PUBLIC WORKS/PARKS COMMITTEE MEETING Monday, June 3, 2019 – 5:15pm Wastewater Treatment Plant – 26729 98th Drive NW MINUTES

Attendance:

Councilmembers: Rob Johnson, Tim Pearce, Judy Williams
City Staff: Kevin Hushagen, Shawn Smith, Lisa Sokolik

The full meeting agenda packet with detailed information can be found on the City's website at www.ci.stanwood.wa.us

1. Ovenell Cleanup Update

A call for bids went out to clean up Ovenell Park. The tires, poles, concrete slabs from the previously demolished buildings, and the manure pit will all be removed. After the park is cleaned up it can be opened to citizens.

The committee had some concerns:

- Spending funds on Ovenell before Heritage Park is tournament ready, which in turn could bring in funds to use on Ovenell.
- The City has 7 years from the time buildings are demolished to be replaced using same footprint, we have approximately 5 years left to rebuild.
- What department is in charge of Park Planning, Public Works or Community Development?

Staff will review the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) grant and the Park Master Plan and bring these concerns up at the Management Team meeting on June 4, 2019.

2. 297 Zone Reservoir Update

Staff informed the committee that the 297 Zone Reservoir project is out to bid. The bid due date is set for June 19, 2019 at 2:00pm.

3. Long Term Water Supply Study

Staff asked the Committee if a Long Term Water Supply Study should be conducted.

Page 6-19 from the City of Stanwood Comprehensive Water System Plan was handed out (attached). The Committee discussed the potential alternative water sources and had these questions: What is our capacity? What capacity are we at now? Based on projected growth will Tatoosh meet that need?

Committee member Johnson commented that the access to Hatt Slough should be remedied or deemed too dangerous to access and look at acquiring a new source.

Discussion:

• SR532 and 72nd Ave Pedestrian Bridge

WSDOT came up with an option to make this intersection safer for pedestrians by adding additional signage, pavement markings and modifications to the vehicle travel. Staff will bring this item to full council on June 13, 2019 under new items.

Table 6-4
Potential Alternative Sources of Supply

Consideration	Alternative 1 Skagit PUD to City	Alternative 2 Tatoosh to City with Fisher/Carpenter Benefit	Alternative 3 Tatoosh to City without Fisher/Carpenter Benefit	Alternative 4 City of Marysville to City	Alternative 5 City of Arlington to City	Alternative 6 Tulalip Tribes to City
Intertie With	Skagit PUD	Tatoosh Water Company	Tatoosh Water Company	City of Marysville	City of Arlington	Tulalip Tribes
Forecast Excess Water Rights (afy)	6,103	740	740	4,535.7	280.0	TBD (E)
Year of Forecast	2027 (A)	Estimated (B)	Estimated (B)	2028 (C)	2058 (D)	TBD (E)
Approximate Total Pipeline Distance (miles)	6.7	6.5	5,4	7.7 (F)	8.5	14.6 (F)
Booster Pump Station(s) Needed	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pipeline Distance Within Future Service Area (miles)	3.3	1,1	2.15, 35	0.5	2.3	0.5
Zoning Adjacent to new pipeline witin Future Service Area (miles)	Riverway Commercial Farmland, Local Commercial Farmland, Low Density Residential, and Neighborhood Business	Local Commercial Farmland	Rural Residential-5 and Local Commercial Farmland	Riverway Commercial Farmland	Riverway Commercial Farmland	Riverway Commercial Farmland
Potential Partners with the City	Skagit PUD	Tatoosh, Snohomish PUD, Ecology	Tatoosh, Snohomish PUD	Marysville, Snohomish PUD, Seven Lakes Water Association	Arlington, Snohomish PUD, Silvana Water Association	Tulalip Tribes, Snohomish PUD Seven Lakes Wat Association
Possible to Wheel Water from Regional Everett System	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

⁽A) - 2007 Water System Plan (Skagit PUD, 2008)

Alternative Source of Supply Conclusions

The City is currently fully dependent on local groundwater and spring sources. Declining groundwater levels over time and difficulty in accessing and maintaining Hatt Slough Springs suggests that seeking an intertie with a larger system that has different sources of supply is a potentially beneficial long-term strategy for the City. However, due to the City's location, there are currently no large water systems that have infrastructure directly adjacent to the City's water system allowing for an intertie. Each of the six alternatives identified involve installation of at least 5 miles of transmission main, which will be a substantial investment for a system the size of the City's.

Each of the alternatives does have the potential for multiple partners, which might help defray some of the transmission main capital costs. The City plans to continue or begin discussions with the identified potential partners. The discussion will determine if the other systems are interested in contracting to provide water to the City. Other next steps include identifying fatal flaws, preparing planning-level cost estimates, formulating an ownership and operation model for new pipelines, determining the optimal alternative, and developing a capital improvement plan to fund the design

Jath dough

⁽B) - Feasiblity Resport, Water System Evaluation Carpenter-Fisher, Upper Nookachamps, and East Nookachamps Subbasins (RH2, 2013)

⁽C) - City of Marysville Water Comprehensive Plan (HDR, 2009) combined with additional water right analysis

⁽D) - City of Arlington Comprehensive Water System Plan (RH2, 2010)

⁽E) - Excess water that could be made available would need to be determined through future negotiations.

⁽F) - Less if Seven Lakes Water Association pipe can be used across a portion of its service area