Regular Meeting of the Board of Commissioners  
Monday, March 6, 2023  
3:30 PM

Meetings of the Board of Commissioners are now hybrid meetings. The public is welcome to attend in-person at the District Office or remotely through the Zoom meeting platform.

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device:
  Please click this URL to join. https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88450309853

Or join by phone:
  Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):  
  US: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 253 205 0468 or +1 719 359 4580 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 444 9171 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 689 278 1000 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 305 224 1968 or +1 310 205 3325 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 360 209 5623 or +1 386 347 5053 or +1 507 473 4847  
  Webinar ID: 884 5030 9853  
International numbers available: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kck00eq2rD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Time</th>
<th>Minutes Allocated</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03:30 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CALL TO ORDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:31 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF AGENDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:32 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoom instructions are available on the District's website: https://spwater.org/371/Board-Meetings.  
Verbal public comment is limited to three minutes per person or five minutes per group.  
Written public comments are to be emailed to administration@spwater.org no later than 12:00 noon the date of the meeting.

03:35 PM 5 CONSENT AGENDA  
A Nevin 219th LN SE Sewer Extension - DEA Initial Acceptance Resolution - Parcel 0424069103

ACTIVE AGENDA

03:40 PM 20 A Final 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan - Resolution to Adopt and Approve for Public Distribution

04:00 PM 60 B Louis Thompson Hill Rd Sewer Project - Template for Future Sewer Extensions

REPORTS

05:00 PM 5 Attorney
05:05 PM 5 General Manager
05:10 PM 10 Commissioner

05:20 PM ADJOURN

Next Regular Meeting - Monday, March 13, 2023
Public Comments

Verbal Comments:
Limited to three minutes per person or five minutes per group.

For those attending remotely, Zoom instructions are available on the District’s website: https://spwater.org/371/Board-Meetings.

Written Public Comments:
Emailed to administration@spwater.org no later than 12:00 p.m. the date of the meeting. Note “Public Comment” and the meeting date in the Subject field of the email.
Consent Agenda
Consent Agenda

Item A
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF SAMMAMISH PLATEAU WATER AND SEWER DISTRICT, KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON, AUTHORIZING AND APPROVING THE APPLICATION FOR THE DEVELOPER EXTENSION AGREEMENT FOR THE

NEVIN 219TH LN SE SEWER EXTENSION

WHEREAS, Ruth and Randy Nevin have submitted an application to enter into a Developer Extension Agreement for service to a development known as

NEVIN 219TH LN SE SEWER EXTENSION; and

WHEREAS, said party has submitted to the District Preliminary/Certificate Fees of

WATER $0.00          SEWER $6,017.50

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Commissioners of Sammamish Plateau Water & Sewer District, King County, Washington, as follows:

1. The District hereby approves the application and authorizes the execution of the Developer Extension Agreement referenced above.

2. The balance of the Preliminary/Certificate fees not yet paid as required by District resolution will be due no later than when the District General Manager approves by signature the design for construction of the water and/or sewer facilities associated with this Developer Extension Agreement, and;

3. If there is no construction of any water and/or sewer facilities for the project, the balance of the Preliminary/Certificate fees not yet paid as required by District resolution will be due before the installation of water meters or side sewers and/or before the District’s final Acceptance of the Developer Extension Agreement, whichever is sooner.
ADOPTED by the Board of Commissioners of Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District, King County, Washington, at a regular open public meeting held on the 6th day of March 2023.

**Individual Commissioner's Vote on this Resolution:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lloyd Warren, President and Commissioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ryika Hooshangi, Vice President and Commissioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mary Shustov, Secretary and Commissioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tom Harman, Commissioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nav Otal, Commissioner
EXHIBIT A

REAL PROPERTY DEPICTION
NEVIN 219TH LN SE SEWER EXTENSION
TAX PARCEL 0424069103

REAL PROPERTY LOCATION

Pine Lake
Active Agenda
Active Agenda
Item A

Final 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan – Resolution to Adopt and Approve for Public Distribution
INTRODUCTION:
The District’s 2022 Wastewater (Sewer) Comprehensive Plan (Plan) was approved for distribution and comment in September 2022. The District received comments from King County, City of Sammamish, Department of Ecology and members of the public. Those comments and the responses and modifications to the Plan based on those comments are attached.

Today’s meeting is to, by resolution, adopt the 2022 Final Wastewater Comprehensive Plan and approve the Plan for public distribution, and to direct District staff to submit the Final Plan to King County, City of Sammamish, City of Issaquah and the Department of Ecology for their final approval.

POLICY:
Res. No. 5137 – 9/26/2022: Adopting the 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan
Washington State Department of Ecology requirements for Plan updates
King County requires plan updates every 6 years, but requests for extensions will be considered.

BACKGROUND:
This presentation to the Board for update of the Wastewater Comprehensive Plan will provide an overview of comments received following adoption of the Plan for public distribution in September 2022.

This is the second of three approval steps to final adoption of the 2022 Plan.
1. For the first approval step, the Board adopted the 2022 Plan and approved it for public distribution on September 26, 2022.
   - The 2022 Plan was distributed to the following:
     o Department of Ecology
     o King County Utilities Technical Review Committee (UTRC)
     o King County Wastewater Treatment Division (KCWTD)
     o Cities of Sammamish and Issaquah
     o Adjacent and nearby sewer agencies – Northeast Sammamish, Redmond
     o Puget Sound Regional Council
     o Posted on the District’s website
   - A public meeting was held on November 14, 2022.
   - Comments on the 2022 Plan were accepted until December 30, 2022.

2. Today’s Action: Board adopts the proposed 2022 Final Plan for submittal to King County Council, Department of Ecology, and Cities for their approvals.
   - Staff has reviewed the comments received, and has updated and modified the 2022 Plan to the 2022 Final Plan for Board consideration and adoption.
   - The comments and responses are included as Appendix R to the 2022 Final Plan.
3. Following approval by the required agencies, the Board will adopt the Complete Final 2022 Plan with any final revisions.
   - If there are any additional comments from the agencies on the proposed Complete Final 2022 Plan, the final edits will be provided to the Board prior to request for the 3rd and Final adoption.

The 2022 Plan as adopted on September 26, 2022 is available on the District’s website. The comments and proposed changes to Plan in response to those comments is provided as Appendix R, as an attachment to this memo.

The 2002 Final Plan, including the updates as proposed, has been provided to the Board under separate cover.

After the 2022 Final Plan is adopted by the Board, the updated version will be added to the District’s website.

**BUDGET STATUS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTANT</th>
<th>Overall Budget</th>
<th>Spent to date 9/2022</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;O Hydraulic Model Update</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td>$17,802.94</td>
<td>$5,197.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray &amp; Osborne, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main:</td>
<td>$159,430.00</td>
<td>$155,192.93</td>
<td>$4,237.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt. Reserve:</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main:</td>
<td>$28,270.00</td>
<td>$23,951.25</td>
<td>$4,318.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt. LS Study:</td>
<td>$4,980.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Consultant Estimates</strong></td>
<td><strong>$230,680.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$196,947.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,752.88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
The Sewer Comprehensive Plan is funded through Sewer General Facility Charges.

**OPTIONS:**

Plan Final Adoption:
1. Adopt the 2022 Final Wastewater Comprehensive Plan Update and General Sewer Plan and approve it for public distribution and submittal for final approval to the jurisdictions and agencies.

   OR

2. Request additional modifications to the 2022 Final Plan prior to adoption.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Adopt the 2022 Final Wastewater Comprehensive Plan Update and General Sewer Plan and approve it for public distribution and submittal for final approval to the jurisdictions and agencies.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Presentation to be provided at Board meeting
- Appendix R – Public Comments and Responses
- Resolution Adopting the Final 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan and Approving for Public Distribution
SAMMAMISH PLATEAU WATER & SEWER DISTRICT
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

RESOLUTION NO. ________________

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF
SAMMAMISH PLATEAU WATER AND SEWER DISTRICT, KING
COUNTY, WASHINGTON, ADOPTING THE FINAL 2022
WASTEWATER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND APPROVING THE
PLAN FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RCW
57.16.010(7), RCW 90.48.110 AND WAC 173-240-050.

WHEREAS, the Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District ("District") is a
municipal corporation providing water and sewer utility services pursuant to Title 57
RCW; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 57.16.010 authorizes the District to adopt a general
comprehensive wastewater system plan and the District has previously done so by the
adoption of the 2013 Comprehensive Wastewater Plan on August 10, 2015 by
Resolution No. 4518; and

WHEREAS, the District Board of Commissioners ("Board") adopted an updated
and revised 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan and Appendices dated September
2022 ("the 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan") by Resolution No. 5317 on
September 26, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan was submitted to the
legislative authorities of King County, City of Sammamish, and City of Issaquah and to
appropriate state agencies, including the Washington State Department of Ecology, for
review and comment by those jurisdictions and agencies; and

WHEREAS, comments were received on the 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive
Plan which have been considered by the District and incorporated into the 2022
Wastewater Comprehensive Plan, and the Board now deems it desirable to adopt an
updated and revised Wastewater Comprehensive Plan dated February 2023 ("the Final
2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan") which is incorporated herein in full by this
reference; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the proposed Final 2022 Wastewater
Comprehensive Plan which was prepared for the District by Gray & Osborne, Inc.
consulting engineers, with input from Financial Services Consulting Group and District
staff; and

WHEREAS, the District acknowledges that, pursuant to RCW 57.16.010, the
Washington State Department of Ecology, King County, City of Sammamish and City of
Issaquah must approve the Final 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, based on a SEPA checklist prepared regarding the proposed
adoption of the 2022 Plan as a non-project action, a SEPA Determination of Non-
Significance ("DNS") was issued by John Krauss, District Manager and District

Resolution No. ________________
Responsible SEPA Official, on September 21, 2022, in conformance with the District’s SEPA Code Section 8.05.010; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Commissioners of Sammamish Plateau Water & Sewer District, King County, Washington, as follows:

1. The Final 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan is hereby approved and adopted as the District’s comprehensive wastewater system plan effective the date set forth below, and is further approved for public distribution in accordance with WAC 173-240-050.

2. Pursuant to RCW 57.16.010(7) and RCW 90.48.110, District Staff are hereby authorized and directed to submit the Final 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan to all required jurisdictions and agencies, including the legislative authorities of King County, Sammamish and Issaquah and to appropriate state agencies, including the Washington State Department of Ecology, as provided and required by law.

ADOPTED by the Board of Commissioners of Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District, King County, Washington, at a regular open public meeting held on the 6th day of March 2023.

Individual Commissioner's Vote on this Resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lloyd Warren, President and Commissioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ryika Hooshangi, Vice President and Commissioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mary Shustov, Secretary and Commissioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tom Harman, Commissioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Abstained:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nav Otal, Commissioner
APPENDIX R

STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
SAMMAMISH PLATEAU WATER & SEWER DISTRICT
2022 WASTEWATER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

FORMAT:
Agency Comment numbered
KCWTD#: King County Wastewater Treatment Division comments
KCUWTRC#: King County Utility Technical Review Committee comments
SAM#: City of Sammamish comments
ISS#: City of Issaquah comments
NESSWD#: Northeast Sammamish Sewer & Water District comment
DOE#: Department of Ecology comments
NONAGENCY#: Comments received from individuals not associated with an agency.

Black-italicized text: District response to agency comment, immediately following the comment.
Blue Text: Location of modifications to Plan text
Blue Italicized Text: Changes to text underlined = additions, strikethrough = deletions

KING COUNTY WASTEWATER TREATMENT DIVISION
(Letter and comments dated December 30, 2022)

KCWTD1: E-3, Regional services paragraph 1: The County’s Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) planning for the North diversion (Sammamish Plateau Diversion or SPD) occurred in the late 1990’s and was identified as a part of a phased preferred alternative suite of projects summarized in a WTD Conveyance System Improvement (CSI) Program report in October of 2003.

Response: The early 1990’s reference in ES Regional Services, paragraph 1 is associated with the District Lakefront System design. Recognition of the KCWTD 2003 CSI Program Report is included through edits in response to Comment KCWTD8.

Change Location: See KCWTD8.

KCWTD2: 1.4.3.1., Pg 1-11: King County’s Conveyance System Improvement Program – 2017 Program Update resulted in a prioritized list of projects to improve capacity in the separated portion of the regional wastewater treatment system. WTD has acknowledged the SPD project was inadvertently omitted from the 2017 update report. Design for this project is funded in the 2023-24 WTD capital budget.

Response: That the omission from the 2017 CSI was apparently inadvertent will be noted.

Change Location: Section 1.4.3.1 King County, 3rd Section KC CSI Program – 2017 Program Update: 2nd paragraph.

Change: In the 2007 CSI, the Sammamish Plateau Diversion (aka the “North Diversion”) was identified as one of seven High Priority projects. At least 5 of the 7 High Priority projects from the 2007 CSI Program had a Capital Project in Progress noted in the 2015 Regional Needs Assessment report. The 2017 CSI includes a project named Sammamish Plateau Diversion Phase 2, identified as Low Priority. The original Sammamish Plateau Diversion, now Sammamish
Plateau Diversion Phase 1, is not included in the 2017 CSI Program as it was inadvertently omitted.

KCWTD3: 1.8.1, Pg 1-19: Suggest acknowledging the County funded the consultant costs and District staff time to manage the consultant contract under the 2019 letter agreement referenced in paragraph two.

Response: The funding of the consultant to develop the 2021 Analysis is acknowledged. See KCWTD4 change.

KCWTD4: 1.8.1, Pg 1-19: Suggest deleting the word “proposing” and inserting “funding 50% of” in the following, “Based on findings in the 2021 Analysis, the County is proposing to partially fund certain interim improvements, also discussed further in Chapter 4.”

Response: When this section was originally written the agreement, to fund approximately 50% of certain interim improvements was only proposed. The agreement to fund a portion of the interim improvements is now referenced.

Change Location: Section 1.8.1 Regional Wastewater System, Paragraph 3

Change: ... The County and District signed a letter agreement in July 2019 that outlined the scope of a study that would identify the necessary improvements to the District’s system related to the deferral of the SPD Phase 1 project. This study, the North Diversion Phase 1 Analysis (“2021 Analysis”) with funding provided by King County, is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4. Based on findings in the 2021 Analysis, the County has agreed is proposing to partially fund approximately 50 percent of certain interim improvements, also discussed further in Chapter 4.

KCWTD5: 4.4.1, Pg 4-9: Suggest including who published the “Rate Comparison and Benchmarking Analysis report published [by XXX] in September 2016...”

Response: The 2016 Rate Comparison and Benchmarking Analysis report by FCS Group was developed for Sammamish Plateau Water with Cascade Water Alliance.

Change Location: Section 4.4.1 Sammamish Plateau Diversion (Northern Diversion), Paragraph 1

Change: ... A Rate Comparison and Benchmarking Analysis report published by FCS Group in September 2016, found that the District is currently underserved from a regional perspective. ...

KCWTD6: Table 4-1, Pg 4-10: Suggest adding a new line for 2017-2022 to identify the County’s regional capacity improvements made [Sunset and Healthfield Pump stations and force main upgrades] to the south of Sammamish Plateau Water.

Response: Table 4-1 Sammamish Plateau Diversion Key Events, is specifically associated with the Northern Diversion. The Sunset and Heathfield Pump Stations are associated with the southern connection.

Change Location: No change.
KCWTD7: Table 4-1, Pg 4-10: Refers to “King County WTD informed the District that SPD Phase 1 had been deferred and delayed. Possibly until 2050-2070.” The timeframe of 2050-2070 refers to Phase 2.

Response: At the time the deferral and delay information was transmitted to the District, no specific timeframe was provided to the District from KCWTD for SPD Phase 1. The CSI 2017 Program Update (CSI 2017) report formed the basis of the District’s understanding of proposed timing of King County projects. The CSI 2017 report Table 4-1 identified SPD Phase 2 with an Estimated Timeframe for Project Completion of 2050-2070. The location of SPD Phase 2 shown on figures in the CSI 2017 report includes the location of the SPD Phase 1 project. Since the SPD Phase 1 project was omitted from the 2017 CSI report, the logical conclusion by the District at that time was that the SPD Phase 1 project was 2050-2070.

Change Location: No change.

KCWTD8: Table 4-1, Pg 4-10: Suggest adding row to the table for identification of the SPD projects in 2003 WTD CSI program documents

Response: The CSI Project – South Sammamish Basin – Phase 2 Subregional Planning Reports, dated October 2003, is a series of documents for providing an evaluation of alternatives for wastewater improvement projects to provide service to the South Sammamish Basin. The reports included a focus on forecasted capacity limitations in the King County system, and reducing flow in the Issaquah Interceptor Section 1 and downstream facilities. The reports did not address the potential constraints within the local component agency facilities.

The Working Alternative developed through the reports included the Sammamish Plateau Diversion north, located between Inglewood Hill Road and the NE Sammamish Interceptor. Based on Figure ES-1 Working Alternative System Capacity: Issaquah Interceptor Section 1 the apparent timeline for use of the Sammamish Plateau Diversion north was between 2010 and 2020.

This report will be included in Table 4-10 so the table is more comprehensive in describing King County considerations associated with the Sammamish Plateau Diversion.

Change Location: Table 4-1 Sammamish Plateau Diversion: Key Events, added row dated 2003.

Change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sammamish Plateau Diversion: Key Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CSI Project – South Sammamish Basin – Phase 2 Subregional Planning Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included Sammamish Plateau Diversion north of Inglewood Hill Road as part of the proposed Working Alternative, estimated use between 2010 and 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KCWTD9: 4.4.1, Pg 4-11: Suggest adding "conceptual" before the word “project” in the following, “Based on capacity issues, the District supported the KCWTD led implementation of the SPD Phase 1 project, identified in the 2007 CSI as a high priority.”

Response: Proposed edits to paragraph accepted. See KCWTD10 change.
KCWTD10: 4.4.1, Pg 4-11: Suggest deleting “on the” or “of the” in the following, “...while continuing to evaluate the flows against the progress on the of the SPD Phase 1 project.”

Response: Proposed edits to paragraph accepted.

Change Location: Section 4.4.1 Sammamish Plateau Diversion (Northern Diversion), Paragraph 5

Change: Based on capacity issues, the District supported the KCWTD led implementation of the SPD Phase 1 conceptual project, identified in the 2007 CSI as a high priority. ... The rationale was to defer and potentially not require those projects with very large expenses, while continuing to evaluate the flows against the progress on the of the SPD Phase 1 project.

KCWTD11: 4.4.1, Pg 4-11: Is there a word(s) missing from the following, “The delay/deferral resulted in KCWTD not meeting its obligations to extend regional conveyance and added capacity to the District consistent with regional plans.”?

Response: The sentence appears to be accurate, but is edited to further clarify.

Change Location: Section 4.4.1 Sammamish Plateau Diversion (Northern Diversion), Paragraph 6

Change: In 2018, in conjunction with completion of the 2017 CSI, KCWTD informed the District that the SPD project had been changed to a low priority with installation of the SPD project now indefinitely delayed, potentially until 2050-2070. The delay/deferral of the SPD project resulted in KCWTD not meeting its obligations to extend regional conveyance and added capacity to the District consistent with regional plans. ...

KCWTD12: 6.2.2, Pg 6-3: Could include reference to King County municipal code 28.86.060.

“Eligibility of local facilities for regional ownership is guided by Conveyance Policy CP-5 (28.86.060), which includes three criteria that must be met.”

Response: The requested edit and citation has been added. See KCWTD13 change.

KCWTD13: 6.2.2, Pg 6-3: Suggested edit to the following, “King County planning over the years has also identified sewage conveyance facilities expected to be eligible to be part of the King County system, including facilities built by King County and those originally built by other sewer service providers.”

Response: The requested edit and citation has been added.

Change Location: Section 6.2.2 King County Wastewater Conveyance, paragraph 4

Change: King County planning over the years has also identified sewage conveyance facilities expected to be eligible to be part of the King County system, including facilities built by King County and those originally built by other sewer service providers. Eligibility of local facilities for regional ownership is guided by King County Code 28.86.060 Conveyance Policies (CP), CP-5, which includes three criteria that must be met: 1) serving a natural drainage area of greater than one-thousand acres; 2) conformance to King County’s comprehensive water pollution abatement plan and Regional Wastewater Service Plan; and 3) meeting a financial feasibility threshold governing limitations of the County’s financial contribution. The definition of facilities to be
considered part of the “Metropolitan Sewerage System” is also included in the Agreement for Sewage Disposal dated August 16, 1973 between KCWTD and the District, as follows: ...

KCWTD14: 6.2.2.1.1, Pg 6-4: Suggest deleting “to be” and inserting “as” before “reflected” in the following, “The District expects and is reliant on KCWTD to meet their obligations, to be reflected in the 2023-2024 budget appropriation...”

Response: The edit has been made to reflect the recent adoption of the King County 2023-2024 budget including funding for design of Sammamish Plateau Diversion Phase 1.

Change Location: Section 6.2.2.1 Policies Regarding King County Wastewater Treatment Division (KCWTD) – Conveyance Facilities, Sub-Section 6.2.2.1.1
Change: The District expects and is reliant on KCWTD to meet their obligations, as to be reflected in the 2023-2024 budget appropriation, to serve in accordance with their plans and construct the Sammamish Plateau Diversion project...

KCWTD15: 6.2.2.1.2: Suggest adding "Subject to a negotiated agreement" before "The District expects...”

Response: Language has been added to clarify the requirement for a negotiated agreement.

Change Location: Section 6.2.2.1 Policies Regarding King County Wastewater Treatment Division (KCWTD) – Conveyance Facilities, Sub-Section 6.2.2.1.2
Change: The District expects KCWTD to take ownership of certain District assets that meet King County ownership criteria as described in the Regional Wastewater Supply Plan (RWSP) CP-5, and also in Section 1. b) of the Agreement for Sewage Disposal dated August 16, 1973 between KCWTD and the District. The ownership will be subject to a negotiated agreement. An option to KCWTD ownership may be for the District to own and maintain the facilities under contract to KCWTD.

KING COUNTY UTRC
(Letter and comments dated December 28, 2022)

KCUTRC1: Figures 1-1, 1-5, 1-6, and others: The “existing district sewer service boundary” seems to extend beyond the “future sewer service boundary.” Either the district will be shrinking its sewer service boundary to the UGA boundary, or the colors are possibly inverted, or some error is at work. Please clarify.

Response: The boundary that is shown as outside the current UGA is the existing sewer service boundary. The area was annexed for sewer service before creation of the UGA. The District does not intend to provide sewer service to the area outside of the boundary, unless specifically authorized by King County. The actions to actually de-annex or withdraw the territory for sewer service may eventually be undertaken, but are not currently a priority project.

Change Location: No Change
**KCUTRC2:** Figures 1-1, 1-5, 1-6, and others: Request that the Urban Growth Area boundary be shown on all maps. Policies for sewer service provision within the UGA are much more permissive than outside of that boundary. Although it may also be the case that the future sewer service area boundary is congruent with the UGA; if so, please clarify.

**Response:** The UGA boundary has been added to Figures 1-1, 1-5 and 1-6. A note has been included in the legend indicating that the UGA may not show if it is congruent with the Existing or Future Sewer Service Boundary.

**Change Location:** Figures 1-1, 1-5 and 1-6.

**Change:** Add UGA Boundary and Legend Note: UGA may not show if it is congruent with the Future Sewer Service Boundary.

**KCUTRC3:** Figure 1-6: Union Hill Water Association is notably absent from this map. Is this just sewer providers? Or all utility providers?

**Response:** Figure 1-6 only shows sewer purveyors. Manage the Title to note that it is Sewer.

**Change Location:** Figure 1-6 Figure Title

**Change:** ADJACENT SEWER PURVEYORS

**KCUTRC4:** In 2021, the District approved a moratorium on new sewer connections. The SPW Board, at that time, noted that it could take 1-3 years to make the necessary improvements to end the moratorium. Does this plan include all necessary projects, funding, and timelines to end that situation and prevent its recurrence?

**Response:** The Immediate Improvements were completed in December 2022. The Interim Improvements are underway and have been funded. As of January 2023 one of the projects is under construction, a second project has been bid and awarded, and the third project is in permitting. (See updated Section 4.4.3.1 and 4.4.3.2)

The permanent solution, the Sammamish Plateau Diversion Phase 1, is a King County project. The funding for design is included in the King County budget proposed for adoption at this time. The budget for construction has not been included in a King County budget to our knowledge, at this time, although the project is proposed for construction by 2030. This is not under the District’s control.

**Change Location:** No change.

**KCUTRC5:** Does the mapping reflect the de-annexation of the service areas which were transferred to the City of Issaquah in 2022?

**Response:** All maps were reviewed and updated as necessary to reflect the recently completed Issaquah Highlands Sewer De-Annexations and Issaquah Juniper Sewer Annexation activities for the sewer service boundaries, and the Issaquah Highlands Water De-Annexation, M-Brook Farm Water Annexation and Siler Ridge Water Annexation to the existing District Corporate Boundary.
The Future Sewer Service Boundary did reflect the recently completed annexations and de-annexations, and did not need to be modified. However, the Existing District Sewer Service Boundary and District Corporate Boundary do need to be updated to reflect completion of the boundary changes.

**Change Location:** Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-5, 1-6

**Change:** Updated the following boundaries, if included on the figure:
- Existing District Sewer Service Boundary
- District Corporate Boundary

**KCUTRC6:** Page 4-27 "de-factor" should be "de facto"

**Response:** Noted typo, to be corrected.

**Change Location:** Section 4.4.4 Transfer of Certain District Assets to King County Wastewater Treatment Division, Paragraph 7, 4th main bullet (Page 4-27).

**Change:** District has funded and installed facilities have acted as de-facto regional facilities to carry flows that were identified and would normally be carried by regional facilities in both the north and south end of the District, in lieu of regional infrastructure that would meet the County’s 1000 acre standard.

**KCUTRC7:** On Page 6-27, the Plan includes a 200-foot threshold for sewer connections for plats and short plats, which is stricter than the UTRC’s commonly accepted standard of 200 feet per connection.

**Response:** Per the discussion with UTRC members, the 200-foot threshold would be applied for projects of 1 Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU). Projects including more than 1 ERU may be required to extend sewer for longer distances, such as 2 x 200 feet = 400 feet for 2 ERUs, but are considered on a case-by-case basis.

On this basis, if a project were closer the 200 feet to a sewer, they would be required to connect to the sewer. The King County Code was also further reviewed, specifically KCC 13.24.035 and KCC 13.24.136.

**KCC 13.24.035 Public Sewer Service**

A. All development within the UGA shall be served by public sewer service except on-site sewage systems may be allowed temporarily in some parts of the urban growth area in accordance with KCC 13.24.136

**KCC 13.24.136 On-site Sewage Treatment and Disposal Systems in the Urban Growth Area.** All new development within the Urban Growth Area shall be served by an adequate public or private sewage disposal system, .... On-site sewage treatment and disposal systems shall be permitted in the Urban Growth Area only for single-family residences or for short subdivisions only on an interim basis and only as follows:

A review of 13.24.136 A for individual lots and 13.24.136 B for short subdivisions indicates that either the Local Services Permitting Division or the Utility Technical Review Committee, respectively, may authorize the interim use of on-site sewage systems if the requirement for public sewer service would deny reasonable use of the property/project. The potential for interim septic system use is not allowed for plats.
Further information on connection requirements is found in the King County Board of Health Title 13 – On-Site Sewage.

**KCBOH 13.04.050 Connection to Public Sewer**

A review of KCBOH 13.04.050 Section A indicates property in the UGA undertaking new construction, short subdivision or subdivision shall connect to public sewer considering the codes of the land use jurisdiction, including KCC 13.24.136 for unincorporated King County. Section B identifies situations when existing development may be required to connect to sewer, and is for properties within 200 feet of a public sewer.

The District review of the King County and King County Board of Health codes supports the information provided in Table 6-3 – Land Use Jurisdiction Requirements for Connection to Sewer and District Requirements under Unincorporated King County Urban Area.

**Change Location: No change**

**CITY OF SAMMAMISH**

City of Sammamish Comments SAM1 through SAM11 are from the Department of Community Development (Letter dated 12/15/2022)

City of Sammamish Comments SAM12 through SAM19 are from the City Engineer (Email dated 12/27/2022)

**SAM1:** Population forecasting and rate of growth used in the Plan is modeled on ‘rate of development’ not the King County Countywide Planning Policy (“CPP”) growth targets. This is an important distinction as the method of forecasting growth and population in the Plan is different than that used in the City’s Comprehensive Plan (“Comp Plan”). The City’s understanding is that the method being used by the District’s consultant is considered as ‘best practice’ for wastewater system planning efforts of this type. The District’s methodology is focused on the ‘future rate of development’ and ‘zoned capacity’, whereas the City’s method is focused on ‘growth target planning’ through regional, County, and local (caucus) efforts. These are fundamentally different approaches. However, it should be noted that the City’s assessed ‘zoned capacity’ is different than the District’s assessed ‘zoned capacity’. An additional point of consideration and explanation for different data points is that the development of the Plan began in 2019, before current CPP growth targets were established. **We suggest adding a section to the Plan that describes the dates of origin of the data and the process used. We also suggest adding a statement that acknowledges that the data may differ from other agency planning documents due to date of study, methodology, and purpose of the planning document.**

**Response:** District review of Section 2.4, Population and Growth Forecasting, revealed that the section was disjointed and did not include a full explanation of the subject. On this basis, the section was reorganized and some language added and/or edited to clarify the method used in the growth forecast. The forecast uses existing sewer customer data from the end of 2019 as a basis, and provides information for 6-Year, 10-Year and 20-Year, and Zoning Capacity projections.

The purpose of the District’s growth forecast is to provide a basis for analysis of the system under existing and future conditions (See Chapter 3). This analysis then provides the basis for
capital improvement program (See Chapter 7) in both facility identification and estimated schedule.

While the City uses growth target planning, one of the District’s goals is to ensure that infrastructure will be available when the growth occurs. Facility planning needs to consider the level of service anticipated at zoning capacity, and cannot always be built incrementally.

Change Location: Section 2.4 Population and Growth Forecasting
Change: Due to the reorganization noted above, there are significant changes. The changes are described in the following, but it may be easier to simply read the revised Section 2.4.

Change Location: Section 2.4 Population and Growth Forecasting, Introductory Paragraphs
Change: To evaluate the District’s sewer system and existing facilities, and determine requirements for future facilities, the existing and projected sewered population is estimated and used to forecast future sewerage flows. The growth forecasting is completed early in the comprehensive Plan development, as it forms the basis for analysis, and subsequent development of capital projects required to address identified deficiencies and future growth related infrastructure requirements. The customer information from the end of 2019 forms the basis for population and growth forecasts.

Irrigation connections are not included in the analysis. District customers with dedicated irrigation connections are assumed to also have domestic water connections. Therefore, including the irrigation connections for comparing water and sewer connections would be redundant and misrepresentative.

Change Location: Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates, addition of Introductory Paragraph and Sub-Sections 2.4.2.1 Developer Extension Agreements and 2.4.2.2 Town Center.
Change:

Growth rates in the Plan are compiled from three areas; 1) currently proposed developments, 2) Sammamish Town Center assumptions, and 3) conversion of existing homes from septic to sewer service. These growth rates are applied to the near-term 6 year period (2019-2025), 10-year and 20-year projections (2030 and 2040), and long-term period designated as Zoning Capacity. Each of the three elements is described briefly in the following, followed by a description of how they are applied to the growth projections. It is noted that these are all assumption based, and the actual growth rate will differ.

2.4.2.1 Developer Extension Agreements:
Currently proposed developments are associated with Developer Extension Agreements (DEA) between the District and developers/property owners. DEAs are used for single lots that require the extension of water and/or sewer facilities, short plats, plats and all non-residential developments. Each DEA includes an estimate of Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs) for that particular development, based on the size of the water meters requested. The time to complete work under a DEA varies, but most are completed within 3 to 5 years. DEAs include a financial commitment and are considered to have a high likelihood of completion, and as such, they form a good basis for estimation of near term growth.

2.4.2.2 Town Center
Town Center assumptions include a timeframe during which the Town Center development will occur. An estimate of the number of ERUs that will be represented by the Town Center has been developed based on the number of residential units and commercial space allowed under the Town Center Plan. The assumptions include full use of incentives and transfer of development rights. It is recognized that these are estimates, and the Town Center Plan itself may be adjusted as it moves forward.

The residential and commercial ERUs already built are tracked, along with the proposed ERUs included in current DEAs. These built and DEA ERUs are subtracted from the total estimated Town Center ERUs to define the ERUs remaining for the Town Center development. To project the timing of these remaining ERUs, the Town Center development is assumed to be completed by 2035.

Change Location: Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates, addition of Sub-Sections 2.4.2.3 Septic to Sewer Conversions. This new Sub-Section is based on prior Section 2.4.4 Unsewered Connections, Paragraph 1, and portions of Section 2.4.3 Projected Sewer Customer ERUs, paragraph 1.

Change: 2.4.2.3 Septic to Sewer Conversions

(Changes shown from Paragraph 1 prior Section 2.4.4 – relocated to 2.4.2.3 Paragraph 1)

As of 2019, the District has more water customers than sewer customers. The District currently serves approximately 19,156 water connections, of which 612 are dedicated irrigation connections, and 4 are dedicated fire sprinkler connections, leaving 18,540 domestic customers. The District has 12,880 sewer connections, so there are 5,660 District water customers that are not sewer customers. Of these 5,660 water customers, 1,487 are in the sewer service area of Northeast Sammamish Sewer & Water District and 823 are in the rural area. This leaves 3,350 domestic water customers in the District’s sewer service area that use private septic systems. As noted previously, 420 of these customers have been identified as having an adjacent sewer stub available, and as such, may be easiest to provide service to in the near future.

(Changes shown from portions of paragraph 1 Section 2.4.3 Projected Sewer Customer ERUs - relocated to 2.4.2.3 Paragraph 2)

Additionally, the District has identified 420 water customers with existing sewer stubs that do not currently use septic systems have sewer service. For this Plan it is assumed that 10 percent of these customers (or 42 septic systems) will connect to the system annually throughout the 6-year planning horizon until 2025. This is close to the recent average conversion of 40 homes per year. There is additionally a large number of additional septic customers within the sewer service area that do not have an existing sewer stub. Through 2076, it is further assumed that the rate of septic conversions will increase slightly as more sewer mains are extended, making connection to the sewer available to more existing septic system users, such that the estimate used in growth projections beyond 2025 is 50 annual septic conversions. By the time of For Zoning Capacity, it is assumed that all homes there are no septic customers within the sewer service area will connect to the sewer system.

Change Location: Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates, addition of Sub-Section 2.4.2.4 Six-Year Growth Projections. This new Sub-Section is based on prior Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates, Paragraph 1, first 3 sentences.
Change: 2.4.2.4 Six-Year Growth Projections
Future growth rates within the District have been developed for the Plan using ERU projection
data provided by the District. Six-year planning data are provided by the District projections are
based on the three components described above, development projects in the planning, design,
and construction phases. The growth analysis was completed in 2020 and is based on starting
figures from the end of 2019, and utilizes Growth from DEA projects underway in early 2019. Is
distributed through the six-year period based on their status in the planning, design, and
construction phases. Six-year growth in the Town Center area is included with the Town Center
DEAs in progress and additional growth from the remaining assumed Town Center growth
applied at a linear rate between 2022 and 2035. Finally, septic conversions are included at a rate
of 42 per year.

The six-year growth rate with all factors combined is 1.5 percent. It is recognized that the Town
Center has a compressed growth rate compared to the sewer service area as a whole. In
addition, septic conversions are based on existing homes, not new development. If the Town
Center and septic conversion growth rates are removed, the underlying average annual six-year
growth rate is 0.73 percent.

Change Location: Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates, addition of Sub-Section 2.4.2.5 10-Year and 20-
Year Growth Projections. This new Sub-Section is based on prior Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates,
Paragraph 2.

Change: 2.4.2.4 10-Year and 20-Year Growth Projections
For the 10-year and 20-year projections, growth projections are determined by extrapolating the
underlying average annual growth rate of 0.73 percent per year in sewer ERUs for the entire
District during the first 6 years. The 6-year ERU growth rate for the District as a whole is
approximately 1.5 percent per year, including septic conversions. In order to ensure that the
growth rate used to determine the 10- and 20-year population truly reflects background
population growth throughout the whole District and not infill growth from septic connections or
concentrated growth in certain areas, the estimated Sammamish Town Center growth and
added septic connections are removed from the 6-year growth rate. The resulting background
growth rate used in the 10-year and 20-year projections is 0.73 percent per year. This rate is
applied to the ERU count within the District excluding planned septic conversions and Town
Center growth. The Sammamish Town Center growth and anticipated septic connections (42 per
year through 2025, then 50 per year through 2040, based on recent historical averages) are then
added back into the total average annual ERU growth count to complete the 10- and 20-year
ERU estimates.

Change Location: Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates, addition of Sub-Section 2.4.2.6 Zoning Capacity
Growth Projections. This new Sub-Section is based on prior Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates,
Paragraph 3 and Paragraph 1, sentences 4 through end of paragraph 1.

Change: 2.4.2.6 Zoning Capacity Growth Projections
The District estimates the anticipated zoning capacity population based on zoning capacity ERU
and household population estimates. Based on carrying forward the 6-year sewered population
growth rate of 0.73 percent per year, the year of zoning capacity was determined to be 2076.
Intermediate ERU estimates are determined by interpolation between 2025 estimates (i.e., 6-Year) and
Zoning Capacity estimates. The ERU zoning capacity estimate is described in Section 2.4.3.3
Zoning Capacity Projected Sewer ERUs. Domestic use estimates at zoning capacity (i.e., buildout)
are determined by the District based on zoning designations for each subbasin. Maximum developable residential densities are assumed throughout the sewer service area based on City and County zoning. Additionally, water use customers that are within the sewer service area but are currently not connected to the sewer system are assumed to connect at a consistent rate during the 20-year planning period. All septic users within the District’s sewer service area are assumed to eventually connect to the sewer system such that there are no remaining septic customers within the District’s sewer service area at the time of zoning capacity.

Change Location: Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates, addition of Sub-Section 2.4.2.7 Growth Rate Comparison. Based on prior Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates, Paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Change: 2.4.2.7 Growth Rate Comparison

PSRC
Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) growth rates are often used for planning purposes to predict future growth. PSRC current projections estimate anticipated household population for each 5-year period through 2040. Forecast Analysis Zones (FAZs) and Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) are used by PSRC to establish, model, and report forecasts of future population, households, and employment. The District’s sewer service area overlaps three FAZs and thirty-four TAZs, as shown in Figure 2-1. [Removed sentences relocated to 2.4.2.7 paragraph 3] The forecasted growth in household rates from PSRC was reviewed at the TAZ level for the District. Upon review, it appeared that these growth rates significantly underestimated known high growth areas of the District and therefore it was decided these growth rates may be too conservative. The District is aware of the rapidly densifying portion of its service area, primarily the Sammamish Town Center area, which appears not to be captured in the PSRC estimations. It should be noted however, that the PSRC estimate for people per household in each decade is used to estimate the District’s sewered population based on the number of households that the District estimates within the service area at zoning capacity.

The TAZ data provided by PSRC includes forecasts of populations within each zone from 2014 through 2040 and is included here as a comparison with the District’s estimated growth rate. These forecasts are used to develop annual growth rates for each TAZ and are presented in Table 2-5.

[Relocated sentences shown as original text] The forecasted growth in household rates from PSRC was reviewed at the TAZ level for the District. Upon review, it appeared that these growth rates significantly underestimated known high growth areas of the District and therefore it was decided these growth rates may be too conservative. The District is aware of the rapidly densifying portion of its service area, primarily the Sammamish Town Center area, which appears not to be captured in the PSRC estimations. In particular, TAZ 1956 and 1959, which include the Town Center area, have a very low and even negative growth projection. As demonstrated in Table 2-5, the PSRC estimated growth rate for 2020 through 2025 is only 0.59 percent, which does not appear to be in line with the known growth in the District. It should be noted that PSRC estimates only account for population growth, which is only a portion of the growth that the District will experience, as a substantial amount of growth in the sewered population will be due to septic conversions. It should be noted however, that the While the District is not utilizing the PSRC growth rates for growth projections, the PSRC estimate for people per household in each decade is used to estimate the District’s sewered population based on the number of households that the District estimates within the service area at zoning capacity.
Land Use Jurisdictions

Additionally, the Cities of Issaquah and Sammamish, and unincorporated King County have their own household growth rates as established in their respective comprehensive planning documents. The growth rates by jurisdiction are provided in Table 2-6. The District’s estimated growth rate was compared to projected growth in households for Sammamish and Issaquah to make sure it is in line with other agencies forecasts.

The District’s anticipated 6-year growth in sewered population (including septic connections and Sammamish Town Center growth) is 1.5 percent, which is in line with the growth rates estimated by Issaquah and Sammamish. [Removed sentences relocated to 2.4.2.7 paragraph 3] As demonstrated in Table 2-5, the PSRC estimated growth rate for 2020 through 2025 is only 0.59 percent, which does not appear to be in line with the known growth in the District. It should be noted that PSRC estimates only account for population growth, which is only a portion of the growth that the District will experience, as a substantial amount of growth in the sewer population will be due to septic conversions.

Change Location: Section 2.4.3 Projected Sewer Customer ERUs, Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 are split into 3 Sub-Sections to describe the 6-Year, 10-Year and 20-Year, and Zoning Capacity Projected Sewer ERUs. There is significant additional language and edits to clarify the different projections. Plus, addition of paragraph 2 under 2.4.3.3 relocated from Section 2.4.4 paragraph 4.

Change:

2.4.3.1 6-Year Projected Sewer ERUs

The District’s projected sewer ERUs (based on each sewer customer’s water meter size) are provided by the District, including growth projections for the next 6 years (through 2025), as included in Table 2-7. The 2020-2025 sewer customer projections are based on developments proposed with Developer Extension Agreements. [Removed sentences relocated to 2.4.2.3 paragraph 3] Additionally, the District has identified 420 water customers with existing sewer stubs that do not currently have sewer service. It is assumed that 10 percent of these customers (or 42 septic systems) will connect to the system annually throughout the 6-year planning horizon until 2025. There is additionally a large number of additional septic customers within the sewer service area that do not have an existing sewer stub. Through 2076, it is assumed that the rate of septic conversions will increase slightly such that 50 septic conversions will connect to the system annually. By the time of Zoning Capacity, it is assumed that there are no septic customers within the sewer service area. The Sewer ERU Projections including growth for the next 6 years (through 2025) are included in Table 2-7.

Annual sewer ERU projections for the near-term (2025) are provided by the District. Parcels that are currently unsewered within the District’s sewer service area and that do not have a dry-side sewer currently installed are not included in the District’s Developer Extension Agreement based growth projections shown in Table 2-7. Instead, these parcels are shown as septic conversions in Table 2-7. Many parcels that currently have an adjacent service stub are assumed to connect to the system in the near term (next 6 years) at a rate of 42 per year, based on recent septic conversion rates within the District.

2.4.3.2 10-Year and 20-Year Projected Sewer ERUs

Projections for the 10- and 20-year planning periods (i.e., 2030 and 2040) are estimated using linear interpolation based on an assumed zoning capacity year of 2076 by extending the underlying average annual growth of 0.73 percent developed from the 6-Year Growth Rate. Town Center growth is then added to the underlying growth. The Town Center growth beyond
2025 is added at a rate of approximately 105 ERUs per year until 2035. Septic customers converting to sewer are assumed to connect at a consistent rate of 50 per year from 2025 to 2040, adding to the 10-Year and 20-Year projections.

2.4.3.3 Zoning Capacity Projected Sewer ERUs
Zoning capacity ERU projections are estimated based on a zoning capacity analysis of buildable land within Issaquah, Sammamish, and King County. The analysis considered property information for all tax parcels service area. Each parcel’s zoning and area was used to calculate each property’s theoretical maximum development potential based on its land use jurisdiction zoning. This maximum level was then refined, or modified, using specific property information such as: existing development of the site, active proposed development projects, and property characteristics including general topography, sensitive areas as well as other individual property features that would impact use of the property. Additional jurisdiction-based factors were applied, such as the City of Sammamish use of net-area density versus gross-area density calculations used by the City of Issaquah and King County, provided by the District. Unsewered parcels within the District’s service area that are not added in the first 6 years of growth as described earlier are added at a rate of 50 per year through 2040. Any currently unsewered parcels are assumed to be connected to the system by the time of zoning capacity. Further discussion of unsewered parcels is provided in Section 2.4.4.

[Relocated from Section 2.4.4 Paragraph 4, second sentence.] The District is assumed estimated to reach zoning capacity in 2076, based on an estimated population growth of 0.73 percent per year starting in 2025 plus additional septic conversions and growth within the Sammamish Town Center.

Change Location: Section 2.4.4 – Removed
Change: Paragraph 1 – Moved to Sub-Section 2.4.2.3 Septic to Sewer Conversions
Paragraph 2 – Deleted as repetitive to language in Section 2.4.2.3 transferred from Section 2.4.3 Projected Sewer Customer ERUs, paragraph 1.
Paragraph 3 – Moved to Section 2.4 – Population and Growth Forecasting, introductory paragraph 2
Paragraph 4 – First sentence retained as introduction to Figure 2-2. Second sentence relocated to Sub-Section 2.4.3.3 Zoning Capacity Projected Sewer ERUs.

SAM2: The draft Plan in section 2.4.2 mentions City zoning yet there does not seem to be any analysis regarding current City zoned capacity and instead relies wholly on PSRC FAZ and TAZ data and (potentially) outdated zoning capacity information. The draft Plan does not also seem to consider the recent UGCS (Buildable Lands) report published by King County GMPC in June of 2021 which includes great detail about the City’s land capacity. However, this may not be important or relevant as the City’s understanding is that the method being used by the District’s consultant is considered as ‘best practice’ for wastewater system planning efforts of this type. Further, the development of the Plan began in 2019, before current UGCS documentation was published.
For District reference, the City’s current zoned capacity, including consideration of pipeline units, and including incentive-based density bonuses and transfer of development rights in the Town Center, is 3,158 residential units. This number is based on results of the recent UGCS process conjoined with the balance of units planned for in the Town Center under the Town Center FEIS.

This equates to 1,268 units in the R-zones,
606 units in the non-Town Center commercial zones, and
1,284 units (remaining under the 2,000 FEIS unit cap) in the Town Center.
This number is subject to revision if changes to land use and zoning are made with the 2044
Comp Plan and if a supplemental EIS is done related to the Town Center.

Response: The District’s data for population and growth was developed based on 2019 end of year
information, prior to the recent Buildable Land’s Report. The basis of the District’s
development forecast is now included early in the discussion, in Section 2.4 Introductory
paragraphs. The PSRC TAZ data is provided for comparison to the District’s data, as now
clarified by new Sub-Section 2.4.2.7. Growth Rate Comparison.

Change Location: Section 2.4.2 – See changes described under SAM1

SAM3: There is no mention or consideration of the Town Center Plan and the Town Center
FEIS 2,000 residential unit and 400,000 sf commercial ‘cap’ and the remaining residential and
commercial development that could occur before the cap is reached. This may not be relevant when
forecasting rate of growth however this does present a current limit for the City’s Town Center. These
numbers are subject to revision if changes to Town Center zoning controls are made with the 2044
Comp Plan and if a supplemental EIS is done related to the Town Center.

Response: Information on the basis of inclusion of the Town Center in growth projections has been
added. This is now included in Section 2.4.2 Growth Rates introductory paragraph, and Sub-
Section 2.4.2.2 Town Center.

Change Location: Section 2.4.2 and Sub-Section 2.4.2.2 – See changes described under SAM1

SAM4: The source of the Near-Term Housing Growth Rate referenced in Table 2-6 is not
provided. The paragraph preceding Table 2-6 identifies that Sammamish has its ‘own household growth
rate’ however there is no reference provided. Suggest adding section and/or page number.

Response: Source references are now provided as footnotes to Table 2-6.

Change Location: Table 2-6 New-Term Housing Growth Rates by Jurisdiction

Change: Footnotes on source of data added.

TABLE 2-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>6-Year Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Issaquah[1]</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sammamish[2]</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated King County[3]</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Source: 1995 City of Issaquah Comprehensive Plan, Amended in 2019
2. Source: 2015 City of Sammamish East King County Housing Analysis
SAM5: The City’s ‘people per household’ ("PPH") was reported by King County in 2020 as 3.04 using 2019 OFM data which is different from the 2.79/2.77 used as an assumption in the draft Plan at 2.4.1. However, this may not be important or relevant as the City’s understanding is that the method being used by the District’s consultant is considered as ‘best practice’ for wastewater system planning efforts of this type and the number used is the regional PPH number.

**Response:** The District does use a number that is an average of PPH over the primarily urban portion of the district. This average also included some rural area south and west of SR 202, as the figure is used for both water and sewer service.

**Change Location:** No Change

SAM6: The zoning map at Figure 1-12 does not match the City’s current Zoning Map and the Town Center zones appear to be converted to either Neighborhood Business or R-1 (suggest using better more distinguishable color choices). We are not sure what the plan considers as Neighborhood Business zoning is and it appears to hold very different assumptions than Town Center Zoning in the uses allowed and the number of units that can be achieved. Suggest updating to the City’s current zoning map.

**Response:** The map will be updated to show the current City Zoning. The data development did use the current City Zoning. The map was drawn, in error, from an older file that had not been identified as out of date.

**Change Location:** Figure 1-12.

**Change:** The Figure will include the correct City of Sammamish Zoning Map designations.

SAM7: The Plan does not consider the recent CPP City of Sammamish 2044 growth target of 2,100 residential units and 728 jobs. The City was recently assigned a new growth target by King County through update to the King County CPPs.

**Response:** As noted previously, the District is aware of the growth targets, and recognizes these are targets. These most recent targets were established after the growth projections had been completed. Further, for design and planning uses, the District uses growth rates rather than targets and errs on the conservative projection size, to work towards the goal of having infrastructure in place ahead of or at least concurrently with new development/customers. In addition, the Wastewater Comprehensive Plan is reviewed and revised every 6 years in order to maintain a consistent level of goal setting that is commensurate with the projections at the time.

**Change Location:** No change.

SAM8: The Plan does not consider the effects of the City’s recent development regulations updates on pipeline projects and land assemblages. Development regulation changes made in 2019 and in 2021 have changed land development project requirements. Geographically situated and geometrically aligned land assemblages meeting updated development standards are more difficult to achieve and the rate of development and redevelopment in the R zones has slowed.
Response: Rates of development do fluctuate with respect to current and updated regulations as well as economic factors that change over time. The District’s estimates of development on properties do include constraints for known development issues. For instance, within Sammamish, which uses net area versus gross area for density considerations, each property’s area available for development is reduced by 16 percent. Additional information has been added to Sub-Section 2.4.3.3, Zoning Capacity Projected Sewer ERUs, regarding the method of estimating zoning capacity.

Change Location: Section 2.4.3, Sub-Section 2.4.3.3 – See changes described under SAM1

SAM9: The Plan does not consider HB 1220 and current work by King County to assign 2044 affordable housing growth target mandates to the County’s cities. Sometime in Q3 or Q4 of 2023 the City anticipates receiving an affordable housing growth target of:
- 554 0-30% AMI Permanent Supportive Housing Units (likely implemented in multi-family)
- 918 0-30% AMI Deeply Affordable Housing Units (likely implemented in multi-family)
- 408 31-50% AMI Affordable Housing Units (likely to be implemented in multi-family)
- 220 51-80% AMI Affordable Housing Units (likely to be implemented in middle housing and diverse housing choices)

Response: As noted before, the District’s growth rates were developed prior to the work assigning updated growth targets within the City. The Wastewater Comprehensive Plan will be updated again prior to 2030, and there will be an opportunity to adjust the longer-term growth rates at that time. The short term growth will likely continue to be based on projects that are in the pipeline. Unless the affordable housing mandates require increasing housing figures well beyond existing Sammamish projections, the increase of affordable housing does not have a direct impact on wastewater flows.

From a projection perspective, the goal of the plan is to ensure that sewer facilities required to accommodate future growth will be in place prior to or concurrent with the growth, and that sources of funding are identified for the infrastructure improvements.

Change Location: No change

SAM10: Envision Sammamish (www.envisionsmammish2044.org ), the City’s required 10 year update to the Comp Plan is underway and due for completion in December of 2024. This effort is focused on planning for a 20 year horizon (2044) as required by RCW 36.70A. The City will be reaching out to the District in early 2023 to set an engagement and collaboration schedule in review of service plans related to growth targets and land use assumptions under consideration with this planning effort.

Response: Noted. The District looks forward to this collaboration effort, for both accommodating projected growth, and considering how to support extension of sewer service into currently unsewered, urban areas.

Change Location: No change
SAM11: Supplemental to the comments above, the following are areas of further staff identified opportunity for collaboration between the District and the City, dependent on priority, workplan, and direction by the City Council and City Manager:

- Support and partnership in implementation of North Sewer Service Area interim and long-term improvements.
- Support in advocating for appropriate transfer of assets to King County.
- Support in holding King County accountable for delivery of the North Diversion.
- Support and collaboration in advocating for power reliability through grid resiliency with PSE.
- Collaboration to simplify permitting for backup power supply installation.
- Collaboration in identifying efficiency improvements to reduce energy consumption and corresponding GHG emissions.
- Collaboration on further study regarding reclaimed water usage.
- Collaboration on development of workforce housing.
- Pursuit of common areas of opportunity between the City and the District including land surplus, transfer of development rights, and overlap of service.

Response: Noted. The District looks forward to this collaboration effort, for both accommodating projected growth, and considering how to support extension of sewer service into currently unsewered, urban areas.

Change Location: No change

Comments SAM12-SAM19 are in regards to locations where District CIP projects (Chapter 7) and City of Sammamish Stormwater projects are in close proximity.

SAM12: SPWSD LS-8 Treefarm East Lift Station (2028-2032) and COS Stormwater Project Retrofit Site #2363 TreeFarm.

This lift station project is in the vicinity of a proposed stormwater retrofit for Tree Farm. This project is not yet scheduled or planned for 2023-2024 but is likely to be implemented by 2028. A conceptual project sketch is below. Depending on the extent of work proposed, this project may be prioritized if coordinating improvements would reduce overall cost.

Response: The District will coordinate with the City of Sammamish on design of the proposed stormwater retrofit to ensure the two projects will be compatible.

Change Location: No Change

SAM13: R-1A (2028-2032) Inglewood Lift Station Bypass to Control Structure (Permanent Solution A-6) and SW-500 NE 217th Street Road Drainage Modification.

This stormwater project is planned with the 2023-2028 stormwater improvements but is on hold to be constructed concurrently with TR-42 (218th Avenue SE/216th Avenue SE: SE 4th Street to Inglewood Hill Road NE) for corridor and safety improvements. TR-42 is not within the 2023-2028 planning window but is listed as a future project.

Response: District project R-1A is a major regional project that would be an alternative to the currently identified King County Wastewater Division Sammamish Plateau Diversion Phase 1. As an alternate, it may not be constructed. However, even if the regional project does not occur, there are potential local sewer improvements that may occur in 217th Ave NE in the future.
The District will coordinate with the City of Sammamish on design of the proposed Drainage Modification project and associated corridor and safety improvements when they occur.

SAM14: R1-B (2021-2023) Interim Bypass of Central Lake Gravity Basin and George Davis Creek Fish Passage and Stormwater Improvement
The George Davis project (SW-601) is planned for construction in 2024. Coordination on design and construction will be required. A project agreement between the City and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer will likely be needed.

Response: R1-B includes three current projects and a fourth potential project. The three current projects are anticipated to be completed by October 2024. These are updated dates. The fourth project, if required, would be located north of Louis Thompson Road, and may not involve the area of the George Davis project. The District will work with the City of Sammamish regarding any agreement that may be required associated with the George Davis project.

Change Location: Section 4.4.3.2.3, See answer to DOE10.

SAM15: LS-10 (2028-2032) Loree Estates Lift Station and Loree Estates Outfall Diversion
This is a high priority project that is planned for design and permitting in 2023 and construction in 2024. Project will potentially involve replacing the stormwater conveyance in SE 19th Street from approximately 20014 SE 19th St to 202nd Pl SE and reconstruct the outfall at Kanim Creek.

Response: The District will coordinate with the City of Sammamish on design of the proposed outfall diversion project to ensure the two projects will be compatible.

Change Location: No Change

SAM16: CL-3 (2022-2027) Louis Thompson Sewer Main and Louis Thompson Road Tightline Project (M-20)
The Louis Thompson Road Tightline project is currently in design. Continue coordination on this effort with the City's capital project team.

Response: At this time, January 2023, the District is coordinating with the City of Sammamish regarding the Louis Thompson Road Tightline Project. The District is working on a water main relocation project required due to the Tightline Project. The District is currently considering the potential of constructing sewer in Louis Thompson Road and has hired a consultant to complete the sewer design in the area of the Tightline Project, which extends beyond the extent of CL-3. The District has not made a final decision on whether to construct the sewer at this time.

Change Location: No Change

SAM17: CL-1 (2028-2032) South End East Lake Sammamish Parkway/Place Crossing and SW-100 – Outfall Erosion Mitigation (E-14), 2504 191st Ct SE
A small erosion mitigation maintenance project is planned for this area. Water discharges from east side of parkway to the west via a pipe underneath E Lake Sammamish Pl and discharges downstream. Erosion causes sediment to deposit in the area and some erosion occurs at the outfall.
The project is scored as a lower priority according to the capital project prioritization criteria, however the City may be interested in scheduling this project concurrently with the sewer project.

**Response:** When this project is moved forward, the District will coordinate with the City of Sammamish on design of the proposed stormwater project.

**Change Location:** No Change

**SAM18:** INT-1 (2022-2023) Issaquah-Pine Lake Road and 234th Avenue SE Gravity Sewer Main Replacement and SW-500 – IPLR Engineered Hyporheic Zone Augmentation.

These projects are in the same vicinity. The stormwater project is listed within the 2023-2028 planning horizon, but is likely to be put on hold until the Issaquah Pine Lake Road widening project occurs. The road widening project is not planned within the 2023-2028 horizon on the City's transportation improvement plan, but is listed as a future project.

**Response:** The District intends to coordinate this project with the City's road widening project.

**Change Location:** No Change

**SAM19:** CL-10 (2033-2037) SE 24th Street at 212th Avenue SE and Pine Lake Creek Basin Plan

The City is starting the Pine Lake Creek Basin Plan and anticipates completion in 2024. The basin plan will address stormwater problems in the area and may include capital improvements at the intersection of SE 24th Street at 212th Ave SE. If a project is identified, it would be added to the City's stormwater capital improvement plan. Timing of an improvement would be beneficial to coordinate so the City can determine if improvements are needed for stormwater conveyance.

**Response:** The District is very interested in coordinating with the City on the Pine Lake Creek Basin Plan, including any stormwater project at the intersection of SE 24th Street and 212th Ave SE. The sewer downstream of this intersection sets some parameters for crossing this intersection that need to be included in any projects for the intersection.

**Change Location:** No Change

**CITY OF ISSAQUAH**

**ISS1:** The City of Issaquah did not provide any comments on the 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan.

**NORTHEAST SAMMAMISH SEWER AND WATER DISTRICT**

**NESSWD1:** Northeast Sammamish had no comments on the 2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan.
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
(Letter dated 11/21/2022)

DOE1: Although not required, it would be helpful to provide a "cross-reference" table to make it clear which each element of the WAC 173-240-050 and WAC 173-240-060 are satisfied within this document.

Response: See the following List for responses to each element included in WAC 173-240-050 and WAC 173-240-060 (shown in green)

Requirements of 173-240-050 WAC

(1) All general sewer plans required of any governmental agency before providing sewer service are "plans" within the requirements of RCW 90.48.110. Three copies of the proposed general sewer plan and each amendment to it must be submitted to and approved by the department before implementing the plan.

Response: Digital copies of the General Sewer Plan (GSP) were submitted for the comment period. Required copies will be submitted following the comment period.

(2) The general sewer plan must be sufficiently complete so that engineering reports can be developed from it without substantial alterations of concept and basic considerations.

Response: See GSP 1.1

(3) The general sewer plan shall include the following information together with any other relevant data as requested by the department. To satisfy the requirements of the local government jurisdiction, additional information may be necessary. (a) The purpose and need for the proposed plan.

Response: See GSP 1.1

(b) A discussion of who will own, operate, and maintain the systems.

Response: See GSP 1.2

(c) The existing and proposed service boundaries.

Response: See GSP 1.5 and Figure 1-2

(d) Layout map including the following: (i) Boundaries. The boundary lines of the municipality or special district to be sewered, including a vicinity map;

Response: See GSP Figure 1-1, 1-2

(ii) Existing sewers. The location, size, slope, capacity, direction of flow of all existing trunk sewers, and the boundaries of the areas served by each;

Response: See GSP Figure 1-16, Figures 3-4 through 3-16, Appendix F

(iii) Proposed sewers. The location, size, slope, capacity, direction of flow of all proposed trunk sewers, and the boundaries of the areas to be served by each;

Response: See GSP Figures 3-4 through 3-16, Appendix F

(iv) Existing and proposed pump stations and force mains. The location of all existing and proposed pumping stations and force mains, designated to distinguish between those existing and proposed;
**Response:** See GSP Figures 3-4 through 3-16, Appendix F Figures F-1 through F-13, and Appendix I

(v) Topography and elevations. Topography showing pertinent ground elevations and surface drainage must be included, as well as proposed and existing streets;

**Response:** See GSP Figure 1-7

(vi) Streams, lakes, and other bodies of water. The location and direction of flow of major streams, the high and low elevations of water surfaces at sewer outlets, and controlled overflows, if any. All existing and potential discharge locations should be noted; and

**Response:** See GSP Figure 1-4

(vii) Water systems. The location of wells or other sources of water supply, water storage reservoirs and treatment plants, and water transmission facilities.

**Response:** See GSP Figure 1-11 and 1-13

(e) The population trend as indicated by available records, and the estimated future population for the stated design period. Briefly describe the method used to determine future population trends and the concurrence of any applicable local or regional planning agencies.

**Response:** See GSP 2.4

(f) Any existing domestic or industrial wastewater facilities within twenty miles of the general plan area and within the same topographical drainage basin containing the general plan area.

**Response:** See GSP Figure 1-6 and 1-15

(g) A discussion of any infiltration and inflow problems and a discussion of actions that will alleviate these problems in the future.

**Response:** See GSP 2.5.2, 4.4.3.4 and Appendix O

(h) A statement regarding provisions for treatment and discussion of the adequacy of the treatment.

**Response:** See answer to DOE3.

(i) List of all establishments producing industrial wastewater, the quantity of wastewater and periods of production, and the character of the industrial wastewater insofar as it may affect the sewer system or treatment plant. Consideration must be given to future industrial expansion.

**Response:** See GSP Appendix B

(j) Discussion of the location of all existing private and public wells, or other sources of water supply, and distribution structures as they are related to both existing and proposed domestic wastewater treatment facilities.

**Response:** See GSP Figure 1-11 and 1-13 address private and public wells in the District’s sewer service area. Wastewater treatment facilities are owned and operated by KCWTD, and private and public wells relating to those facilities are not provided.

(k) Discussion of the various alternatives evaluated, and a determination of the alternative chosen, if applicable.

**Response:** See GSP 4.4.3.3 and Appendix M

(l) A discussion, including a table, that shows the cost per service in terms of both debt service and operation and maintenance costs, of all facilities (existing and proposed) during the planning period.
Response: See GSP Chapter 8 and Appendix P

(m) A statement regarding compliance with any adopted water quality management plan under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended.

Response: See GSP 1.4.1.4

(n) A statement regarding compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), if applicable.

Response: See GSP 1.4.1.5

Requirements of 173-240-060 WAC

(1) The engineering report for a domestic wastewater facility shall include each appropriate (as determined by the department) item required in WAC 173-240-050 for general sewer plans unless an up-to-date general sewer plan is on file with the department. Normally, an engineering report is not required for sewer line extensions or pump stations. See WAC 173-240-020(13) and 173-240-030(5). The facility plan described in federal rule 40 C.F.R. 35 is an "engineering report."

Response: Yes See prior list

(2) The engineering report must be sufficiently complete so that plans and specifications can be developed from it without substantial changes. Three copies of the report must be submitted to the department for approval, except as waived under WAC 173-240-030(5).

Response: Digital copies of the General Sewer Plan (GSP) were submitted for the comment period. Required copies will be submitted following the comment period.

(3) The engineering report shall include the following information together with any other relevant data as requested by the department:

(a) The name, address, and telephone number of the owner of the proposed facilities, and the owner’s authorized representative.

Response: Contact information has been added.

Change location: Section 1.2

Change: The District is a special purpose district with the authority to operate under Title 57 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW).

Sammamish Plateau Water & Sewer District, General Manager
1510 228th Ave SE, Sammamish, WA 98075
(425) 392-6256, or through the District’s website at www.spwater.org.

The District is administered by a five-member Board of Commissioners with overlapping 6-year terms.

(b) A project description that includes a location map and a map of the present and proposed service area.

Response: See GSP 1.1, 1.5 and Figure 1-2

(c) A statement of the present and expected future quantity and quality of wastewater, including any industrial wastes that may be present or expected in the sewer system.

Response: See GSP 2.3, 2.5 and 3.6
(d) The degree of treatment required based upon applicable permits and rules, the receiving body of water, the amount and strength of wastewater to be treated, and other influencing factors.

N/A

(e) A description of the receiving water, applicable water quality standards, and how water quality standards will be met outside any applicable dilution zone.

N/A

(f) The type of treatment process proposed, based upon the character of the wastewater to be handled, the method of disposal, the degree of treatment required, and a discussion of the alternatives evaluated and the reasons they are unacceptable.

N/A

(g) The basic design data and sizing calculations of each unit of the treatment works. Expected efficiencies of each unit and also of the entire plant, and character of effluent anticipated.

N/A

(h) Discussion of the various sites available and the advantages and disadvantages of the site or sites recommended. The proximity of residences or developed areas to any treatment works. The relationship of the twenty-five-year and one hundred-year flood to the treatment plant site and the various plant units.

N/A

(i) A flow diagram that shows general layout of the various units, the location of the effluent discharge, and a hydraulic profile of the system that is the subject of the engineering report and any hydraulically related portions.

Response: See GSP Figure 5-1

(j) A discussion of infiltration and inflow problems, overflows and bypasses, and proposed corrections and controls.

Response: See GSP 2.5.2, 4.4.3.4 and Appendix O

(k) A discussion of any special provisions for treating industrial wastes, including any pretreatment requirements for significant industrial sources.

Response: See GSP 3.6

(l) Detailed outfall analysis or other disposal method selected.

N/A

(m) A discussion of the method of final sludge disposal and any alternatives considered.

N/A

(n) Provision for future needs.

Response: See GSP Chapter 7 Capital Improvement Plan

(o) Staffing and testing requirements for the facilities.

Response: See GSP 5.2
(p) An estimate of the costs and expenses of the proposed facilities and the method of assessing costs and expenses. The total amount shall include both capital costs and also operation and maintenance costs for the life of the project, and must be presented in terms of total annual cost and present worth.

Response: See GSP Chapter 8 and Appendix P

(q) A statement regarding compliance with any applicable state or local water quality management plan or any plan adopted under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended.

Response: GSP 1.4.1.4

(r) A statement regarding compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), if applicable.

Response: See GSP 1.4.1.5

(4) The engineering report for projects that use land application, including seepage lagoons, irrigation, and subsurface disposal, shall include information on the following together with appropriate parts of subsection (3) of this section, as determined by the department:

N/A

(5) The engineering report for projects funded by the Environmental Protection Agency shall, in addition to the requirements of subsection (3) or (4) of this section, follow EPA facility plan guidelines contained in the EPA publication, "Guidance for Preparing a Facility Plan" (MCD-46), and shall indicate how the special requirements contained in 40 C.F.R. 35.719-1 will be met.

N/A

DOE2: In general, large figures are interspersed with text and frequently not near the sections that reference them. Readability could be improved by all figures to the end of each section.

Response: The figures are setup for a printed version where all figures follow the even number page. So page 1-1 also has page 1-2 on the back of it when printed in a hard copy format and then any figures referenced on pages 1-1 to 1-2 will then follow page 1-2.

Change Location: No Change

DOE3: The general sewer plan must address the requirement of WAC 173-240-050(3)(h), which requires "A statement regarding provisions for treatment and discussion of the adequacy of the treatment." Although Ecology recognizes that the District does not own and operate a sewage treatment facility, it must still demonstrate in the general sewer plan the adequacy of treatment for all wastewater generated during the planning period. The plan must include sufficient discussion necessary to demonstrate that the District's agreements with King County will provide adequate treatment throughout the planning period. Please identify the capacity available to the District at the King County facilities for treatment and identify whether any agreements contain capacity constraints that may limit or otherwise constrain the city's ability to provide sewer service.

Response: King County Wastewater Treatment Division carries out wastewater and capital facility planning for the regional treatment plants through the Treatment Planning Program. The Treatment Planning Program evaluates current and forecasted capacity needs and regulatory requirements and plans for improvements at the treatment plants.
Currently, wastewater from homes and business in the District are sent to the South Treatment Plant in Renton for treatment. Future projects to occur will result in the ability for wastewater from the district to be treated at South Treatment Plant or the Brightwater Treatment Plant. Through these King County Wastewater Treatment Division planning programs and the projects implemented based on the planning as well as the Agreement for Sewage Disposal between King County and the District, the necessary provisions are in place for treatment through the planning horizon.

The District’s Agreement with King County requires all sewage from the District be sent to King County for treatment, but does not contain any limits on the volume of sewage to be transmitted.

Change Location: Section 6.2.1 Wastewater Treatment Agency, Paragraph 1, added language to end of paragraph.

Change: ... Under the terms of the current METRO Agreements, the District is required to deliver sewage collected to the King County system, and contain no capacity limitations.

DOE4: While the overall discussion of the water system is generally appropriate, the section should include additional information related to discussion of water conservation measures and how they impact the city’s sewer systems (see RCW 90.48.495). Ecology also recommends including a map that shows the relationship between existing unsewered areas and wellhead protection areas.

Response: The reduction in water use over time may impact the flow of sewage in lines that have few customers and low slopes. These terminal lines with only a few customers may require more frequent cleaning.

Change Location: Section 1.3.2 Water System Planning, added language.

Change: Section 1.3.2: The Water Comprehensive Plan discusses the existing water system facilities, water usage and forecasted demands for future design criteria, system expansion, and water system improvements. The recommended water system improvements include new distribution and transmission main upgrades and replacements, water storage capacity improvements, and booster pump station improvements necessary for long-term growth. The Water Comprehensive Plan includes the District’s Conservation Plan (Chapter 4 and Appendix N of the Water Plan), which has resulted in an overall reduction in water use per ERU over time. This reduction is reflected in the measured sewer flows described in Chapter 2. The Water Comprehensive Plan was approved by the Department of Health on April 23, 2020, and the fully approved Plan was adopted by the Board of Commission on May 11, 2020.

Figure 1-11: Added septic service areas to Figure 1-11

Section 1.5.1.5: The Critical Aquifer Recharge Area and Wellhead Protection Area delineations along with their relation to unsewered area can be found on Figure 1-11.

DOE5: Please expand this section to include more detail on policies and practices related to coordinating with King County’s Industrial Waste Program to ensure industrial facilities receive appropriate pretreatment permitting.
Response: King County issues the Industrial Waste Permits to industrial connections and they work directly with King County. King County provides the District with copies of the Industrial Waste Discharge Permits.

Change Location: Section 1.4.1.10 Local Permits
Change: King County may also issue Industrial Waste Discharge Permits to industrial connections within the District to ensure that appropriate pretreatment of wastewater is provided. These connections currently include dental facilities, food processors, vehicle wash and research facilities. In addition, King County may issue. Those issued in the District are typically limited to temporary stormwater discharge permits from construction sites, following an application from the contractor or owner of the project requiring the discharge. A list of current Industrial Waste Discharge Permits in the District is provided in Appendix B.

DOE6: The second to last paragraph states "the South Treatment Plant (STP) serves an average wet-weather flow of 115 million gallons per day (mgd)...". This is not quite accurate and should be rephrased to "the South Treatment Plant (STP) is designed for an average wet-weather flow of 115 million gallons per day (mgd)..."

Response: Comment noted and modification provided.

Change Location: Section 1.8.1.1 Southern Diversion – South Treatment Plant, 5th Paragraph
Change: The South Treatment Plant (STP) is designed for serves an average wet-weather flow of 115 million gallons per day (mgd) and a peak hour flow rate of 325 mgd from King County’s East Service area. ...

DOE7: There are a couple of small segments which indicate over capacity at zoning/2030 in Laughing Jacob's but these locations are not discussed in Table 3-12 or 3-13. How will these issues be addressed?

Response: The pipes are discussed in Section 3.2.3.2.5 (Page 3-15) and listed in Table 3-10. Table 3-12 provides a footnote indicating that the table does not include pipes that are already listed in the individual sections described earlier for each basin (i.e. page 3-15). The few small segments of 10" pipe are nearly flat and barely surcharge (in the range of 0.007' to 0.073'). Due to the minimal surcharge, the District did not feel these are warranted to become CIPs but will monitor in the future.

Change Location: 3.2.3.2.5 Zoning Capacity Flows, Existing System - Laughing Jacobs Basin, added language to end of paragraph

Change: The smaller diameter pipes with expected surcharging will be monitored for problems.

DOE8: Figure 3-8 show a section of gravity main higher up on the plateau (not the main that runs along the water front) in the North Lake Sammamish area that will be over capacity at zoning. It is also not included in Table 3-12. What improvements are planned to prevent SSO in this area?
Response: The pipes are discussed in Section 3.2.3.2.2 (Page 3-13) and listed in Table 3-7. The pipe segments on the hill, shown to be deficient at zoning capacity, are all 8" pipes that are either at reverse grade and have minimal max flow rates (10 to 14 gpm) or they surcharge a minimal amount (0.05' to 0.08') so the District will monitor these areas in the future instead of creating CIPs at this time.

Change Location: Section 3.2.3.2.2 Zoning Capacity Flows, Existing System – North Lake Sammamish Basin, added language to end of paragraph.

Change: The pipes located higher in the North Lake Sammamish Basin that are not addressed by the King County SPD Phase 1 project that are shown to be deficient at zoning capacity have minimal flow rates, and result in minimal surcharges. These pipes will be monitored in the future for problems.

DOE9: Please expand the discussion of SPW's Emergency Response Plan. Please include information on the history of SSOs experienced in the system along - particularly with respect to the frequency of SSOs, typical causes, and how SPW has used information about SSOs to form its operations and emergency response plans. Please also include information related to procedures for notifying appropriate state and local agencies when SSOs occur. This discussion should include information on how SPW responds to overflows that may impact any of the following: surface waters of the state, groundwater in wellhead protection areas, stormwater systems (either under the city's jurisdiction or another local jurisdiction), and areas accessible to the general public.

Response: Additional language has been added to Section 5.7 Emergency Response Program to specifically address Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) responses.

Change Location: Section 5.7, added Section 5.7.1 Spill Response.

Change: 5.7.1 Spill Response

Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO) are an emergency event with specific guidelines for response. In the event of a SSO that either reaches bodies of water (lakes, streams) or Municipally Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) certain notification is required. The notification will include information on the spill location, approximation of volume of the spill, facilities or water bodies impacted, cause of the spill, and the clean-up process and result. If an MS4 facility is impacted, District staff will contact that agency as soon as possible after identification of the situation. In addition, for any spill that impacts a body of water or MS4 the District will notify the Department of Ecology (DOE) using the Statewide Environmental Incident Report Form.

Over the 5-year period from 2018 through 2022, the District had a total of 4 SSOs. The cause of these SSOs were 2 from equipment failure, 1 by roots in the sewer main, and 1 by construction activity. This is a rate of approximately 0.5 overflows per year per 100 miles of sewer. Three of the SSOs had estimated volumes of less than 1,500 gallons, and the fourth had an estimated volume of 18,000 gallons.

DOE10: Interim Central Lake Force Main construction is stated to have a expected completion date of September 2022. Please update with new expected completion date or rephrase to note the project's completion.
Response: The dates for all Interim Improvements projects have been updated. In addition, the date for completion of the Temporary Immediate Improvements has been updated.

Change Location: Section 4.4.3.1 Temporary Immediate North Diversion Improvement, 2nd paragraph, 1st bullet, modify second paragraph.
Section 4.4.3.2.3 Interim Improvements Design and Construction for each listed in the following, 1st bullet, modify last sentence.
I-4 Phase One
Interim Central Lake Force Main Construction,
Interim North Lake Lift Station Capacity Improvement Construction
I-4 Phase Two + Portion I-2
Interim North Lake Force Main Construction

Change: Section 4.4.3.1
The Portable Bypass Pump was initially anticipated to be onsite by November 2021. However, supply chain issues resulted in a delay, with the pump finally installed in December September 2022.

Section 4.4.3.2.3
Interim Central Lake Force Main Construction: Construction Completion Estimated by January 2023 September 2022.
Interim North Lake Lift Station Capacity Improvement Construction: Construction Completion Estimated by October 2024 February 2023.

DOE11: Please provide more clarity on whether Table 5-7 also applies to temporary pumps/equipment like those used in the interim solutions for NSSA. If Table 5-7 does not apply, please elaborate on the maintenance procedures for in-service and stand-by mobile generators/pumps.

Response: The maintenance schedule provided in Table 5-7 applies to all generators, onsite and mobile. Language has been added to clarify the coverage.

Change Location: Section 5.6.1 Lift Stations, 2nd paragraph.
Change: The District has 15 lift stations that are provided with a standby generator that will operate the station during a loss of commercial power. The six lift stations without backup generators generally collect wastewater from smaller residential basins and have mobile generators that will be utilized during a power outage. The complete maintenance schedule for the generators is provided in Table 5-7. The maintenance schedule applies to all generators including both onsite and mobile generators.

DOE12: Paragraph 2 states that "The District provides guidelines for the general assessment of an emergency situation in its Emergency Response Plan". Please add details about what these guidelines are and how the District uses these guidelines, especially with respect to SSO notifications. Alternatively, a copy of the ERP could be include as an Appendix.

Response: Additional language has been added to Section 5.7 Emergency Response Program to specifically address Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) responses. See DOE9
The ERP is not provided as an Appendix as it is protected from public inspection pursuant to the provisions of RCW 42.56.420.

Change Location: Section 5.7, added Section 5.7.1 Spill Response.

Change: See Change provided in response to DOE9

DOE13: Several projects listed in the 2013 GSP as to be completed by 2018 or within 10 years, have not been completed and are directly carried over. Please provide a comparison of project originally expected to be completed by 2023 (as delineated in the 2013 GSP) as well as the reason for the change in timeline.

Response: Additional information has been added to Section 7.3 to address the projects from the 2013 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan that have been continued, but with different estimated completion dates.

Change Location: Section 7.3 Proposed System Improvements, added 3rd paragraph and following bullet points for specific projects.

Change: Certain projects included in the CIP were also included in the 2013 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan, and for some, the Year Planned has changed. Brief explanations for these changes are provided in the following, in some cases grouping projects together.

- **R-1A – Inglewood Lift Station Bypass to Control Structure:** This is a project to provide permanent connection of the basins flowing to the Inglewood Lift Station to the King County system, and would be funded by KCWTD. The change in timing R1-A is due to a King County delay. In addition, the project described in the 2022 Plan is an alternate route to that proposed by KCWTD and as described in the 2013 Plan.
- **R-1B – Interim Bypass of Central Lake Gravity Basin:** The project start was delayed to allow completion of additional studies.
- **R-2 – Control Structure Modifications:** The metering portion of this project described in the 2013 Plan was completed, and the Control Structure is part of the District’s system being proposed for transfer to King County.
- **INT-1 – Issaquah-Pine Lake Road and 234th Avenue SE Gravity Sewer Main Replacement:** This project is proposed to be completed in conjunction with a City of Sammamish road project, which has been delayed.
- **INT-2 and INT-3:** Both of these projects were considered for completion with a City of Issaquah road project, but were deferred to a time in the future when they would be needed due to upstream growth. The deficiency identified in INT-3 is based on modeled results and has not been identified by District operations to be at a level to require improvement at this time.
- **INT-4 and INT 7 – South Plateau Conveyance Projects:** These are both future projects, to respond to future growth. The projects are part of the system that is being proposed for transfer to King County.
- **INT-5 – South Pine Lake Interceptor Replacement:** The District Operations Department has determined through pipe evaluation that this project can be delayed. The timing of the project is being projected through the District’s Asset Management Plan.
• **CS-1 – Water’s Edge Lift Station Collection Sewer System and LS-4 Waters Edge Lift Station:** CS-1 is not required until LS-3 is constructed, and LS-4 is delayed due to limited funding availability.

• **CL-1, CL-2 and CL-3 – Critical Link Projects:** The timing of these projects will be in response to service requests. CL-3 – Louis Thompson Sewer Main is also being considered for construction in conjunction with a City of Sammamish project.

• **LS-2 – Freegard Lift Station Wet Well:** This construction of this project was delayed due to operations prioritization compared to other projects and continued studies to better understand the project needs and requirements to support the scope of the final project.

• **LS-6, LS-7, LS-8, LS-9, LS-10, LS-11, LS-12, LS-13 and LS-14 – New Lift Stations:** The timing of these projects will be in response to service requests.

**DOE14:** Project ID R-1B is listed as being for the purpose of growth. But Section 4.4.3.2 and Figure 3-8 indicate that it is already exceeding its capacity. Please explain why this is not need for "deficiency".

**Response:** The original intent of Project R-1B was to provide for growth, which helps determine the District funds used for the project. However, the project was required to respond to a current deficiency caused by delays in installation of the KC WTD SPD Phase 1 project. To reflect both situations, the purpose of the project will reflect both deficiency and growth.

**Change Location:** Table 7-1, Project R-1B

**Change:** Purpose of Project for Project R-1B: Deficiency/Growth

**DOE15:** The description of the lift station capacities does not match those included in Table 3-14 and frequently does not follow the Criteria for Sewage Works Design guidance that capacity should be based on the single failure of the largest pump at any given lift station.

**Response:** The listed capacity within Table 3-14 uses the average of measured pumping rates of the individual pumps, rather than the highest or lowest of any individual pumps. The analysis for capacity was completed with the largest (highest volume) pump in a lift station out of service.

**Change Location:** Table 3-14 Sewer Lift Station Capacity Analysis, Footnote 1 added language

**Change:** (1) Most Lift Station capacities are based on drawdown tests conducted August 16-18, 2011. Capacities of the Central Lake Sammamish, Inglewood, North Lake Sammamish, and Freegard Lift Stations are based on more recent flow meter data from 2019 and conversations with District staff. Listed capacities are with the largest pump at the lift station out of service.

**DOE16:** Several lift stations list a single model of pump but different capacities for each pump. Please explain or correct.

**Response:** Each individual pump was tested and the capacity for the different pumps is provided. Pumps that are the same model may have different capacities based on differences on how they are configured within the lift station, overall hours of operation or operational situations that have occurred over their period of use. A note has been added to clarify that the capacities listed are from testing of each individual pump.
Change Location: Appendix I, Lift Station Inventory. Language added to end of 1st Paragraph.

Change: The following provides a detailed inventory of the components at the District’s lift station facilities. The section also provides color photographs of each facility and a site plan. Pump curves for each station are located in Appendix J. Illustrations of typical wet pit/dry pit and submersible lift stations are also provided in Figures I-1 and I-2, respectively. Figure I-3 provides an illustration of typical wet well settings. It should be noted that the pump capacities listed herein are based upon the measured rates resulting from drawdown testing of the individual pumps.

NON-AGENCY COMMENTS

NONAGENCY1: Eric Johnson (email dated 12/30/2022)

We live at 1429 212th Ave NE. This portion of 212th Ave NE from NE10th St to NE 16th St is lacking many basic services. This portion of the street was excluded from the "Tightline" project upgrades. There is a sewer connection at NE 10th St and a connection was installed around the 1500 block of 212th Ave NE. Almost all of the homes on 212th are connected to yard septic systems, many greater than 40 years old. A new house was built near NE 14th St that uses a grinder pump uphill to connect to the sewer at the 1500 block of 212th Ave NE.

A development of 12 large homes (4000 - 5100 sq ft) is proposed on the east side of 212th Ave NE between NE 14th St and NE 16th St. A current proposal has all 12 homes using grinder pumps to reach the sewer connection in the 1500 block of 212th Ave NE. No infrastructure is being added to this area to connect a sewer line along 212th Ave NE so that homes on 212th Ave NE, NE 14th St and NE 13th St could eventually connect to a sewer when their current septic system fails. The 12 large home development is not adding infrastructure to support these homes by adding a sewer line connection to NE 10th St.

The following is an excerpt that we submitted during the comment period for the proposed development.

- The existing problem of lack of sewer infrastructure on 212th is not being addressed even though it could be. Most of the homes on 212th Ave. NE were built in the mid-1970s or early 80s and are still on septic systems. These systems are nearing or at the end of their expected lifespan. If these systems fail and cannot be rebuilt, the nearest gravity connection at NE 10th is a long distance for most of these homes and a significant expense. Even though Sammamish Plateau Water’s comprehensive plan calls for a future sewer pipe down the street to connect with NE 10th, the applicant chose not to help provide this infrastructure through latecomer agreements and instead chose a less expensive option using grinder pumps to connect to another sewer, directly across from the proposed development, providing only for its own needs.

Development must provide infrastructure to support their demands for services.

Response: This comment is for a specific proposed Developer Extension Agreement (DEA) project, North Pointe. The Wastewater Comprehensive Plan does identify potential project locations through
the Conceptual Sewer Plan (see Chapter 7), but is focused on creating the policies under which the projects could be installed, rather than the requirement to install any particular project.

District policy that applies to the situation where a DEA project proposed use of interim sewer facilities:

Section 6.3.1 Wastewater Design Criteria, paragraph 2 states (emphasis added)

“When sewer service is required for an area before the proposed downstream facilities are available, and it is not reasonable to install all of the downstream facilities at that time, the District may consider the use of interim or temporary sewer facilities on a case by case basis. ...”

The determination of what is "reasonable" is subjective, with the District making that determination. In this case, extension of the gravity main along 212th from the proposed North Pointe development referenced in the comment would include installation of approximately 1,300 feet of sewer, with an estimated cost between $500,000 and $800,000. For the 12 lots proposed this would amount to between $41,000 and $67,000 per lot in added cost. In this case, the District agreed that the developer could utilize an interim low-pressure main for sewer service. The District is still requiring installation of permanent gravity main in 212th Ave NE, north of the gravity connection in the NE 15th block, which will provide permanent sewer access to two lots on the west side of 212th Ave NE and none in the developer’s property.

Change Location: No Change

NONAGENCY2: Josh Pedigo (email dated 12/30/2022)

I am a resident of Eden View at 305 207th Ave NE, my property line backs right to Louis Thompson road. I want to write in support of adding sewer to Louis Thompson Road and hooking up to the network, the sewer line is downhill, and naturally gravity fed from my property and I open up the rest of the neighborhood for the service. My concern is paying an egregious cost to do so. We are adding the sidewalks right by my house, and you will have to move the water line; while doing this you should dig out, connect and should add sewer. As the water company has a natural monopoly on the water and sewer services in the area; much as PSE does for electricity and gas, it is an ethical responsibility for the district to bring sewer to the neighborhoods and possibly a legal one; as a service in the 21st century. This is strictly a cost for you of doing business and your customer acquisition cost; as once we are hooked up our great grand children will still be paying for this service in perpetuity. I am a US Army veteran, long time Seattle resident, and business owner who loves this neighborhood and wants to sewer come to it. Thank you.

Response: This comment is for a specific potential Capital Improvement Project (CIP), a sewer main along Louis Thompson Road. The Wastewater Comprehensive Plan does identify potential project locations through the Conceptual Sewer Plan (see Chapter 7), but also sets policies under which the projects could be installed.

The Conceptual Sewer Plan along Louis Thompson Road includes a future gravity main between 205th Ave NE and 208th Ave NE identified as Project CL-3 Louis Thompson Sewer Main, and the section between 208th Ave NE and 210th Pl SE is identified as additional collection main.
Policies that address this comment are found in the following sections:

- Section 6.4 Mainline Extension Methods
  o Section 6.4.4 Capital Improvement Projects
- Section 6.7 Financial Philosophy
  o Section 6.7.2.1.1 Policies Regarding District Facilitation of Infrastructure Installation: Support sewer extensions when funds available:
- Section 6.8 Connection Charges
  o Section 6.8.2 Local Facility Charge

Summarizing application of the referenced policies to this project:

- The methods used by the District to facilitate sewer extensions will have a financial impact on existing sewer customers.
- Sewer extensions to backfill areas (areas transitioning from septic use to sewer) are more likely to require District financial support, which represents support borne by the existing District sewer customers.
- The District may decide to install a CIP project associated with other projects that provide efficiency of installation, such as a road project.
- The District should support sewer extensions as part of Interagency projects where there is an opportunity for significantly reduced project costs.
- All properties are subject to payment of a Local Facility Charge (LFC), which represents the customer’s share of sewer facilities providing service to a specific local area.

At this writing (1/24/2023), installation of the sewer in Louis Thompson Road is under consideration by the District Board of Commissioners. The impetus for this consideration is the City of Sammamish project that is addressing stormwater concerns and includes additional improvements to the road.

The District obtains the funds to support installation of sewer facilities from its existing sewer customers. If the District does not collect or plan to collect the cost of a new sewer facility from the property owners that utilize that system, the existing sewer customers are essentially subsidizing the new customers. Therefore, the “cost of doing business” noted in the comment is a cost borne by existing sewer customers.

Change Location: No Change

**NONAGENCY3:** Victor Shestakov (email dated 12/30/2022)

Thank you for opportunity to comment on sewers planning around Tamarack.
I am not sure if we asking too much, but if SPWSD could mail those surveys regarding septic abandonment and connection to city sewer for our 50+ houses in Tamarack community - that would be awesome. I could take care of mailing costs if that’s an issue.

Email forwarded with Victor Shestakov email dated 12/30/2022 See comment **NONAGENCY5.**

**Response:** This comment is for a specific potential collection sewer main along 211th Ave starting north of Louis Thompson Road and extending north approximately 1,700 feet. The Wastewater Comprehensive Plan does identify potential project locations through the Conceptual Sewer
This sewer main, or portion of the sewer main in 211th Ave, has been discussed with the commenter as a potential candidate for installation through a Utility Local Improvement District or the Neighborhood Sewer Program. Initiation of the project under as either a ULID or NSP starts with a survey of property owners on their interest in obtaining sewer service. As is normal District practice, the District may assist in dissemination of the surveys.

District policies that apply to this potential project can be found in Section 6.4 Mainline Extension Methods:
- Section 6.4.2 Utility Local Improvement Districts
- Section 6.4.3 Neighborhood Sewer Program

Change Location: No change

NONAGENCY4: Mary Wictor #1 (email dated 12/30/2022)

As you are aware, the attached input as Public Comment from 11/14/2022 SPWsd Board of Commissioners meeting speaks to Sewer and the real needs for it. Thus, I am officially submitting this neighbor’s input for the Wastewater (Sewer) Comprehensive Plan before/by the deadline of today, FRI 12/30/2022 5pm PST. In Lukas attached 1-page written text, he refers to "runoff" (stormwater and drainage) issues NOT being a focus for Sammamish Plateau Water & sewer district. However, when an area is developed, on septic, and without sewer, the water (from private wells--very few) or purchased from SPW and piped locally enters the ground through drainfields. This pre-saturates and adds to soil saturation all during the year, but especially during the Wet Season Sep-May each year. When there is more precipitation, there is more stormwater runoff created, and if that has no place to go (area developed before modern stormwater management adopted/required), there are DOWNHILL impacts. People have water come downhill, downgradient to their home, yard, near foundations, and their septic system. There are also areas of geological hazards (landslides, steep slopes, and erosion hazard areas that are at increased risk due to runoff, septic, and losing trees.) Many homes on 208th AVE NE and in this area both above and below, have old, very old (designed to 1970-1980 King County septic standards/rules), and are pre-failing, failing, have failed, needed repair, and are failing yet even again. Lukas mentions this where he lives, and the "odor" is a very hard-to -live with and withstand when it is in the area, but not clear from exactly which neighbor... taking months and years to be determined and "fixed", and then it fails again. I am aware the SPW did send out "survey" cards earlier this year to ask folks in the area about their septic and sewer interests. I have NOT seen the cards, but heard from some neighbors that they had received and/or responded to them. Also, I only heard briefly results presented at one of the SPWsd Board meetings. However, I am writing to include information that can and does affect Lukas's home and property in addition to others on 208th AVE NE nearby that house. Typically I do NOT mention nor use specific properties, so I will just stick with "homes on the South-end of 208th AVE NE" which are upgradient from Louis Thompson Road NE.

- Homes are > 200ft from any sewer or potential being available, this even includes the most recent single-house (very expensive) sewer extension nearby [for 238 208th AVE NE].
- There are at least 3+ homes that have experienced septic failures once or more, including a redo/repair of the septic field for each house separately some years ago--
and not usually at the same time nor even same year. These are all upgradient and adjacent to or near the Lukas residence

- I do not believe and am not aware that the Lukas home has had any septic failures up to the present time, however, it is likely that any remodel or other work on their home would require modification(s) or improvement to their septic system, and would need to be brought up to "current" King County Standards (if do-able).
- Revamping a septic system is NOT always able to be done, and is quite expensive itself (and SPW should learn and get #’s and $’s from King County EHS)
- Current septic systems do not have a super-long life, and are typically at or near the end of that time, revamping a system even to code may last ~20 years (?) [Again SPWsd should communicate and learn/work closely with KC EHS to get these type #’s and $’s as I believe they are not entirely different from sewer $).

I know people don't want to deal with their septic system, and paying for repair/replacement and even pumping is expensive. Plus, they don't want to pay a whole lot more for sewer, plus new/additional monthly charges for gravity systems or additionally grinder pump systems. Sewer is necessary now or in the future, but should be economical with affordable options to pay reasonable amounts over a realistic number of years.

In the case that one of these area homes, or the Lukas residence, would desire and pursue attaching to sewer and become an SPWsd customer, according to what I have learned, know, and understand the following would need to happen... and be 100% paid for by the house/home wishing to attach to sewer. Full burden is on that interested homeowner, and SPWsd benefits by not having to do sewer extensions nor costs but gains a single customer for property life.

1) Get approval from SPWsd via DEA (even though it is for just one OLDER home in 1964 Tamarack historic plat < 1977 when County 1st required drainage)
2) Per new SPWsd changes, for small projects, SPWsd could be the designer of the system versus that individual house hiring someone and SPWsd review it. [This is a good and needed change... thanks for suggesting and approving it.]
3) House would be required to install new main sewer pipe from nearest manhole (now/recently #238th 208th AVE NE) and also put in the side sewer.
4) Latecomers agreement could be requested with potential payback by other homes within 15 years, but I hear SPWsd also requires that house to pay $5K per Latecomers desired (more costs, no assurance that any connections will occur within that 15 years for any payback at all since SPW, the City, and KC hold the cards). SPWsd gains new customer, without any outlay of $ for getting sewer extended.
5) Additionally, any home wanting sewer would need a grinder pump since no gravity sewer service is nearby (but BEST design would be to flow down to Louis Thompson Road NE.) This costs additional $ to install, and to forever maintain with double monthly charges/costs for that PUMP system... into a low-pressure force main--because the Critical Link on Louis Thompson Rd NE (from 205th AVE NE up to 210th AVE NE does not exist, unless implemented soon as is currently being considered.)
6) Any home wanting sewer would also be required by SPWsd to put in a "dry" sewer main pipe to support potential future connecting to the SPWsd gravity main, when and if that ever would be installed. Current homeowner must pay more because SPWsd does not have sewer in the area. Homeowner $, SPWsd benefits.
7) All charges are required for 1 older single-family home just to have Wastewater services instead of an old septic system in an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in an R-4 development which was 60% developed by King County (126 / 212) and has continued to be developed by the City of Sammamish to 80% (40-44 new homes making it 166-170 new homes out of 212 Lots originally recorded in 1964 as an Assessor’s Plat of Tamarack... without any developer and King County not requiring any stormwater management/drainage officially until 1977, and the City of Sammamish not adopting modern code until 1-1-2017 requiring drainage review for < 5,000SF (or even < 2,000 SF) of impervious surface.

Bottom line:
- Sewer is expensive, but so is retrofitting septic and having no other option, and then doing it again every 10-20 year (or sooner depending on site conditions)
- Septic systems ALL have a finite lifetime--but sewer connections pay $ for services to SPWsd and King County from the time of connection forward (eternally)
- Sewer needs MAIN LINE connections within the vicinity to even be technically & economically viable; SPWsd to address Critical Links and main-line extensions!
- For in-fill and redevelopment where it occurs one (1) single house or vacant Lot at a time... it is just too expensive to have 1 home pay and even likely to not get Latecomers paybacks due to NO CONTROL nor influence, but needing the triad to SPWsd, the City, and KC Environmental Health Services to work as a team

NOT using GRAVITY as much as possible, wherever possible does seem to me very bad planning. I did speak to an experienced "Sanitarian of the Day" recently for about 1 hour by phone, asking a lot of questions to learn more about septics. He said there are places and cities that DO NOT ALLOW connection to the sewer via grinder pumps as they just don't want them.

I have heard that SPWsd does NOT want Lift Stations, dislikes adding them. It seems similarly to me that grinder pumps should be avoided as much as possible?! In my time listening to many meetings regularly since 2015, I believe in recent years the # of grinder pumps in the City of Sammamish has increased from like 450 to 580 or more (off the top of my head)... [and I am glad that SPWsd has made decisions to keep owning/maintaining them as individual ownership/maintenance would be a true nightmare!] Plan gravity Sewer basins with gravity Stormdrainage basins. SPWsd needs to implement sewer mains in areas that don’t have them but have been built out and/or are increasing buildout via infill. Ensure $charges are not so extremely high that an individual home needing connection has to pull/put in sewer a long way, put in pumps, add dry main connections, and provide potential connections to other homes nearby... but never see any $ returned for that. A related outcome of that is older more affordable and naturally affordable homes will be demolished and replaced by giant, new, expansive McMansions and statistics show Sammamish has a great # of SFR.

ALERT: THERE HAS NOT BEEN ONE MENTION FROM STAFF NOR THE BOARD COMMISSIONERS ABOUT THE POTENTIAL FOR GRANTS $$$. I see that King County Wastewater has and does grant $ for Stormwater projects... I have not researched but believe that getting Grant $ for Louis Thompson Road (petition for public County road 1915) is possible and even probably likely. There are certainly many other grant opportunities as well saving $ for all of us.
2023 is a time for septic to sewer conversion discussions, for figuring out ways to finance things affordably knowing that septic systems don't fail all at the same time and repaired/replaced septic systems were expensive and folks won't want to attach to sewer until they have to... so attaching has to wait precariously until septic systems fail and are diagnosed as such... in the meantime adversely affecting neighbors and the environment.

Close communication, cooperation, and ensuring code and regulations work together are needed by SPWsd, the City of Sammamish, and KC EHS.

Lukas Stankiewicz email dated 11/14/2022 referenced previously:
I just found out that there is a public meeting on the Tamarack area sewer/septic situation. I'm a resident (since 2011) of 204 208th Ave NE and have seen many septic systems around me fail over the years (most recently we started smelling sewage again and I think it's one of my neighbors again...). The situation on this whole hill is a disaster in general. I'm not an expert in none of these areas (water flow, septic, etc) but even I can tell you that we are sitting on a time bomb and probably already creating ridiculous amounts of pollution just due to the runoff and dead drain fields. I understand runoff is not an issue of focus for SPWater but the septic situation and lack of sewer most certainly is. I know there is a plan to re-do Luis Thompson Rd with a bike lane and etc. I am hoping that SPWater also puts in a link for sewer as well so we can finally have a way to connect for something that doesn't involve a $20k+ bill. I feel like this part of the hill has been left un-cared for since we're a small subset of homes and potentially don't amount to much in the bigger scale of things. I am writing this email and hoping at least someone can sympathize and find a solution, or, for the love of whatever is important to you please STOP developing on this hill until basic infrastructure and sanitation issues are addressed (neighbor just told me that a 16-home development is in the plan for a lot at the end of 208th... that's just crazy). Thank you!

Response: This comment provides several statements regarding the use of septic systems, which are noted.

The comment further appears to address methods for sewer extensions driven by individual lots, and potentially neighborhoods. A recent single lot sewer extension on 208th Ave NE is referenced as an example that was completed as a Developer Extension Agreement (DEA) project. The comment further references a specific potential Capital Improvement Project (CIP), a sewer main along Louis Thompson Road.

District policies that apply to the different project types can be found in Section 6.4 Mainline Extension Methods:
- Section 6.4.1 Developer Extension Agreements
- Section 6.4.2 Utility Local Improvement Districts
- Section 6.4.3 Neighborhood Sewer Program
- Section 6.4.4 Capital Improvement Projects

Sewer design preferences can be found in Section 6.3.1 Wastewater Design Criteria, where the preference for gravity systems is clearly stated, along with the potential use of Interim Facilities, which are most frequently low-pressure sewer mains.

Policies that address challenges associated with provision of sewer service to areas that have already been built with septic systems are included in Section 6.7 Financial Philosophy, and
more particularly in Sub-Section 6.7.2 Policies Regarding District Facilitation of Infrastructure Installation.

As a matter of practice, District staff work regularly with City of Sammamish and King County Health Department personnel regarding those land use agencies requirements for transition from septic system to sewer connections.

The attached email from Stankiewicz, previously sent to the District on 11/14/2022, is in reference to a specific project, the sewer main along Louis Thompson Road. In addition, concern on the potential cost associated with connection to a sewer installed along Louis Thompson Road is raised. Please see the response to comment NONAGENCY 2, which raised similar issues.

**Change Location: No change**

**NONAGENCY5:** Mary Wictor #2 (email dated 12/30/2022)

I am emailing this in as Public Comment on behalf of a Tamarack resident on 211th PL SE, who has made inquires to SPWsd about Sewer in recent years for his area.

Victor and his family had asked SPWsd about Sewer for their home and area. They own a "double-lot" where an older home exists with the next lot still vacant.

Dated November 12, 2021, SPWsd had printed handouts for him to use in surveying his area along 211th PL SE for interest in sewer service.

**Questions, concerns, and requests he has are** the following (and he did listen to the SPWsd meeting 11-14-2022 about sewer that had a PUBLIC MEETING.)

1. Will the materials provided by Jay Regenstreif, P.E., Planning Engineer dated 11/14/2021 to Victor still be valid to use for getting to neighbors in the area? [During that meeting I had asked generally "if folks who had materials" such as these... "would the Sewer Connection Costs still be valid?"--the answer was "Yes".]. **Note:** The gravity flow from 211th PL SE to Louis Thompson Road SE appears to be able to use EXISTING sewer main in Louis-T going then thru Montage, etc. However, there is NOT a sewer main into/up/along 211th PL SE that exists. There are only about the first 4-5 homes on 211th PL SE east-side having sewer now.
2. What is the status of the SPW Water Main along 211th PL SE and NE, regarding its type, size, age, and life expectancy?
   a. Would that water main servicing all the homes need to be (or should be) replaced too? [Also, I recently learned that this roadway of 211th PL SE & NE was most likely paved 1992-1994.] It would seem cost effective to have water, sewer, and stormdrainage dealt with at the same time, and pave/repave the asphalt portion just once.
   b. Do the costs provided by SPWsd include re-paving of the asphalt roadway surface... and also the side sewer pipe installations for all those area properties?
   c. What are normal, current time, connection charges for an individual home: side-sewer to house including proper abandonment of any septic components?
3. Based on current/upgraded/any replaced Water main and future potential Sewer main locations, is there a plan to allow Stormwater Drainage assets to work and/or be implemented?
At present, stormwater runoff from street and homes just flows through soils or is piped into the uphill roadside on the East, with conveyance through roadside ditches, and culverts under driveways. There are NO catch basins, but likely needed sooner than later, & no areas with detention. Flooding occurs at Louis-T Rd.

Where might Storm be located along with fire hydrants + Water and Sewer to provide best long-term services? Is joint planning well-thoughout to reduce costs? [I know from researching that 10ft laterally is required by SPWsd/DOE between water mains and sewer mains, with sewer usually a bit deeper in case of leaks. Also, stormwater drainage systems need to be 3ft from Water mains and/or Sewer mains. Tamarack has private road ROW of 60ft but reduced by topography. And, it has never been clarified if stormdrainage can be implemented BETWEEN a Water main and a Sewer main because 10ft later separation does space > 3ft + 3ft... and mathematically that only gives 4ft in-between which to install underground stormwater drainage pipes.]

4. The number of copies provided by SPWsd to distribute to area residents/owners is like over 50. Victor speaks English quite well, but he is NOT a native American English speaker. What type of support might SPWsd be able to provide, and/or create/change/adopt new policies to help not just allow or facilitate, but to really encourage sewer to be installed in older areas growing by infill and having older septs that will need replacement or connection to sewer sooner than later? For example, it is overwhelming to consider that one individual might go door-to-door for 50-75+ people and talk to them individually and handout SPWsd info? Can SPW help in any of the following ways:
   a. Mail the info to property owners of prospective sewer connections?
   b. Set up a generalized meeting to help initially provide information and education folks about septic vs conversion to sewer?
   c. Provide help getting sewer costs down (consider using grants, CIPs, Neighborhood Sewer Programs, etc.) & explanation to folks about how to afford/finance?
   d. Hold a meeting in-person somewhere suitable, and/or offer ZOOM calls virtually including folks by phone so people can see, listen, and ask questions?

5. What can SPWsd do to help folks understand what it costs to have septic and keep it, versus converting to sewer sooner than later to provide long term wastewater management in the City of Sammamish to appropriate King County facilities?

Response: The Tamarack resident referenced in comment NONAGENCY5, submitted a separate standalone comment NONAGENCY3. Please reference responses to this specific potential sewer project found under NONAGENCY3.

Water main installation and replacement schedules are not addressed in the Wastewater Comprehensive Plan. Decisions regarding replacement of a water main in conjunction with a sewer main project are made on a case by case basis.

District connection charge information can be found in Section 6.8 Connection Charges. District connection charges do not include private side sewer installation costs.

The District does not have jurisdiction for stormwater, which is under the jurisdiction of the land use agencies. The District does coordinate with land use agencies when there are District and City projects located in proximity to each other. See Comments SAM12 through SAM19 for examples.
The District is not the subject matter expert on the costs for operation and care of individual septic systems. See District policy Section 6.2.5 Individual Septic Systems indicating the King County Health Department is the appropriate agency to provide this information.

Change Location: No change.

NONAGENCY6: Mary Wictor #3 (email dated 12/30/2022)

In 7 years of advocacy, I have learned about many factors that influence sewer needs.

--I keep harping on these first 3 paragraphs as I don't hear SPWsd giving any special consideration nor attention to building in highly constrained Critical Areas (which are required by the Department of Commerce / Growth Management Act (GMA) to be identified and protected, since 1990 and certainly known 1998+.) Additionally, the City of Sammamish must do and complete their Critical Areas update and adopt it by the end of 2024... it's supposed to be done every 8 years. The City is supposed to have and will be working on Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) program to reduce development pressures away from these areas.

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS for SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE (must include higher designated and/or actual zoning) The City of Sammamish incorporated 8/31/1999 and is ALL within an Urban Growth Area (UGA) Boundary--and there is NO RURAL land zoning in the City! However, for infrastructure it is extremely important to ensure areas with higher designated zoning (R-4+ vs R-1) get higher priority and also high priority given to where actual built environment [like in 1889 Inglewood] can be R-3 to R-17 depending on how many original individual 2,500SF (25ft x 100ft) 1889 paper plat Lots) are aggregated into a parcel to build [1 Lot is R-17, 2 Lots is R-8/9, 3 Lots is R-6, 4 Lots is > R-4, 5 Lots is R-3.5 etc. Much of historic Inglewood is >R-4.] [The math is 43,560SF per acre / (2,500 x # of Lots) = R-value equivalent for the actual/effective zoning in that built environment within the 1889 Inglewood Plat.] NOTE: There are 40 Vacant Lots left in Tamarack and over 160 Lots in Inglewood... so that is 200+ Lots in historic Plats that might still try to build. Can't ignore!

HISTORIC PLATs (as defined by the City of Sammamish < 1977) THAT ARE CONSTRAINED BY MULTIPLE often overlapping CRITICAL AREAS More importantly, historic 1889 Inglewood one-page "paper plat" and historic 1964 Tamarack two-page survey recorded as an Assessor's Plat (to get taxes) are unique in that comprehensive Subdivision Regulations were not implemented in WA State until 1969, and drainage was not REQUIRED by KC until 1977. There are MAPped Landslide, Steep Slopes, and multiple types of Erosion Hazard areas that are indeed CRITICAL AREAS that should NOT build nor receive growth. For Ordinance O2016-417 the City of Sammamish created zoomable .pdf 1-page maps each for 1889 Inglewood & 1964 Tamarack showing Steep Slopes and Landslide Hazard areas. The Sammamish Property Tool is online and interactive at the City of Sammamish website and can display other Critical Area overlays. Sammamish also has very important areas mapped as "drains to" areas called Landslide Hazard Drainage Areas (LHDAs) and specific & unique to our City the Erosion Hazard Near Sensitive Water Bodies (EHNSWB o verlay). Note: Steep slope hazards in the City of Sammamish are regulated as Landslide Hazard areas. No Disturbance areas in the Erosion family are also unique to Sammamish and require special code/regulations to prevent or reduce impacts to these areas.

ALERT: Critical Areas are supposed to be subtracted from land areas to take Growth for the City. Allowing and trying to Build in non-buildable areas requires RUEs and ends with one or multiple foreclosures hurting the land, the neighborhood and environment with stalled development that never really gets corrected.
HOW MUCH OF SAMMAMISH IS LEFT TO DEVELOP? (a 2016 Vacant Lands map shows BLUE parcels and is generally/roughly correct) -- FILE ATTACHED

- Land in the City seems ROUGHLY to be about 85% built-out at present with about 15% still vacant and developable—so how and where we grow is very key!

[Sammamish has too many McMansions & a very high % of Single-Family homes but not enough other different, diverse, smaller housing. Need Town Center.] More housing can be supported with less sewer pipes and costs when buildings are centralized and stacked higher/taller with services for people & businesses. Also, this type of development has a real chance of reducing Green House Gas emissions, Vehicle Miles Traveled, and overall impacts on Climate Change. Infrastructure includes roads and utilities including the THREE WET UTILITIES of Water, Sewer, and Storm. These MUST be planned and implemented together. When building occurs without sewers, or sewers are implemented without Stormdrainage, problems on that Lot or in that area develop over time, esp. downhill. [History has shown that when SPWsd and the City don’t work together to plan and implement infrastructure, road paving gets ripped up, pipes have to be moved, flooding occurs, or landslides occur due to runoff and saturation of soils in highly constrained areas receiving in-fill development while building moratoriums or lotteries hold off growth elsewhere.] These next two years 2023-2024 should encourage and will require much closer communication, for planning and growth! And King County is important for Wastewater services and also for ensuring septics will NOT be allowed to be used/ixed when sewer connections are available.

- SPWsd & the City of Sammamish must work closely to not only define current Zoning Capacity (SPW calculates for sewer & water capacity), consider upzoning, but also for ensuring that growth of external targets can be accommodated, plus the INTERNAL needs & wants can be met with optimal housing, variety and types for essential workers (Water & Sewer staff, Fire, Police, Teachers, employees for businesses, health care, staffing for services, SENIORs to stay-play-enjoy, etc.) [Affordable Housing is important but hard to attain--needs subsidies, and Housing Affordability is also missing and is much more likely to be achievable to include workforce housing, individuals, divorced, couples young or old, families, and seniors can all be served by housing suited to lifestyles, needs, and life-cycles.]

- Growth follows sewers, so planning is extremely key to serve areas currently on septic plus new development in places that have or can provide adequate infrastructure. Gross capacity does seem to be looked at with planning, but local area capacity and how to best implement sewers needs much more attention.

GRAVITY is best for flows in Sewers & for Stormwater -- look at those subbasins together and make planning and regulations use less lift stations/grinder pumps. As has been done in the 1889 Inglewood Plat, SPWsd should look for and buy easements where it makes sense to run Water and/or Sewer not in a road ROW. However, it is key to NOT use private lands to put large area sewer (or water) flows unless those are known, communicated, and maintained well with/by SPWsd. [Even if easements exist, often owners don’t know or think about planting trees, or letting things grow via natural/volunteer growth that may include large trees.] SPWsd, the City, and King County Environmental Health Services/Eastgate (KC EHS) all THREE (3) need to work much more closely together, communicate better and more often, keep better records, set-update-know-use-enforce better code-regulations-compliance to transition over 3,200 septic systems to sewer, much faster than by just default of about 40 conversions that historically happen per year (but also 15 new septics on average have been added annually per KC #’s.... so it’s really only been about a reduction on average of 25 septics per year in Sammamish. Plus, schools and churches etc are still using septic, too.)
- Educate people about septics, especially where sewer is not likely to be extended or implemented for quite awhile. Many people really don't know much about septics, the needs for maintenance, and how to properly use and protect septic systems, and avoid having problems, plus that a permit is and should be needed for repairs, etc. While this might be a responsibility of King County, NOT doing this can adversely impact groundwater, wells, streams and lakes, and cause health issues with fecal coliform, e.coli and other bacteria or viruses being transmitted via soils, flushing downgradient, etc. Outreach, education, reduce issues!

- Get current day costs to educate/compare for septics, repairs, permits, maintenance... show these next to sewer, monthly fees, and conversion steps to attach.

- Know new codes that have been adopted by the City of Sammamish starting 1/1/2017 with new stormwater code and/or amendments plus DevRegUpdates. For example, septics are NOT allowed anymore in Geological Hazard areas (landslide, steep slopes, erosion hazards) and stormwater can’t be dumped above septics. More changes are needed to protect property, avoid/reduce health risks, prevent trees tilting/falling/dying, and to ensure that infrastructure is protected.

SPWsd should look NOW at what is on the 2023-2024 City of Sammamish Work Plans and ensure that priority items from SPW and City are synergistic! [Septic-Sewer is on the list, 2024 Comp Plan is a BIG item, 2024 Critical Areas identification/protection especially for GeoHazards is vital, & DevRegUpdates etc.] What projects is the City planning to do, & what similar area projects might SPWsd have slated to try to reduce disruptions, improve services, reduce costs, etc? As I know you are aware, I give inputs via verbal and written official Public Comment early and often. Above I have tried to summarize key aspects related to Sammamish and sewer system plans and needs. For your convenience, and to encourage/aid review, here is a list of other written Public Comments I have emailed into you via adminstration@spwater.org since about the first presentations on the Wastewater (Sewer) Comprehensive Plan done by the very knowledgeable, highly experienced, and just amazing Ms. Jay Regenstreif. I offer this to ensure any one of of you have easy access to inputs/details from me.

- 12/19/2022 last 2022 Board meeting ~ Growth/Capacity & Housing work closely with City of Sammamish 12/05/2022 request main webpage BOX to show/notify folks about upcoming Hearings, or Public Meetings and timeframes/deadlines for inputs to be made

- 11/21/2022 is a key meeting I missed due to urgent family health situation, but it was on Louis Thompson Road projects/plans for Water mains and maybe sewer

- 11/14/2022 PUBLIC MEETING that was NOT recorded since it was not an official Public Hearing--I suggest the Board consider making/adopting Policy to record!

- Wastewater Comp Plan occurs only 1-time per decade. Folks need to know about it and have a real chance to give any input small or large, once or often.

- 10/10/2022 Share many things with City, & "the oddities" of Tiburon area would be key to know and have Jay Regenstreif write up as this area is very unusual

- 10/03/2022 Fall Retreat - Board (no inputs given)

- 09/26/2022 Priorities, specifics to share with City, Try GRANTs to lessen $ from all and to put in Critical Links etc for sewers

- 09/19/2022 Why GRANTs really might be sought & granted for Louis Thompson Road projects and historic plat areas (KC Wastewater grants $ for Stormwater!)
- 08/15/2022 Docket information which was submitted to the City by the 1st Monday in August annually--for septic to sewer considerations with documentation. Good for Goals, Policies, Priorities, info, etc.
- 07/25/2022 Inputs to Policies and Priorities (2nd corrected version SE)
- 07/18/2022 Need to septs to convert to sewers in key areas plus Gravity subbasins are best and avoid pumping!
- 07/11/2022 #2 Critical Areas need sewers and with TOP Priority
- 07/11/2022 #1 King County data on # of Septics and conversions

Hope this list of dates with written Public Comments made might help get to details researched, known, and applicable behind my inputs if needed/applicable.

**Response:** The comment provides several statements regarding policies and regulations that are not under the District’s jurisdiction. Land use agencies set the zoning and provide development guidelines and regulations. The determination of where building permits can or cannot be issued is under the jurisdiction of the land use agencies, as is their updates to their Critical Area Ordinances.

The District notes the availability of sensitive area maps from the City of Sammamish and further notes that certain critical area maps are provided in the Plan as Figure 1-4 Floodplain and Creeks, Figure 1-9 Sensitive Areas, Figure 1-10 Aquifer Susceptibility, and Figure 1-11 Wellhead Protection Areas and Critical Aquifer Recharge Zones.

As noted in response to comment NONAGENCY4, sewer design preferences can be found in Section 6.3.1 Wastewater Design Criteria. Additionally, easement acquisition policies can be found in Section 6.5 Property Acquisition.

As noted in response to comments NONAGENCY4 and NONAGENCY5 as a matter of practice District staff work regularly with City of Sammamish and King County Health Department personnel regarding those land use agencies requirements for transition from septic system to sewer connections, and provision of information regarding the use of septic systems.

As noted in the response to comment NONAGENCY5, the District does coordinate with land use agencies when there are District and City projects located in proximity to each other. See Comments SAM12 through SAM19 for examples. In addition, as noted in the response to comments SAM10 and SAM11, the District will be working with City of Sammamish personnel on the update to the City of Sammamish Comprehensive Plan and other areas of potential collaboration.

The prior provision of input to the District Board at multiple meetings is noted.

*Change Location: No change*
Active Agenda
Item B

Louis Thompson Hill Rd Sewer Project – Template for Future Sewer Extensions
INTRODUCTION:
The City of Sammamish is proceeding with a project to install stormwater facilities and other road improvements along Louis Thompson Road. In conjunction with the City of Sammamish project relocation of existing District water facilities along Louis Thompson is also proceeding.

The topic today concerns the potential to also install gravity sewer mains along Louis Thompson Road and into the Louis Thompson Sewer Basin.

District staff previously provided information regarding this potential project to install sewer in Louis Thompson Road on May 2 and November 21, 2022. This is a continuation of that discussion.

District staff will be requesting Board input on what information they will need to determine whether to support the potential sewer project(s), and the ultimate decision on whether to pursue the Louis Thompson Sewer project in conjunction with the City of Sammamish project.

POLICY:
Board approved funding for design of the sewer in Louis Thompson Road.

2022 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan Policy Section 6.7.2

6.7.2.1 Support Sewer Extensions when Funds Available for
   a. Transition customers (septic to sewer), especially in fully developed areas.
   b. Interagency projects providing an opportunity for significantly reduced project costs for transition customers.

BACKGROUND:
The City of Sammamish project extends in Louis Thompson Road from East Lake Sammamish Pkwy to 210th Pl SE. The Louis Thompson Road sewer project under consideration almost matches the City project extent, starting from the existing sewer at 205th Ave NE and extending to 210th Pl SE.

In addition, there is potential for a project or projects extending beyond Louis Thompson Road, into the side streets extending from Louis Thompson Road into the Eden View, Eden Creek Estates and Tamarack developments.

A map showing the project area follows.
BUDGET STATUS:

Sewer Cost Estimates
Louis Thompson Road Spine Sewer $3,587,500
Side Streets Sewer $2,599,250
Total Sewer $6,186,750

Sewer design and installation costs would be charged to the Sewer Local Facility Charge Fund

Sewer LFC Fund (12/31/2022) $5,499,098

The total estimated project costs exceed the current Sewer LFC Fund balance. To fund the entire work in the Louis Thompson Sewer Basin additional funds would be required, and there would no Sewer LFC Funds available to support additional projects.
**Associated Water Replacement Projects**

Replacement of the water main in Louis Thompson Road is expected due to conflicts with the proposed City stormwater improvements: This funding for this water main has been approved by the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louis Thompson Road Water Design Services</td>
<td>$180,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Thompson Road Water Replacement Estimates</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Louis Thompson Road Water</td>
<td>$2,180,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If sewer is installed in the Side Streets, there will also be some associated AC water main replacement. There is 4,250 LF of AC water main in the side streets. Decisions on the water main replacement would be made in conjunction with future sewer designs, if pursued. Using the District’s Standard Water LFC as a basis for the AC water replacement costs, the following are potential added costs for water main replacements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Side Street Water Replacement Estimates</td>
<td>$2,388,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water main replacements would be charged to the Water Main Replacement Fund.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Moving forward with any of the Louis Thompson Basin Sewer will required inclusion in the current Capital Plan associated funding to be approved.

**OPTIONS:**

Discuss the following, and get Board direction for next steps:

- Project Implementation Strategies
  - Full Basin Project
  - Separate Spine + Side Street Projects
- Project Financing Methods and associated Cost Recovery Expectations
- Determine what information/input the Board needs to make a decision on whether or not to proceed with a sewer project(s).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

NA

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Presentation will be provided at the Board Meeting.
Reports