements, and reclaimed water.
- Describes the use of planning data from the King County I/I Study in the development of City flows and the City's sewer model development.
- Discusses the impacts of water conservation on the City's sewer system.

Sewer System Evaluation (Chapter 4)

- Summarizes efforts to analyze the system using a hydraulic and hydrologic wastewater model.
- Describes existing sewer facilities by basin.

- Identifies problem areas or deficiencies by capacity, operation and maintenance (O&M) and/or obsolescence.
- Presents recommended improvements by sewer basins.
- Provides figures of all the existing sewer facilities and recommended improvements.

Operations and Maintenance (O&M) (Chapter 5)

- Documents maintenance problems, describes Redmond's sewer inspection program and recordkeeping methods, and discusses operation and maintenance staff.
- Describes the City's Fats, Oils, and Grease (FOG) Program.
- Describes requirements for the Capacity, Maintenance, Operations, and Maintenance (CMOM) Program and a proposed plan for the City's implementation of CMOM.
- Presents an evaluation and condition assessment of the City's pump stations.
- Details enhancements to be made to the existing O&M Program.

Capital Improvement Program (Chapter 6)

- Summarizes the recommended infrastructure improvements identified in the sewer system evaluation for each basin.
- Summarizes the recommended improvements for the O&M Program.
- Identifies costs of the improvements and presents capital funding sources.

Implementation (Chapter 7)

- Identifies the procedures, permits, and approvals needed to implement the Plan.
- Describes the Neighborhood Sewer Replacement Program.

1.5 Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

The following terms and abbreviations are used in this Plan:

AAF	Average Annual Flow, or Average Daily Flow. This flow condition captured all daily flows during the year.
AWWF	Average Wet Weather Flow. The average flow from the months of November through March. All flows during this period are summarized regardless of the amount of precipitation.
Basin	An area that is served, or will be served, by a specific part of a sewer system. Basins generally correspond to natural drainage areas.
Budgeting by Priorities Process	Budgeting process begun in 2017 that includes citizen involvement and prioritization of City services based on input from community involvement.
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CMOM	Capacity, Management, Operation, and Maintenance
DFM	Decennial Flow Monitoring
DWF	Dry Weather Flow, or Domestic Flow. An estimation of wastewater flow with little to no I/I contribution.
Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology

EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAR	Floor-to-Area Ratio
FOG	Fats, Oils, and Grease
Force Main	A pipe that transports sewage under pressure delivered by a sewage pump.
Full Service Area	Defined by King County as areas where water supply is available and where public sewer is available now or will be provided in the next six years.
GMA	Growth Management Act
gpad	gallons per acre day
gpcd	gallons per capita per day
gpd	gallons per day
gpm	gallons per minute
ILA	Interlocal Agreement
Impact and Planning Area	Area outside of the city limits that is anticipated to be served by the City.
Infiltration	Groundwater that enters a sewer system through fractured or defective pipes, leaking pipe joints, leaking manholes, and other defects.
Inflow	Stormwater runoff that directly enters a sewer system from roof, street, and other drains, perforated or leaking manhole covers, and other sources. Water from foundation drains is also considered inflow.
I/I	Combined total of infiltration and inflow without distinction between the two.
King County WTD	King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Treatment Division (formerly the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle or Metro)
LID	Local Improvement District
mgd	million gallons per day
MMF	Maximum Month Flow. The average flow of the maximum month.
MWL	Municipal Water Supply – Efficiency Requirements Act Chapter 5, commonly known as the “Municipal Water Law.” It was adopted in 2003 and includes requirements for water and wastewater master planning.
MIKE URBAN	Danish Hydraulic Institute Software. This is the software used for the hydraulic and hydrologic model simulations.
NESSWD	Northeast Sammamish Sewer and Water District

NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System. As authorized by the Clean Water Act, the NPDES permit program controls water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants into waters of the United States. Point sources are discrete conveyances such as pipes or man-made ditches.
PDF	Peak Day Flow. The maximum total daily flow through the system.
Peak Design Flow	Estimated sewer flow in the system during a 100-year flow-event.
PHF	Peak Hour Flow. The peak sustained flow rate occurring during a one-hour period.
Potential Annexation Areas	Areas that Redmond would consider annexing if it would be able to provide the facilities necessary to serve the resident population in compliance with Redmond's goals and policies. These are generally areas between Redmond's city limits and its UGA boundary.
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
RDI	Rainfall Dependent Inflow/Infiltration
Results Teams	Part of Budgeting by Priorities Process. Groups of five City staff across departments and one citizen that are responsible for providing recommendations to the Mayor and Council on budgeting priorities.
Sewage	Wastewater resulting from residential, commercial, and industrial water use, exclusive of irrigation.
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act. A law of the State of Washington that requires identification of environmental impacts for proposed projects and actions. Sewer plans are subject to review under this law.
Sewer	A pipe or conduit, generally closed but normally not flowing full, for carrying sewage.
Service Planning Area	Defined by King County as the area within Redmond's urban growth area that will ultimately receive sewer service.
Service Area	The area currently served by sewers.
SFR	Single-family Residential
SSOAP	Sanitary Sewer Overflow Analysis and Planning
TDR	Transfer of Density Rights
Urban Area	King County defines as an area with a land use classification of urban that is further classified as Full-Service Area or Service Planning Area.
UGA	Urban Growth Area

UPD	Urban Planned Developments. These are land developments within the UGA involving a public review process with the intent of mutual benefit to public and private interests.
UTRC	Utility Technical Review Committee, King County.
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WTD	King County Wastewater Treatment Division
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

From: [Legals](#)
To: [Gloria Meerscheidt](#)
Subject: RE: 10011 - Please publish on Thursday, May 6, 2021 - SEPA-2021-00311 General Wastewater Plan Update
Date: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 3:45:05 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[10011Proof.pdf](#)

External Email Warning! Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Hi Gloria,
This notice is scheduled to publish on 5/6, the total is \$202.93. Proof is attached.
Thank you!

Holly Botts

Legal Advertising Representative

p: (206) 652-6604

e: hbotts@seattletimes.com



From: Gloria Meerscheidt <GMeerscheidt@REDMOND.GOV>
Sent: Tuesday, May 04, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Legals <legals@seattletimes.com>
Cc: Gloria Meerscheidt <GMeerscheidt@REDMOND.GOV>
Subject: 10011 - Please publish on Thursday, May 6, 2021 - SEPA-2021-00311 General Wastewater Plan Update

Hello Seattle Times Representative,

Please publish the enclosed attachment (word format) as a liner ad for Thursday, May 6, 2021

Attachment: SEPA-2021-00311, COR Wastewater Plan Update

Please respond to verify this request.

Thank you,

Gloria Meerscheidt
Administrative Assistant, City of Redmond



☎ 425-556-2407

✉ gmeerscheidt@redmond.gov

🌐 www.redmond.gov

MS:4SPL • 15670 NE 85th St • PO Box 97010 • Redmond, WA 98073-9710



Notice of Public Disclosure: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account is a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

COVID-19 (Coronavirus) Message: City of Redmond buildings remain closed. City staff are teleworking while facilities are closed and available by phone, email and website. Visit Redmond.gov/COVID-19_for_updates

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

**City of Redmond
STATE ENVIRONMENTAL
POLICY ACT (SEPA)
DETERMINATION OF
NON-SIGNIFICANCE**

Name of Proposal/File Number: General Wastewater Plan Update SEPA-2021-00311

Description of Proposal: City of Redmond Wastewater Plan Update

Location of Proposal: city-wide

Site Address of Proposal (if any): n/a

Applicant: Jeff Thompson

Lead Agency: City of Redmond

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the requirements of environmental analysis, protection, and mitigation measures have been adequately addressed through the City's regulations and Comprehensive Plan together with applicable State and Federal laws.

Additionally, the lead agency has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment as described under SEPA.

An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. **This information is available to the public on request.**

Comment Period: Depending upon the proposal, a comment period may not be required. An "X" is placed next to the applicable comment period provision.

X This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2) and the lead agency will not make a decision on this proposal for 14 days from the date below. Comments can be submitted to the project Planner, Niomi Montes De Oca, at 425-556-2499, via fax at 425-556-2400, via e-mail at nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov. **Comments must be submitted by May 20, 2021.**

Responsible Official/Position/Title:
Carol V. Helland, Planning Director

Responsible Official/Position/Title:
David Juarez, Public Works Director

Address: 15670 N.E. 85th Street, P.O. Box 97010, Redmond, WA 98073-9710

Appeal Period
You may appeal this determination to the City of Redmond Planning Department, Redmond City Hall, 15670 N.E. 85th Street, P.O. Box 97010, Redmond, WA 98073-9710, **no later than 5:00 p.m. on 06/04/21** by submitting a completed City of Redmond Appeal Application Form available on the City's website at www.redmond.gov. You should be prepared to make specific factual objections.

For more information about the project or SEPA procedures, please contact the project planner, Niomi Montes De Oca at 425-556-2499 or e-mail nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov.

Date of DNS issuance: Thursday, May 6, 2021

From: [Gloria Meerscheidt](#)
To: [Adam](#); [andy.swayne@pse.com](#); [Avril Baty](#); [casey_barney@yakama.com](#); [Chris Jenkins](#); [Dan Sokol](#); [dbeagle@cj.sammamish.wa.us](#); [Elizabeth.Elliott@kingcounty.gov](#); [Erika Harris](#); [Fisheries.fileroom@muckleshoot.nsn.us](#); [fmiller@lwsd.org](#); [genick@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov](#); [Glen St. Amant - MITED Habitat Program](#); [Gretchen.Kaehler@dahp.wa.gov](#); [Heidi Bedwell](#); [Jennifer Meisner](#); [jerry_meninick@yakama.com](#); [Jil Nogi](#); [Jim Ishimaru](#); [John Greene](#); [Johnson Meninick](#); [Jon Regala](#); [klyste@stillaguamish.com](#); [laura.murphy@muckleshoot.nsn.us](#); [Mark.Wilgus@kingcounty.gov](#); [matth@snoqualmtribe.us](#); [Miles Penk](#); [Peter Alm](#); [Philippe D. LeTourneau](#); [Puget Sound Clean Air Agency](#); [robert.nunnenkamp@kingcounty.gov](#); [rrod](#); [ryoung@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov](#); [sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov](#); [sepadahp](#); [sepadesk@dfw.wa.gov](#); [sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov](#); [Stephanie Jolivette](#); [Steve Mullen-Moses](#); [Steve.Bottheim@kingcounty.gov](#); [Steven Mullen-Moses](#); [tina.morehead@kingcounty.gov](#); [tlavender2@frontier.com](#); [tmcgruder@gmail.com](#); [Todd Scott](#); [Tom Hinman-citizen](#); [WA Dept of Ecology](#); [wendy klahr](#)
Cc: [Niomi Montes De Oca](#); [Gloria Meerscheidt](#); [Jeff Thompson](#)
Subject: City of Redmond - SEPA - General Wastewater Plan Update
Date: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 1:25:44 PM
Attachments: [SEPA202100311.pdf](#)
[Chapter 1 - Introduction.pdf](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image016.png](#)

Hello,

Attached: City of Redmond General Wastewater Plan Update, SEPA-2021-00311

Type of SEPA Documentation: Determination of Non-Significance

Description of Proposal: Update to the City of Redmond General Wastewater Plan

Date of Issuance: May 6, 2021

If you have any questions, please contact the assigned planner:

- Niomi Montes De Oca
- nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov
- 425-556-2499

Gloria Meerscheidt
Administrative Assistant, City of Redmond



425-556-2407

gmeerscheidt@redmond.gov

www.redmond.gov

MS:4SPL • 15670 NE 85th St • PO Box 97010 • Redmond, WA 98073-9710



Notice of Public Disclosure: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account is a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

COVID-19 (Coronavirus) Message: City of Redmond buildings remain closed. City staff are teleworking while facilities are closed and available by phone, email and website. Visit [Redmond.gov/COVID-19](https://www.redmond.gov/COVID-19) for updates