



## MINUTES

### Special Joint Meeting

#### PLANNING POLICY COMMISSION & ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD

6:30 p.m. - Thursday, March 10, 2022

*Alternate Meeting Format: On March 6, 2020 the Mayor declared a civil emergency due to the outbreak of novel coronavirus (COVID-19). On March 24, 2020 the Governor issued Proclamation 20-28 relating to the COVID-19 emergency and open public meetings. The proclamation has been extended. Due to these factors, the meeting was held using a remote meeting platform.*

---

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m. by Chair Faul.

Planning Policy Commissioners Present:

Chair Faul, Vice Chair Voiss, Commissioners Bader, Lewis, Monahan, and Zaragoza

Absence: Commissioner Milligan (Excused)

Environmental Board Members Present:

Chair Davidson, Vice-Chair Finch, Board Members Anderson, Fisher, McQuilliams, Newcomb, and Wall

Absence: Board Member Hazra (Excused)

Board Members Bollapragada (Unexcused), Hintz (Unexcused), Lebeiko (Unexcused), and Madan (Unexcused)

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

Staff Present: Emily Appleton, Engineering Manager, CP&D  
 Millie Dhaliwal, Director, CP&D  
 Christen Leeson, Senior Planner, CP&D  
 Stephen Padua, Public Works  
 Stacy Vynne McKinstry, Sustainability Manager  
 Julie Wartes, Environmental & Regulatory Program  
 Administrator, PWE  
 Douglas Yormick, Assistant Planner, CP&D

CHAIR FAUL stated that the Planning Policy Commission would turn cameras off and not participate in topic deliberations.

## 2. Approval of Minutes

Minutes were on the agenda but not addressed until the end of the meeting.

## 3. Public Comments (General) (00:04)

- Kyler Danielson, Land Use Project Manager with Lakeside Industries, stated that comments would be regarding the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA). There are concerns that the map designations coincide directly with property lines while the aquifer functions underground and data has not been seen in support. Danielson requested that the information be posted online for the public. Changes are inconsistent with zoning code and the Development Agreement that Lakeside Industries has signed and agreed to with the city of Issaquah in 2013. The agreement recognized the continued existence of Lakeside Industries at the site. By making the site a non-conforming use, making changes to the plant to improve environmentally will become more difficult. Lakeside Industries would like to continue to make modifications and improvements with the future in mind. Danielson stated that Lakeside Industries is happy to talk with staff regarding the issue.
- Hendrick (Hank) W. Haynes, Canyon Rim resident, stated that a written comment had been submitted in advance with a video link. Sensitive areas along State Route 169 are of concern, the Cedar River, along Cedar Grove Road and along Issaquah Creek. Slide zones and potential use of coal mine areas for underground vertical farming and avenues for future thoroughfares are of concern as well. Haynes stated appreciating the position of Lakeside Industries.
- Susan Neville asked how proposed changes will work and if new code changes have been discussed in past meetings. Neville asked if Planning administration would consider taking an existing development and comparing old and proposed code side by side in order understand changes.

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

- Connie Marsh stated that city staff has worked on the code for a long time, hoping to move forward, but reminded Commissioners and Board Members that the mayor and city Council have not put the item on a timeline so that there will be ample time for review. The draft is out, comments being submitted, and Marsh asked how comments made at this meeting will be incorporated into the draft for city Council, as well as when changes will be occurring, the feedback loop. Topic changes should be known prior to breakout discussions.

CHAIR FAUL asked that presenters speak to the question of Marsh regarding the feedback loop.

#### 4. Public Hearing

##### a) Proposed Amendments to Title 18 Natural Environment (D)

- Wetlands, Streams
- Fish and Wildlife
- Conservation Areas
- Critical Aquifer Areas
- Geological Hazard Areas

*Presented by Minnie Dhaliwal, Director, CP&D*

**(00:14)** Dhaliwal stated there will be further opportunities to provide public comments. Deliberation will occur at the March 24, 2022 meeting and elements needing additional work can be identified. The elements will be shared with city Council and any further direction will be taken. Comments compiled prior to completing the draft and responses are included in the packet. After the draft has been released, all comments will be tracked in a matrix. The next Public Hearing is scheduled for summer 2022 with a consolidated draft. Presentations at this meeting will be illustrated with examples and graphics.

**(00:18)** Jim Johnson with Golder Associates presented slides regarding geologically hazardous areas and proposed code changes.

**(00:31)** CHAIR FAUL opened Commissioner and Board Member questions regarding Geologic Hazard Areas.

VICE CHAIR FINCH asked if there are instances when the type of development occurring has the potential to change the landslide risk of a slope, and if so, how this would be addressed in code. Johnson replied that critical area studies are required for a Development Application that has a critical area on or suspected on the location. During peer review of the critical area study, a check is made to assure all appropriate critical areas have been addressed. Appleton replied that applications are verified with maps to identify critical areas impacted by the application. A geologic study is then requested to be submitted to assess impact. Peer review progresses after receipt of the geologic study. VICE CHAIR FINCH clarified the question with an example, if a parking lot funneling water to the bottom would be treated differently than a

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

house in terms of buffers. Johnson replied that the buffer would be required regardless of the structure. The purpose of the buffer is to retain natural state. There would then be reviews regarding any discharge of water to the crest of slopes.

CHAIR DAVIDSON stated concern regarding a possible conflict of interest, allowing surface water to be conveyed across a steep slope and asked why this would be allowed. Appleton replied that conveyance would be in a pipe, an exemption for a utility type of occurrence. Dispersed water would not be allowed on a steep slope. CHAIR DAVIDSON asked if the explanation should be better expressed in code for applicants. Johnson replied that city agencies would be allowed an exemption for conveyance but not an applicant for site development. Dhaliwal replied that the language would be examined. CHAIR DAVIDSON stated that surface water can be conveyed in a ditch or canal, not always in a pipe, and clarification is important. CHAIR DAVIDSON asked if there were a specification that lines would need to be prepared by a specialist in deep slopes or seismic areas. CHAIR DAVIDSON asked what criteria would be used to change the amount of buffer required in landslide hazard areas. Johnson replied that the intent is for applicants, geotechnical engineers, and other scientists to provide analysis of the slopes with buffer options being proposed. The analysis includes slope stability. Stability of the slope must be demonstrated to not decrease from the 50-foot buffer compared to the reduced buffer in any location where a buffer reduction is proposed, and seismic and static safety must be maintained.

BOARD MEMBER ANDERSON asked to discuss a slide which occurred recently on Newport Way, asking if design and construction of the road would have been approached differently with proposed codes. Johnson replied that the property adjacent to the road is King County and the road is city of Issaquah, with challenging cross-jurisdiction. Constructing a new road today, critical areas adjacent to the roadway would need to be identified. In this case, both steep slopes and landslide hazards exist. Stability would need to be assessed, a critical area study done, demonstration that slopes would be stable, and inclines proposed. If not stable, retaining walls, in example, or regrade would be required to make stable. Slopes greater than 40% are not allowed to be regraded. A geologic landslide can be mitigated and made stable for the roadway. There will be a structural fix put in place that will stabilize the landslide and provide catchment for other materials that may slide beyond the stabilized area to keep material off the roadway in the future.

VICE CHAIR VOISS asked why there are so many *Not Available* references in the slide presentation. Johnson replied that for liquefaction, there is no buffer because the only way to mitigate is to design for liquefaction. VICE CHAIR VOISS asked if there is data regarding availability of experts for peer reviews. Johnson replied that the consulting community has many experts in the fields needed, and while coal mine hazards have fewer experts, there are not many applications each year dealing with coal mine hazards.

BOARD MEMBER NEWCOMB asked if coal mines are filled to create more stability. Johnson replied that there has been a proposal, for the first time in Issaquah, to mitigate a severe coal mine hazard, so excavation will be done to the access tunnel with loose ground, opened to the surface and filled in, effectively eliminating the hazard.

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

CHAIR FAUL opened Public Comment. (00:48)

- Kyler Danielson with Lakeside Industries stated that finding experts for peer reviews can be very challenging, particularly those who can speak on steep slopes. Expert report expense can be very high in some cases. Danielson stated never having seen a peer review process in any of the counties or cities in which Lakeside operates. Peer review is typically used for reports that will be published and widely relied on rather than a site-by-site assessment. Experts qualified with information, knowledge and background should be considered qualified to comment without a peer review. Danielson recommended that the peer review requirement be removed.
- Connie Marsh stated having watched geologic struggles in Issaquah for many years. Best Management Practices with peer reviews and even double peer reviews for steep slopes and other landslide situations still have not eliminated landslides. Upheaval from earthquake faults and glacial formations create a geologic underpinning, creating more difficulty in Issaquah than most other places to understand what is happening underground, even with Lidar. Marsh stated being in favor of peer review even though landslides still occur. Criteria used in reports need to be more stringent. When access roads are allowed requiring variances, critical area studies will be needed in addition when cutting across vulnerable steep slopes and hazard areas.
- Susan Neville asked if the Director would make the final approval regarding criteria for changing buffers after analysis, if trees that lose stability due to other uprooted trees can be protected, and if there are any protections for homeowners if a slide occurs within a development. The final question was if the Planning Policy Commission was asking questions currently.
- Mary Lynch stated that in recent years, the city has internally peer reviewed issues, and problems have been found regarding less than thorough studies. Lynch stated being in favor of keeping peer reviews, with an outside review by people familiar with the area as well. Concern had been expressed by the public at development meetings for the Newport Way slide area. A complete study of the hill had not been done and after a short wall was built, the slide occurred. Time deciding whether the slide was a city or county issue has left citizens inconvenienced. Issaquah touches county areas in many places and this should be addressed in code to identify how slides will be handled, who is responsible and how the issue will be prevented in the future.

CHAIR FAUL closed Public Comment.

CHAIR FAUL asked CHAIR DAVIDSON if the Environmental Board should deliberate on topics separately or after all presentations have been completed. CHAIR DAVIDSON replied that separate topics would be best. CHAIR FAUL asked the Planning Policy Commission to turn off cameras.

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

(01:00) CHAIR DAVIDSON opened Board Member Comments from the Environmental Board Members.

BOARD MEMBER MCQUILLIAMS stated that how the proposed code compares to requirements of stormwater standards should be examined by staff; current standards inform that dispersal must occur first.

VICE CHAIR FINCH stated appreciating coal mine standards and stated that clarifying likelihood, variety and size could be defined as used for avalanche warnings. FINCH asked if there is a common language that could be used.

BOARD MEMBER FISHER stated that peer review should be included, a very specialized expertise. Issaquah should encourage development.

BOARD MEMBER ANDERSON stated that the Environmental Board Members are not scientists and wondered how resolution to concerns from the Lakeside Industries representative can be accomplished. The city would need to determine if there is a problem and find resolution. The role to decide if peer reviews are based on best science available is not for the Environmental Board Members.

BOARD MEMBER WALL stated not having any comments beyond what is already being discussed.

CHAIR DAVIDSON stated being concerned about a reduction in buffer sizes. Fifty feet of buffer is not a lot to ask on a steep slope or landslide hazard area. Consequences of earth movement has been seen, A 50-foot buffer reduced to 10-feet is significant and should not be an option in code. Reducing to half seems more reasonable, 25-feet. The responsibility will lie with the city to pay for and deal with a slide. Peer reviews should continue, but staff should examine criteria for reductions and long-term consequences over the next 100 years.

(01:08) Yormick gave the next presentation, Wetlands.

CHAIR FAUL opened Commissioner and Board Member questions regarding Wetlands.

(01:15)

BOARD MEMBER FISHER asked how revised buffer sizes had been decided on, low to high. Yormick stated that a publication from Ecology, 2014 Wetland Guidance, had been consulted. Best available science had been used to develop the information.

CHAIR DAVIDSON asked if redevelopment next to a stream would be required to pull back from previous impact, out of the wetland. Yormick replied that there is currently code for non-conforming structures within buffers, allowing outward expansion although there are criteria required. The Wetland buffer cannot be expanded into unless over existing impervious. CHAIR DAVIDSON asked if redevelopment can be addressed in proposed code, an opportunity to benefit a property owner and protect habitat. Yormick replied that non-

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

conforming development will be address in a future topic. Dhaliwal replied that the non-conforming chapter has information on critical areas code and what grandfathered rights are. Comments can be taken now, but a deeper dive will be made in the Process and Procedures section. If there is policy direction at this time, comments can be factored in.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked why no appropriate decibel level has been set regarding activities generating noise, page 66, C2, as is done for lumens, and gave an example from within a neighborhood. Yormick replied that the issue can be examined. Dhaliwal replied that noise regulations within the city adopt the Department of Ecology noise standards which addresses decibel levels, but the city does not have a special decibel level. Decibel levels generally are decided considering neighboring uses and time of day. The next issue is enforcement, and there are exemptions such as a vehicle driving past. The regulation is more qualitative than quantitative. The issue can be examined further. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked for clarification regarding diverting toxic waste, page 66, C3; that while toxic waste is to be diverted away from wetlands, does this indicate that toxic waste is going elsewhere. COMMISSIONER LEWIS continued with page 66, C4, regarding treatment on-site of storm water run-off, and asked how many sites both private and public have the capacity to accomplish treatment. Yormick replied that the stormwater engineer would be able to address. There are stormwater vaults with filter cartridges that can remove many pollutants before entering the city system, or flow path. COMMISSIONER LEWIS stated realizing that treatment on-site can be done but asked if treatment is being done and if the code would need to be rewritten to what is happening. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked how, on page 67, C5, the penetration of 150-feet was arrived at for pesticides, in example, as 150-feet does not appear to be within the values hoped for in the proposed code. In high industrial areas, buffer is 190-feet. Yormick replied that 150-feet is standard, Dhaliwal replied that best available science shows that pollutants can be removed within 100-feet before reaching a body of water. COMMISSIONER LEWIS stated having access to conflicting information to the point and encouraged staff to be sure that best science as opposed to cut and paste from other standard State regulations is used. Dhaliwal replied that the issue becomes enforcement realistically. COMMISSIONER LEWIS replied that enforcement would be very realistic if a priority for the city. Other cities across the country are actively banning pesticides completely. The city has an opportunity to take a firmer stand. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked why the in-lieu-of-bank remains an available option. Yormick replied that if there is no way to avoid a wetland impact, mitigation needs to occur. Under current codes, mitigation can occur on-site, off-site or the in-lieu-of bank. The priority now of the Army Corp of Engineers is wetland bank. Proposed code reflects how mitigation can occur when there are unavoidable impacts. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked for clarification regarding page 68, the Wetland Mitigation Ratios table. Yormick replied that the ratios are for when there are direct wetland impacts and not buffers. If one acre has been impacted and another wetland must be created somewhere else, four acres are required for every one acre. If some functions of the wetland are being altered, there are ratios as well. Ratio is determined by wetland category, and size and types of impacts. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked if the Wetland Mitigation Ratios have been pulled from previous code or updated. Yormick replied needing to see a comparison. COMMISSIONER LEWIS stated that seeing comparisons would be helpful to know if code is maintaining, exceeding, or updating. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked about the duration of the

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

monitoring period on page 71, 5C. Yormick replied that when there are impacts to either the buffer or wetland, there is a monitoring period to ensure that mitigation done is correct and functions as expected. Buffer mitigations are typically five years and for direct impacts 10 years. The applicant must submit a monitoring report to the city every year based on the original mitigation report approved by the city. At the end of the period, bond would be released, and maintenance and monitoring responsibilities of the applicant are then over. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked if monitoring periods are a carryover from previous code or updated. Yormick replied that monitoring times are the same. The Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Ecology require 10 years for direct impact.

VICE CHAIR FINCH asked how the presence of invasive species and trash impacts a habitat score. Yormick replied that trash is not necessarily considered. When filling out the wetland rating form for habitat, plants on-site are analyzed. Potential habitat connecting further out then adds to the score. VICE CHAIR FINCH asked how significant blackberries contained within a site would be to a habitat score. Yormick replied that there would be decrease in habitat. VICE CHAIR FINCH referred to page 43 of the Environmental Board packet, section E, plantings in the buffer, that non-native plants can be used in the buffer if the same function is served; other areas require native species and asked why non-native can be allowed in a buffer. Dhaliwal replied that a pre-existing road may not be appropriate for a particular species, more flexibility for those uses. VICE CHAIR FINCH stated reading the section differently and may need further clarification. VICE CHAIR FINCH asked for clarification regarding a situation when a monitoring period for impacting a buffer has ended and the property owner removes plantings and put down grass. Yormick replied that the situation would then become a code enforcement issue and when discovered, the applicant would be worked with to restore the site with the same monitoring process beginning again. VICE CHAIR FINCH asked what the level of staffing and pro-active monitoring is currently. Yormick stated that there is one code enforcement officer as well as inspectors and residents bringing issues to the attention of the city.

CHAIR FAUL reminded the Commissioners and Board Members that the time at this point was only for questions and not deliberations.

BOARD MEMBER MCQUILLIAMS asked if, a developer cannot meet LID means to treat stormwater, would a treatment train vault system in the buffer be allowed to protect water quality. Yormick replied that a vault would need to be contained within the developable site area outside of the buffer.

CHAIR FAUL opened Public Comment. (01:46)

- Connie Marsh stated that Integrated Test Management, in a different chapter to be reviewed, is mentioned in both stream and wetland situations. Pesticides and herbicides are mainly ruled in those categories. The format of the code now makes finding anything difficult, and under one topic four different areas have been splintered into. Having all information in one place per topic is suggested. The Wetland chapter is a collection of old and new code, inconsistencies, and duplications.

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

There is no clear explanation regarding wetland versus wetland buffer. The more language inserted, there is more conflict and difficulty to hold people to the rules. Maintenance and monitoring should always be 10 years and no wetland buffer will be self-sufficient in five-years. There are no statistics regarding whether wetlands have thrived over time. Maintenance should occur in perpetuity, with city enforcement power and access to view the areas as in Bellevue. Issaquah wetlands have deteriorated over time. If required by the Army Corp of Engineers to have a mitigation bank, a bank should be established for Issaquah to keep wetland restoration within the city. The wetlands need to be improved and not only buffers.

CHAIR FAUL asked the Planning Policy Commission to turn off cameras and CHAIR DAVIDSON opened Board Member comments.

VICE CHAIR FINCH stated that the city needs to avoid incentivizing possible mismanagement of wetlands. VICE CHAIR FINCH stated agreement with Marsh regarding monitoring requirements. Wetlands will not last without an aggressive approach as well as the right to monitor after the initial monitoring period, and the issue should be included not only in Title 18 but within the operating plan and budget.

BOARD MEMBER FISHER stated that it is good to see the city move toward the ecology rating system and guidance. Ratings are on the conservative side. BOARD MEMBER FISHER stated that the period system is sufficient but maintenance such as regular watering and reduction of invasive plants should be a requirement.

BOARD MEMBER ANDERSON stated that banking should be banked against wetlands within Issaquah or very close, remaining local in ecological issues.

VICE CHAIR FINCH stated that the questions of CHAIR DAVIDSON regarding encouraging movement out of buffers and how redevelopment can improve the location of structures would be an opportunity to incentivize wetland and buffer improvements.

CHAIR DAVIDSON encouraged same buffer widths on existing developments if possible.

**(01:58)** Yormick continued with Streams, Fish and Wildlife, and Conservation Area presentations.

**(02:06)** CHAIR FAUL opened Commissioner and Board Member questions but not deliberation.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked why many numbers remain the same regarding stream buffer widths on page 75. Dhaliwal replied that the update is focused on aligning with Fish and Wildlife categories, updating definitions and changes to some buffer width requirements. The Department of Ecology approved the Shoreline Master Plan last year. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked for clarification about language on page 78, trails through buffers, how vegetation can be removed to create a trail, but vegetation then needs to be added somewhere else.

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

Dhaliwal replied that Shoreline Management Act goals include recreation and water dependent uses. The Growth Management Act focuses on protection. Trails have been discussed in three areas: steep slopes, wetlands, and stream buffers. If a trail is put in, any impact still needs to be mitigated. COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked if the code is carryover, an alignment with State standards, or new. Dhaliwal replied that previous code did allow trails within the buffers and the code is aligned with State requirements for mitigation from impacts.

VICE CHAIR FINCH asked if there were any streams which would have more protection than others under the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) portions of code. Yormick replied that the SMP has different allowances for water dependent uses. There is more leniency along the lake in Issaquah because the SMP adopts a critical areas ordinance as an appendix. Stream standards in the critical areas ordinance become the SMP. There are instances, because of the ways the Shoreline Management Act and the SMP are structured, that allow for greater use along the shorelines of the State versus streams or wetlands. VICE CHAIR FINCH asked if potential specific uses and not buffers were affected. Yormick replied that in the SMP, public water access is important but not discussed in the critical areas ordinance. For the lake shore there are allowances for paths to the water and water dependent uses. The code for streams is the critical areas code adopted by appendix. VICE CHAIR FINCH asked for clarification regarding Stream Channel Stabilization. Yormick replied that in the SMP there is a provision for bio-stabilization or soft shore, using both natural and manmade elements to create a more natural shoreline to provide stabilization, versus a concrete wall. Most stabilization will likely occur along Issaquah Creek, governed by the SMP. VICE CHAIR FINCH asked for clarification that there are not specific requirements and Yormick replied yes.

BOARD MEMBER NEWCOMB asked why Cougar Mountain is not in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Corridors in Lake Sammamish. Yormick replied that Tiger and Squak have State managed parks or natural areas. The map can be expanded to find further corridors.

CHAIR DAVIDSON asked if analysis has been done regarding buffers and flood way. Yormick replied that Issaquah Creek is out of the flood plain most of the time but there are areas where the 100-year flood plain extends beyond the 100-foot buffer. There are stream buffer requirements but also flood hazard requirements, examined together. There is a Flood Plain Engineer to examine flood hazard permits. CHAIR DAVIDSON asked how groundwater interacts in critical areas. Yormick replied that there will be an opportunity to address in the Storm and Surface Water Master Program, but at this stage the actual critical area and not groundwater is being addressed. Critical Area Recharge Area (CARA) will be examined next.

CHAIR FAUL stated that the meeting was running over scheduled time, and that Public Comment would now be opened. (02:20)

- Connie Marsh stated that State Law requires that the code update include best available science. There is confusion regarding when standard codes are in effect and when mitigation or management reports are necessary with Fish and Wildlife guidance. Another question is language regarding the buffer not being reduced to less than 100 ft. on buffer averaging. Marsh stated disagreement that best available

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

science buffers are being achieved. The Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area needs to be an overarching chapter and not tucked into the streams chapter. Marsh asked if a Biodiversity and Habitat Corridor is the same as Species of Local Concern with slightly different language. Streams should be considered riparian management zones as areas surrounding and buffers are the habitat that feed the fish. Using the word *streams* only creates an inappropriate visual.

CHAIR FAUL closed Public Comment and asked the Planning Policy Commission to turn off cameras. CHAIR DAVIDSON opened Board Member Comments. (02:24)

VICE CHAIR FINCH stated agreement with moving people off buffers similar to wetlands with redevelopment, and proactive monitoring. Stream stabilization could be consistent across all waterways.

CHAIR DAVIDSON stated agreement with Marsh that water areas are overarching, including the SMP, the stream section and Fish and Wildlife. A holistic approach would be encouraged, not coming across in the code as presented.

(02:26) Yormick continued to the final presentation regarding Critical Aquifer Areas.

(02:30) CHAIR FAUL opened Commissioner and Board Member questions.

BOARD MEMBER MCQUILLIAMS asked for clarification regarding where wells exist in Issaquah. Wartes replied that all Issaquah drinking water wells as well as most of Sammamish are along the I-90 corridor. Color areas on a slide were mentioned but locations not identified for the audio recording.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS asked if a hydrogeologic study had been conducted by staff or a consultant. Wartes replied a consultant.

VICE CHAIR FINCH asked for clarification regarding why an area had become significantly larger since the last study. Wartes replied that the old study was done in 2004 based on soil boring pathology understanding at the time. The new study was done in 2019 in a 3D modeling world. Hypotheticals were employed. Factors are recharge, how groundwater moves through the soil, and the amount of time needed to get to wells.

CHAIR FAUL opened Public Comment. (02:34)

- Connie Marsh stated that the proposed code is an upgrade with little further work necessary.
- Kyler Danielson stated hoping that written comment would be read and the impact to a Development Agreement with Lakeside Industries considered. The new proposals would be inconsistent with the contract and zoning.

## 03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission &amp; Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

CHAIR FAUL closed Public Comment. (02:36)

Dhalliwal stated that a meeting can be arranged between Danielson and staff to provide additional information and a conversation regarding the Development Agreement.

CHAIR DAVIDSON opened Environmental Board Member comments.

CHAIR DAVIDSON stated appreciating the regulations, a step forward in direction and requirements.

Padua stated that there had been meeting minutes to approve at the beginning of the agenda which had not been addressed.

#### Approval of Minutes (02:38)

CHAIR FAUL asked if there were any comments or changes to the February 10, 2022 meeting minutes and there were none. The minutes were approved.

CHAIR FAUL asked if there were any comments or changes to the February 24, 2022 meeting minutes and there were none. The minutes were approved.

CHAIR FAUL stated that the Environmental Board could leave the meeting.

## 4. Reports

### a) Council Update (02:39) *Presented by Stephen Padua, Public Works*

Padua stated that city Council met in person for the first time since the beginning of the pandemic. There is not yet a plan for other Boards and Commissions to meet in person but will be a next discussion. The Housing Action Plan implementation grant was approved. The next Planning Policy Commission meeting is on March 24, 2022 regarding the entire Natural Environment topic.

Padua stated that COMMISSIONER LEWIS had a comment regarding Point of Order.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS stated that the Reasonable Use Exemptions portion of the packet had not been covered and asked if staff would present in-depth at the next meeting. Dhalliwal stated that further information can be provided, and that a hand-out in the response to community comments had been emailed to Commissioners. COMMISSIONER LEWIS stated that the topic should be discussed in a public forum at the March 24, 2022 meeting.

03-10-22 Special Joint Meeting Planning Policy Commission & Environmental Board Meeting Minutes

7. **Adjournment**

With no further business to conduct, CHAIR FAUL adjourned the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Garza, LLC  
Recording Secretary