



Agenda
Planning Commission Workshop
Wednesday, April 8, 2015
City Manager's Conference Room | 975 George Washington Way

Commission Members: Chair Madsen, Vice-Chair Wallner and Commissioners Berkowitz, Boring, Clark, Palmer and Wise

Liaisons: Council Liaison Lemley
Staff Liaison Planning and Development Services Manager Simon

Regular Workshop - 7:00 p.m.

Call to Order / Attendance:

Business:

- I. Continued Discussion of Stormwater Retrofit Program
 - Rick Simon, Development Services Manager
2. Discussion of Code Amendments Relating to Vendors in City Parks
 - Rick Simon, Development Services Manager

Special Meeting - Immediately Following the Regular Workshop, Approximately 7:45 p.m.

- I. Consideration of a Property Surplussing Action Regarding .73 acres of an Existing Trail Corridor Located North of the Columbia Community Church, East of Venus Circle and West of Bellerive Drive.

Adjournment

The next Planning Commission Workshop is May 13, 2015

The next Planning Commission Meeting is April 22, 2015

Richland City Hall is ADA accessible. Council Chamber parking and access is available at the entrance facing George Washington Way. Requests for sign interpreters, audio equipment, and/or other special services must be received 48 hours prior to the Planning Commission Workshop by calling the City Clerk's Office at 942-7388.



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM COVERSHEET

Meeting Date: 04/08/2015

Agenda Category: Business

Prepared By: Rick Simon, Development Services Manager

Subject:

Continued Discussion of Stormwater Retrofit Program

Request:

Key 5 - Natural Resources Management

Recommended Motion:

None

Summary:

At the Commission's last regular meeting, the Public Works Department presented its Stormwater Treatment Retrofit Program report. The Commission heard a staff presentation and public comments and determined to continue the discussion onto this workshop. Staff has not prepared any additional materials beyond those that were included in the Commission packets from the March 25th meeting.

Attached is a table listing the various alternatives and providing a cost benefit analysis. The Commission had indicated that each member should choose their preferred alternatives from this list. At the workshop we can compile the individual lists to help form the Commission's recommendation.

Also attached is a copy of correspondence received from Ellen Murphy and David Hostetler.

The Battelle scientist who has volunteered some time in reviewing this program as well as the consultant that prepared the report have both been invited to attend the workshop.

Attachments:

1. Table of Stormwater Retrofit Outfall Projects
2. Comments from Murphy & Hostetler



STORMWATER RETROFIT OUTFALL PROJECTS

Alternatives & Cost Benefit Analysis

OUTFALL NAME	TREATMENT SYSTEM	CNST COST	RANK 5=Best 1=Worst	O & M COST (annual)	RANK 5=Best 1=Worst	TREATMENT Effectiveness	RANK 5=Best 1=Worst	IMPLEMENTATION DELAYS (i.e. Corp of Eng property)	RANK 5=Best 1=Worst	CHANGE TO EXISTING FEATURES (i.e. Leslie Grove Park drain fields)	RANK 5=Best 1=Worst	Construction IMPACTS	RANK 5=Best 1=Worst	Rank	COMMENTS
RICHARDSON RD OUTFALL	Pond Infiltration	\$136,100	5	Low	5	High	5	Port Easement (\$0)	5	Pond	2	—	5		
SPROUT STREET OUTFALL	Drywell System	\$76,200	3	Mod *	3	Med	4	—	5	Underground	5	Traffic Delays	2		
FERRY STREET OUTFALL															
Ferry St Outfall Alt 1	Pond Infiltration	\$91,400	5	Low	5	High	5	CORP (+\$50k + 6 Mo.)	1	Pond	2	—	5		
Ferry St Outfall Alt 2	Drywell System (4)	\$146,500	3	Mod *	3	Med	4	—	5	Underground	5	Traffic Delays	2		
SAINT STREET OUTFALL															
Saint Street Outfall Alt 1	Pond Infiltration (WTP)	\$212,000	5	Low	5	High	5	—	5	Pond	2	—	5		
Saint St. Outfall Alt 2	Trench Gallery (Soccer Field)	\$462,000	2	Mod *	3	Med	4	CORP (+\$75k + 6 Mo.)	1	Underground	5	Park Closed	2		
Saint St. Outfall Alt 3	Trench Gallery (WTP)	\$478,000	2	Mod *	3	Med	4	—	5	Underground	5	—	5		
Saint St Outfall Alt 4	Drywell System (51)	\$2,315,000	1	Mod *	3	Med	4	—	5	Underground	5	Traffic Delays	2		
Saint St Outfall Alt 5	Linear Bioretention (122)	\$2,801,000	1	High	1	High	5	—	5	Reduced street width	2	Traffic Delays	2		
Saint St Outfall Alt 6	Infiltration Trenches (32)	\$1,326,000	1	High	1	Med	4	—	5	Underground	5	Traffic Delays	2		
Saint St Outfall Alt 7	Contech Storm Filters	\$786,000	2	High**	1	Low	3	CORP (+\$50k + 6 Mo.)	1	Underground	5	—	5		
Saint St Outfall Alt 8	Curb Bump Outs (378)	\$4,492,000	1	High	1	Med	4	—	5	Reduced street width	2	Traffic Delays	2		
Saint St Outfall Alt 9	Snyder Pond + Contech Filters	\$1,116,000	2	High**	1	Med	4	CORP (+\$50k + 6 Mo.)	1	Pond + Underground	2	Traffic Delays	2		
PARK STREET OUTFALL															
Park St Outfall Alt 1	Dispersion Infiltration	\$75,300	5	Low	5	High	5	CORP (+\$50k + 6 Mo.)	1	Saturated in Rain Events	3	Park Closed	2		
Park St Outfall Alt 2	Pond Infiltration	\$113,200	3	Low	5	High	5	CORP (+\$50k + 6 Mo.)	1	Pond	2	Traffic Delays	2		
Park St Outfall Alt 3	Drywell System	\$158,500	2	Mod *	3	Med	4	—	5	Underground	5	Traffic Delays	2		
SWIFT Blvd LID System	Pond + Swales	\$336,300	5	Low	5	High	5	—	5	Pond + Swales	2	Traffic Delays	2		

* Low ongoing cost, high end of life replacement

** Annual cost of Filters

April 1, 2015

To: Richland Planning Commission
From: Ellyn Murphy & David Hostetler
203 Enterprise Dr., Richland
Re: Saint Street Outfall Stormwater Project

As homeowners whose property abuts the Saint Street Outfall Alternative 1, we have the following concerns:

1) At the planning commission meeting on March 25, 2015, the City distributed a table for *Stormwater Retrofit Outfall Projects, Alternatives & Cost Benefit Analyses*.¹ This analysis lacks rigor and is highly biased. For example, for the estimated construction cost, using the range for Saint Street alternatives from \$212K to \$4,492K, Alternative 2 would also be a ranking of “5”, not “2.” On implementation delays, why is \$75k and 6 months equal to a 1 for the CORP properties? \$75k is not much in the big picture. Six months delay matters to whom? For such a highly qualitative table, the assumptions must be clearly stated.

I believe that the only useful information in this table is the estimated construction cost and the changes to existing features. The other categories in the table are highly subjective. O&M costs were not determined, yet Alternative 1 receives a “Low” or 5 best ranking. This ranking contradicts a concern from the City’s consultant report² that the low elevation coupled with surcharge from the pond may require frequent sediment removal from the storm water pipes in this area:

*A concern with this location is the amount of surcharge that would take place. Stormwater would surcharge from the pond, in the influent piping and flow splitter manhole, as well as the main conveyance piping. Contributing catch-basins have surface elevations near the maximum water level of the pond, as shown in Figure 3-4... With surcharging taking place frequently, sediments may be deposited throughout the conveyance lines increasing the frequency of maintenance for the system.*²

“Treatment Effectiveness” cannot be determined unless the storm water runoff has been analyzed and we know which contaminants need to be removed. Construction impacts are also overstated for anyone familiar with the area; e.g., Leslie Groves Park will not be closed because of construction at one soccer field. Traffic delays are not noted for Alternative 1, yet the engineering diagrams show road construction on Saint Street and the removal of 7750 cubic yards of excavation, which presumably will be hauled from Saint Street.

For this table to be useful, the city needs to add a rigorous cost estimate range for O&M and life cycle costs, as well as, potential costs associated with property damage to homeowners.

2) The Saint Street stormwater plan³ confirms the concerns of property owners near the proposed Saint Street Outfall Alternative 1. From the engineering diagrams, all of the flow

¹ *Stormwater Retrofit Outfall Projects, Alternatives & Cost Benefit Analyses*. Table distributed by Public Works at the City of Richland Planning Commission Meeting, March 25, 2015.

² *Technical Memorandums for Richland Storm Retrofit Evaluation*, 2011, HDR Engineering, Inc.

from the 300-acre drainage intersects at the manhole just outside our back gate. This flow runs to a manhole at the south end of the green space with a small decline in elevation. To date, this low elevation has not caused a problem with homeowners, even those of us with basements, because the soils are free draining.

In a letter dated January 15, 2014 from Jay Marlow to the Department of Ecology, he specifically states, that the City's *"basic percolation testing was completed that led us to believe native soils were free draining and would not be expected to meet the requirements of the SWMMEW"* (Storm Water Management Manual for Eastern Washington). As a result, the city is proposing to add a sediment layer to create a "pond" according to the "changes to existing features." What has not been addressed is how this pond feature will impact nearby homeowners. Will the aesthetics of the infiltration pond lower property values or result in actual water damage to homes? Hydrology dictates that a pond will create a mound of groundwater below the surface creating flow towards the surrounding homes – a reversal of the current flow towards the river.

The 300-acre drainage would be the largest of operating stormwater outfalls for the City of Richland.⁴ The other areas that approach this size include the Queensgate Dr./Duportail St (180-220 acres) that drains mostly commercial (the surface of the outflow is coated with a black oily substance). The Columbia Park Trail & Steptoe St drainage (285 acres) and the Leslie Rd near Rachel Rd (150-190 acres) drain large areas with water diverted to wetlands. How will the surface of the current green space be altered by Alternative 1? Will it be similar to an industrial pond, a new wetlands, or remain the grass green space it is today? The final design has great impact on the homeowners and must be addressed, even if it is just a simple artist's rendition.

3) Serious consideration should be given to Saint Street Outfall Alternative 2, trench gallery soccer field. The elevation difference between houses on Harris Street and the soccer field is great and any overflow will flow to the river, not nearby houses. The cost difference with Alt 1 is trivial when one considers potential problems to homeowners and M&O costs. Furthermore, there are no safety risks to public - no ponds for toddlers to fall in and no health impacts from pond water (e.g., mosquitoes). All pollutants are contained at depth, not at or near the surface.

Finally - I know that the city does not want to analyze the stormwater for fear that the contaminant levels may be reportable. As if ignorance is better than dealing with a real problem. On the flip side, if analyses indicate that the contamination of the runoff is minimal, then one could argue that the City is wasting taxpayer money by building these stormwater projects. At the least, the site selection should be delayed until measurements can be made!

³ URS Technical Memorandum, Saint Street Stormwater Plan, March 10, 2015, NR04 Up-Basin Stormwater Retrofits for project 3376497.

⁴ City of Richland Updated Stormwater Treatment Retrofit Memorandum, URS, April 10, 2014.



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM COVERSHEET

Meeting Date: 04/08/2015

Agenda Category: Business

Prepared By: Rick Simon, Development Services Manager

Subject:

Discussion of Code Amendments Relating to Vendors in City Parks

Request:

Key 6 - Community Amenities

Recommended Motion:

Summary:

Parks Department staff are working with the Parks and Recreation Commission to amend the regulations regarding the operation of park concessionaires. The attached draft has been presented to the Parks Commission in a workshop but the Commission has not yet developed a formal recommendation yet.

This is an opportunity to discuss these proposed amendments and potentially to look at the broader issue of mobile food vendors operating throughout the City.

Attachments:

1. Proposed Rules for Park Concessionaires

RMC Requirements for food vendors

23.42.185 Portable food vendors.

Whenever permitted, portable food vendors shall meet the following standards:

- A. Only food and/or beverages are allowed to be sold. No other retail sales are permitted.
- B. No outdoor storage of pushcarts or other equipment used by a portable food vendor is permitted.
- C. Portable food vendors shall operate only during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.
- D. Portable food vendors shall comply with all local and state public health and safety regulations.
- E. Vendors must operate in such a fashion to avoid creating congestion on public streets or sidewalks. If operating on a public sidewalk, portable food vendors must ensure the free passage of pedestrians or vehicles. The net passable sidewalk width of any public sidewalk shall not be reduced below four feet.
- F. Portable food vendors shall not place pushcarts or other equipment within a public street.
- G. All portable food vendors shall provide a waste receptacle at all times. [Ord. 28-05 § 1.02].

23.06.780 Portable food vendor.

“Portable food vendor” means the vending of food and/or beverages from a movable cart-type stand which is located on the same lot as, and in conjunction with, a permitted use. Portable food vending stands cannot be, must serve only walk-up customers, and may not be stored outdoors when the portable food vendor is not open for business. [Ord. 28-05 § 1.02].

23.42.051 Concessionaire operating standards.

It is the intent of this section to encourage concessionaires in city parks and other public places that provide amenities to the public and that encourage and support the public use of parks and other public places.

Concessionaries, when permitted in the PPF – parks and public facilities district, shall comply with the following requirements:

- A. All concessionaires shall have a permit, written agreement, or contract with the entity that owns the underlying land upon which the concessionaire operates.
- B. Concessionaires shall comply with all applicable local and state regulations, including those relating to public health and safety.
- C. Concessionaires shall operate within enclosed buildings, from portable vending stands or from motorized vehicles and shall comply with all standards contained within this section.

D. All concessionaires operating from portable vending stands shall use stands that comply with the following requirements:

1. ~~Stands shall not be self-propelled.~~
2. Stands shall be placed and used to serve only walk-up customers.
3. ~~Stands shall not be stored on site when not in use and must be removed from the site at the end of each business day, except when a stand has been permitted to operate for a specific festival or event for a time period not to exceed one week.~~
4. Stands that are placed on a concrete pad or similar hardscaped surface may be permitted to remain on site during nonbusiness hours.
5. Stands shall be limited in size to a maximum of 150–250 square feet in area.
6. Stands shall not operate from the same location for more than 180 days within a one-year period. for a term as established by agreement with the City.

~~E. All concessionaires operating from motorized vehicles shall comply with the following requirements:~~

1. ~~Motorized vehicles shall operate within designated parking areas only; except that beverage carts operating within a golf course property are not restricted to parking areas.~~
2. ~~No motorized vehicles shall engage in concession activities within public rights-of-way.~~
3. ~~No motorized vehicle shall engage in concession activities from a fixed location for more than a 20-minute duration.~~

F. Concessionaires shall maintain the area around their concession location free from litter and shall provide a suitable container for litter collection.

G. Concessionaires must ensure the free passage of pedestrians or vehicles and shall not create congestion on public streets or pathways.

H. Concessionaires may be permitted in the NOS – natural open space zone only at trail head facilities in accordance with the standards contained in this section. [Ord. 28-05 § 1.02; Ord. 13-08].

I. Concessionaires shall operate only during established park hours.

J. Concessionaires sales/rentals in public parks shall include but not be limited to food & beverage products (no alcohol), water sports equipment, field sports equipment, cycling equipment or other services as approved by the City that will enhance users enjoyment of the park.



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM COVERSHEET

Meeting Date: 04/08/2015

Agenda Category: Special Meeting

Prepared By: Bill King, Deputy City Manager

Subject:

Consideration of a Property Surplussing Action Regarding .73 acres of an Existing Trail Corridor Located North of the Columbia Community Church, East of Venus Circle and West of Bellerive Drive.

Request:

Key 5 - Natural Resources Management

Recommended Motion:

The Planning Commission, recommends that City Council surplus approximately 0.85 acres of unneeded City land located north of Columbia Community Church between Venus and Bellerive.

Summary:

The City is considering acquisition of 88 acres straddling the western ridgeline of Little Badger Mountain. This proposal involves a gift of land from the Bauder Estate LLC and an exchange of property rights between the City and Milo Bauder, including a .73 acre City trail corridor and an option on 10 acres of City property north of the City shops. Staff has been working this proposal for several months and discussed the concept with the Commission in January. The land that Mr. Bauder proposes to give to the City would protect most of the remaining ridge and upper slopes of Little Badger Mountain, helping to accomplish several City goals including a new trail corridor which may connect Amon Basin to Badger Mountain. The majority of this land would be zoned NOS, but a portion (10-20 acres) of the lower flatter ground would be land banked for future City use or possible resale.

The proposed exchange involves a portion of the trail corridor north of the Columbia Community Church between Venus and Bellerive. This property will need to found surplus to City needs after review by both the Parks and the Planning Commissions. The actual trail surface is in the northern portion of the 100 foot wide former railroad right of way. The City would retain at least 30 feet for the trail and approximately 100 feet on either end for storm water retention. Mr. Bauder would use the property to help expand the church grounds, but has agreed to provide and maintain a 10 foot landscape strip next to the trail.

As part of the exchange, Mr. Bauder is seeking an option to purchase, at a reduced price, a 10 acre City property at the northwest corner of Duportail and City View. This property has been surplussed by the City and is zoned for multifamily or office use. More than half of the property is encumbered by steep slopes. Mr. Bauder has agreed to limit development in these areas and has agreed to establish a trail corridor providing access from Duportail to the Yakima River.

Attachments:

1. Map of Property Proposed for Surplus



Area: 31,658.57 sq ft
Perimeter: 1,191.30 ft

VENUS CIR

GAGE BLVD

BELLERIVE DR

LANTANA

LARKSPUR

MEADOWS

50 m