

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

CITY OF LAKE FOREST PARK CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION MEETING MINUTES October 9, 2003
--

Councilmembers present: Dwight Thompson, Mayor *pro tempore*; Alan Kiest, Carolyn Armanini, Mary Jane Goss, Nate Herzog, Roger Olstad, Ed Sterner

Staff present: David R. Hutchinson, Mayor; Karen Haines, City Administrator; Dennis Peterson, Police Chief; Sarah Phillips, Community and Government Affairs Manager; Neil Jensen, City Engineer; Susan Stine, City Clerk

Others present: Lake Forest Park Water District Commissioners Gordon Hungar and William Currie; Water District staff Joan Grindeland and Dan Mundall (engineering consultant)

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor David Hutchinson called the study session meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM/DISCUSSION

Brightwater Siting Project/Discussion with Lake Forest Park Water District

Mayor Hutchinson welcomed Lake Forest Park Water District commissioners Gordon Hungar and Bill Currie, staff member Joan Grindeland, and engineering consultant Dan Mundall. Hutchinson said that the city is interested in discussing issues related to the Brightwater siting project with the Water District representatives, and he noted that King County staff has been invited to discuss the project at the October 23, 2003 council study session.

Water District Commissioner Gordon Hungar expressed concern regarding the potential impact of tunnel construction for the Brightwater project on the district's resources. He noted the impact of citizen resistance in the city of Mountlake Terrace on the proposed tunnel route.

Hungar noted a conversation with Metropolitan King County Council Member Carolyn Edmonds regarding the impact of political decisions on the project.

Hungar said that the district's concern is the potential impact of the project on the aquifer and watershed area, both from possible drainage of or contamination to the aquifer.

Hungar noted that connection to Seattle water (recommended by county staff as a solution to the potential water supply problem) raises questions regarding connection as well as water supply costs.

In response to a question from Cmbr. Kiest, Hungar noted that the County did not anticipate a remedy other than the connection to Seattle water to the potential aquifer damage.

1 In response to a question from Cmbr. Olstad, Hungar noted that the district's aquifer
2 recharge area has not been mapped and can only be estimated.

3
4 Engineering Consultant Dan Mundall discussed his research regarding tunnel design
5 and construction and results of his work with King County staff related to the Brightwater
6 project. He expressed the district's desire for an agreement with the county prior to the
7 issuance of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

8
9 Water District staff member Joan Grindeland expressed the concern that the District is
10 not mentioned as an affected agency, and the district's concerns have not been
11 addressed in technical studies related to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

12
13 In response to a question from Cmbr. Thompson, Mundall discussed the district's
14 interest in an interlocal agreement with the county, his work with hydrogeologists
15 assigned to the project, and issues related to regional geology affecting the project.

16
17 Kiest asked that the administration prepare a resolution for council consideration at the
18 October 23, 2003 meeting supporting the Lake Forest Park Water District related to the
19 Brightwater project. He noted the absurdity of creating an environmental hazard through
20 damage to the aquifer by construction of a project intended to fix an environmental
21 hazard from sewage.

22
23 Mundall noted that the aquifer serving the Lake Forest Park Water District has the
24 potential of serving more customers in the future if it is not damaged by the Brightwater
25 project. He expressed his concern regarding the County's plan to test the tunnel only at
26 commissioning and at 15- and 30-year intervals.

27
28 Cmbr. Armanini noted that the Growth Management Act identified the aquifer protection
29 area as a category to be addressed in an environmentally sensitive areas ordinance.
30 She said that the administration should determine whether the city has legal authority to
31 protect the aquifer in the City.

32
33
34 **Update on Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Capital Funds**

35
36 City Administrator Karen Haines reported that the city must use some of its accumulated
37 CDBG capital funds, which have been held in the County pool. She said that the Human
38 Services Commission has recommended that the city seek applications from public or
39 nonprofit agencies providing needed human services, and she discussed requirements
40 for the potential projects.

41
42 Kiest expressed his concern regarding the impact of increasing property values on
43 affordable facilities accessible to clients of human services agencies. He recommended
44 that staff consider how future funding can be used to support such agencies.

45
46 Armanini suggested that some funds might be earmarked for future planning for facilities
47 for human services providers.

48
49
50
51

1 **Report on Organics Pilot**

2

3 Community and Government Affairs Manager Sarah Phillips noted that King County staff
4 members and consultants are present to provide an update on the organics pilot and the
5 results of a recent telephone survey regarding the pilot project. Phillips said that the
6 visitors were prepared to remain for the regular meeting to report and discuss issues
7 related to the organics pilot with the city council.

8

9

10 **Adjournment**

11

12 There being no objection, the study session meeting was adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

13

14

15

16 _____
Susan Stine, City Clerk

17

18

19

20 _____
David R. Hutchinson, Mayor