



KITTITAS COUNTY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Kirk Holmes, Director

2011 Road Standards Update Citizen's Advisory Committee

MEETING MINUTES
July 12, 2011
2:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order:

KIRK HOLMES opened the meeting at 2:30

II. Attendance:

<i>Citizen Advisory Committee</i>		<i>In Attendance?</i>
Kirk Holmes, Chair	Public Works Director	Yes
Doug D'Hondt	County Engineer	No
Christina Wollman	Planner II	No
Urban Eberhart	Agricultural community representative	No
Marc Kirkpatrick	Encompass Engineering & Surveying	Yes
Brenda Larsen	Fire Marshal	Yes
Pat Deneen	Developer	Yes
David Gerth	Citizen	Yes
Dan Valoff	CDS Planner	Yes
Terry Clarke	Cattleman's	Yes
Kelly Bacon	Engineer Technician I	Yes

Public in attendance:

Vernon Swesey, Central Cascades Land Co.
Catherine Clerf
Chad Bala, Terra Design Group

III. Minutes

Minutes from the June 28, 2011 meeting were reviewed. BRENDA moved to approve the minutes as written. DAN seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

IV. Old Business

KCC 12.01.095 (B) Second Access: KIRK explained that the access topic was tabled to ensure that Fire Marshal BRENDA had the opportunity to discuss a few topics before we

moved on. KIRK recapped the previous discussion of the possibility to use the variance process for the second access easement width and stated that PAT was going to present everyone with some suggestions because he didn't like the idea of using the variance process, but had not received anything as of yet. PAT stated that he emailed those thoughts out and would find the email to resend. KIRK stated that he would like for BRENDA to weigh in on her requirements of the second access, in specific the width. KIRK stated that currently the width is 60 foot easement. BRENDA stated that the fire code speaks solely to the minimum requirement for apparatus and that is the 20 feet. The Fire Code is pretty silent in regards to easement width requirements. PAT stated that most of his suggestions revolved around when the second access requirement is required. The second access is not an issue when you're on your own property, but when you have to go across someone else's land and cause the least amount of impact and get the property owner to agree to the easement. If it is not a transportation corridor issue and depending on where you are, 30 foot easement should be sufficient for a 20 foot roadway on second accesses. BRENDA stated that 20 foot is all that the fire code requires. PAT stated that your primary access is going to be paved. KIRK stated that he would like to have CHRISTINA add the language into the code in a different color so that everyone can compare and be clear about what direction we are going to go.

KCC 12.04.080 Driveways

KIRK stated in regards to driveways, the suggestion had been made for joint use driveways to be increased from 2 to 3 lots and 2 lots have an easement width of 20 feet and 3 lot have a 30 foot easement requirement. The group needed BRENDA'S input on the easement issues. KIRK stated that he did some research on the engineering aspect of this issue and he didn't see any reason these changes would not be appropriate other than if it was at all inconsistent with the Fire Code. BRENDA stated that she did not see any issues with these changes and that they would not be inconsistent with fire code. Title 20 states that if you have 150 foot or greater driveway length than your driveway width is a minimum of 16 feet and less is a 12 foot minimum.

KCC 12.01 General Information:

i. 12.01.130 Variance

KIRK stated that the proposed variance language needed to be discussed. KIRK would like to read CHRISTINA'S notes into the record a little bit in regards to the variance procedure.

CHRISTINA'S notes: The changes to the Variance section came from KCC 17.84 for zoning variances. The road standards are clear on the process. The code 12.01.010 states in the third paragraph that the standards cannot provide for all situations. They are intended to assist but not substitute for confident work by design professionals. It is expected that land surveyors, engineers and architects all bring to each project the best of skills from their respected disciplines. These standards are also not intended to limit unreasonably

any innovative or creative effort which could result in better quality better cost savings or both. Any proposed departure from the standards will be judged however on the likelihood that such variance would produce a compensating or comparable result. Additional, earlier in the same section the standards speak to this specific and consistent road design element. The opinion of the Engineering and Planning section of Public Works is that the road standards remain specific and consistent and that it is not appropriate to place if/then conditions options and workaround within the code. The code should remain specific and equal to everyone and variances issued when appropriate.

KIRK stated that these are the issues we would like to have the discussion about. PAT stated that he had two questions. This section of the code E states that financial gain cannot be the grounds for a variance. PAT believes that almost every time you have a variance, there is money involved. KIRK stated that what we have seen in the variance process is that people come in and don't have the money to build to the standards and staff doesn't believe that this is an appropriate use of the variance process. If there are topography issues or a geological issue or they are changing something because of something on the ground that is what we are trying to get to. PAT understood that just because you don't have enough money you shouldn't be able to build a 16 foot road rather than the 20 foot but believes that the way that it reads needs to be clarified. MARK stated that one of his comments was to place "AND" after each of the requirements so that it is not the only requirement. BRENDA stated that she had that written in to her standards from one of the previous meetings. KIRK stated that he will have CHRISTINA provide in writing you with a little more feedback on F specifically of 12.01.130

ii. 12.01.160 New County Roads

Kirk explained that this section has been changed to allow the BOCC to state their desire to accept a road onto the county road system prior to the road being constructed. We came up with the term provisional acceptance to mean the road will be accepted after it is constructed provided the road is constructed and designed as required. PAT had a question in regards to (A) the county will not normally consider taking on internal subdivision roads. PAT asked if this is saying that the county only wants to take on arterial type roads now. KIRK stated not necessarily. If you are proposing a development and you have internal roads and don't want to take care of them and would like the county to take them on for maintenance, then your development plan is going to include that information. This tool allows you to understand how that process is going to work. This is laying out the process in which would bring your roads on system.

PAT asked if this is going to take place with the BOCC at the preliminary level. KIRK stated that the BOCC has made it pretty clear that this is not where they want it. KIRK believes that some provisional acceptance can be made at the time of plat approval. If from the start of your project you know you want the county to take on your roads, the county is going to know that during the preliminary application process. Once you get

the preliminary plat approval that would give you some assurance of some provisional acceptance of that concept. The BOCC wants to maintain the public process for bringing roads on system.

PAT wanted better clarity in regards to development and those who want to keep it all private, is there a trigger there to say no we want this road. KIRK stated that we need to consider new language on Paragraph A: General (pg. 15) beginning. Considering county public, private, and county maintained on system. DAVID stated that we need to clarify who makes decision. If the road is important to the transportation system this may be road we would like to have. PAT stated that with the economy the way it is we need language allowing the county to deny taking a road on system at this time but being able to take it on in the future. KIRK stated that we need to make this section a little more flexible.

iii. 12.01.180 Joint Review

KIRK state that this section was updated to clarify the process of reviewing a project with other agencies. This section requires the applicant to begin their conversations with the other agencies early in the process and requires some sort of documentation prior to preliminary approval from that agency that states a permit has been issued, will be issued, does not need to be issued, or that the agency is ok with the County issuing preliminary approval. This documentation is required prior to preliminary approval to ensure that the other agency is aware of the project and that the applicant is aware of the agencies requirements and that no major issues arise late in the process.

MARK stated that this is inconsistent with a few other things. Not necessarily with the requirements.

PAT stated that the Forest Service, BLM, Northern Pacific, Plum Creek, Boise Cascade all had easements across each other's land. Now they are privately owned and segregated. It is very difficult to get into contact with the Forest Service.

BRENDA stated that she has sent out letters to other agencies that state that if response has not been received within 30 days they will continue as if no comments have been received from your department/agency. If appropriate maybe under like C we could add wording to accommodate such issues. PAT stated that they will just say nothing and put a halt to the process. If Public works won't move forward until they receive something from Forest Service. BRENDA stated that her process didn't involve anyone federal and there may be RCW or WAC that apply. VERN stated that if owner has an easement there shouldn't be any issues. KELLY stated that what is received from the forest service is not an easement or a permit; it is usually in the form of a maintenance agreement. KIRK asked if these FS roads should be identified in the Long Range Transportation Plan. FS just wants to hold on to their access. MARK it is more than that. They want that access but don't want to maintain it. PAT believes this should come out during the SEPA process. PAT stated that these Forest Service roads are important to the future of Kittitas

County's Transportation system. KIRK stated the challenges that he sees, if this is an identified long range transportation corridor for the county that ensures public access into public land, it has been a mission of this particular board and I think of boards of the past that the county is going to be on the hook for brining certain roads on the system potentially in the future. The issue is going to be that the county is not going to take on a road that they only own an easement for; it would have to be fee simple ownership. PAT doesn't see why this is an issue for the county. KIRK stated that we need some feedback from the BOCC, we need to take this to a study session - Easement and FS Road Dedication.

PAT stated that we need to place a respond by time in our standards or leave it in the SEPA process. KIRK stated that SEPA doesn't apply to everything.

MARK had a concern with it saying preliminary approval and if you go to 12.01.095 where it talks about approved easement permit. This section states Final Approval. These go hand in hand. PAT asked what an approved easement is. MARK stated maybe it should read valid rather than approved easement. He thinks this is meant to mean compliant with county standards. KIRK stated that he would like to put this on a study session.

KIRK stated that on these roads and access points, the county needs to take a more proactive approach or stay out of it. If we stay out of it, we cause more issues. PAT stated that we need to dedicate some time with the Forest Service. Get a group together. BRENDA stated that is such a large issue, we should finish the Road Standards this year and then look at dedicating a group to working with the Forest Service.

KIRK stated he would like to table Joint Review until next meeting. Keep on the agenda. Kirk will have discussion with the board a little bit. Keep the document as is or maybe modify a little bit and come back to this discussion.

KIRK recapped the discussion of leaving it at SEPA, remove the language out of C that talks about preliminary approval and the discussion about easement rights for the property needs to be attached to preliminary approval.

iv. Other

KIRK was unsure what other was for. He is going to move forward to Definitions.

KCC 12.02 Definitions

Everyone would like to have more time. There are multiple locations that we need to take a look at. KIRK asked if there were any questions or concerns with definitions. David stated he submitted a couple of changes. PAT stated that Land Activity Development is too vague. KIRK stated that we need to add language to the definition to clarify. We will leave Definitions open throughout the process.

V. NEW BUSINESS

KCC 12.06 Stormwater:

KIRK asked if anyone is ready to speak about stormwater or if everyone needs further time to review. MARK asked who the audience is on this chapter. If we are addressing the typical person coming in asking for storm water requirements or for the design engineer who designs for a living. If the standards has one paragraph referring to the Storm Water Manual. DAVID stated that you can get the manual online very easily. KIRK stated that Public Works can make that manual available online. MARK stated that there is conflicting flow control requirements between the manual and the counties requirements. Let the road standards tell the general public the timing of permit/plan and maintenance and allow the technical portion to refer to the storm water manual.

KIRK under general requirements we need to refer them to the Eastern Washington Storm Water Manual. MARK stated that he will take a shot at summarizing this section to refer to applicant to.

PAT asked when do you have to have a storm water design done, is it prior to preliminary? KIRK wants to make the timing very clear. MARK stated that the DOE manual has a preliminary process where you do a level 1 analysis and identify if your development is in a flood hazard area that would create downstream problems and what we could do is submit that with our preliminary and then the county engineer knows how to condition the plat.

DAVID stated that there is a lack of the word treatment. This should be in here also to address stored waters. MARK stated that less is more with this. IF you can reference the manual then you don't have to restate the Eastern Washington Manual. As written there are things that don't match up and it needs the reference the manual. It would then be up to the developer and the design team to support their design with the Eastern Washington Manual.

KCC 12.01.095 Irrigation

KIRK stated that this issue needs to wait until the July 26th meeting because the irrigation districts have been invited to attend.

VI. Business not on the Agenda

VERN asked about the Bonding of Private Road Improvements and if the after two years

the county will pull the bond and whether or not the applicant can apply for an extension past those two years. KIRK stated yes that is the direction we are headed and that there will be further discussion on this topic.

VII. Next Meeting Agenda

Irrigation, bridges, public road design criteria, accesses.

VIII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by KIRK HOLMES at 4:40 pm.