

**DRAFT**

## **CITY OF SHORELINE**

### **SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

June 19, 2014  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

---

#### **Commissioners Present**

Chair Scully  
Vice Chair Craft  
Commissioner Malek  
Commissioner Maul  
Commissioner Montero  
Commissioner Moss  
Commissioner Strandberg

#### **Staff Present**

Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Gail Harris, Emergency Management Coordinator  
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Planning Commission Chair, Keith Scully, called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

#### **ROLL CALL**

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Scully, Vice Chair Craft, and Commissioners Malek, Maul, Montero, Moss and Strandberg.

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Ms. Basher explained that the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting minutes were transcribed from memory because the recording did not work. They were approved on June 5<sup>th</sup>. Subsequent to that approval, the Commission received an email from a citizen, Tom McCormick, asking that the Commission amend the minutes to include specific wording that a presenter used when delivering a staff report. Rather than amending the amendments, as they are not meant to be a verbatim account of the meeting but rather a record of actions taken at the meeting, Chair Scully suggested that the email request be noted in May 1<sup>st</sup> minutes for clarification.

**VICE CHAIR EASTON MOVED THAT THE EMAIL REQUEST BE ATTACHED TO THE MAY 1, 2014 APPROVED MINUTES FOR CLARIFICATION. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Commission approved the May 15, 2014 minutes as submitted.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Tom Jamieson, Shoreline**, said he attempted to obtain the audio recording of the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting via a public records request, but he is satisfied that the audio is not acceptable quality. He said he also had a discussion about his concerns related to the meeting minutes with Mr. McCormick. However, he agreed with Commission's decision.

### **STUDY ITEM: HAZARDOUS MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE**

#### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Harris, Emergency Management Coordinator for the City of Shoreline, advised that the City's Hazardous Mitigation Plan (HMP) was adopted in 2004 and updated in 2009. For the 2014 update, the City has joined a countywide initiative to have a King County Hazard Mitigation Plan, with each jurisdiction having an annex to that plan.

Ms. Harris explained that Federal law requires the City to have an HMP if it wants to be eligible for pre-disaster mitigation grants and post-disaster funding to help recover loss after a significant event that impacts the community and to assist in funding mitigation projects. The overall goal of the HMP is to identify and recommend projects and programs that, when implemented, would eliminate, minimize, or otherwise mitigate the vulnerability of the people, property, environmental resources and economic vitality of the community to the impacts of future disasters.

Although the original plan and subsequent updates were not reviewed by the Planning Commission, Planning Director Rachel Markle observed that Item 2.30.060.B of the Planning Commission's duties states that "the Planning Commission shall review land use management, shoreline management and environmental protection ordinances and regulations of the city and make recommendations regarding them to the city council." Because the plan deals with land use management, staff felt the Commission should review the plan and forward a recommendation to the City Council.

Ms. Harris observed that the original HMP identified 28 mitigation strategies, many of which were incorporated into the City's normal way of doing business. The current update identifies 16 mitigation strategies. Most of them are not new, but something the City does automatically. She reviewed each of the strategies as follows:

- SH-1 – Continue to maintain compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance Program.
- SH-2 – Research funding opportunities and endeavor to have an alternative power supply in place for the City of Shoreline City Hall facility by 2016.

- SH-3 – Continue the public education outreach program, using the “Map Your Neighborhood” tool to ensure communities can take care of themselves and those who live around them during a disaster event.
- SH-4 – Continue to ensure operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center and establish a backup center in a new location at the Washington State Public Health Lab where security and backup power is available.
- SH-5 – Replace the decking and improve the structural integrity of the bridge that provides the only access to Richmond Salt Water Beach Park across the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad line.
- SH-6 – Replace aging stormwater infrastructure throughout the City.
- SH-7 – Identify drainage, water quality and habitat issues within specific drainage basins.
- SH-8 – Consider opportunities for the City to participate in the Community Rating Systems for communities that participate in the National Flood Insurance Program.
- SH-9 – Study the feasibility of replacing the aging Hidden Lake Bridge (10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW) that was built on a ravine. Its structural sufficiency rating is at a point that will require replacement soon, and the City must seek opportunities for funding the project.
- SH-10 – Implement strategies identified in the City’s Climate Action Plan.
- SH-11 – Require new development to be designed and constructed to reduce or eliminate flood damage. This is something the City already does and will continue to do.
- SH-12 – Implement updated International Building and Residential Codes.

Ms. Harris advised that all of the Cities participating in the countywide plan were asked to adopt the following strategies:

- SH-13 – Where appropriate, support retrofitting, purchase or relocation of structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with properties with exposure to repetitive losses as a priority. The City does not have a lot of these situations, and the provision mostly applies to flood-prone areas.
- SH-14 – Continue to support the countywide initiatives identified in the plan.
- SH-15 – Actively participate in the maintenance strategy identified in the plan.
- SH-16 – Integrate the mitigation plan findings into planning and regulatory documents and programs.

Commissioner Malek asked if the Police Department is located at City Hall. Ms. Harris answered that the Police Department will be relocated to City Hall in the near future, and that is another reason why an alternative power source is important.

Vice Chair Easton asked if the bridge and infrastructure projects have been approved and are just waiting for funding. Ms. Harris said that repairs to the Salt Water Park Pedestrian Bridge are identified in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for 2015. The City has also allocated funding for a feasibility study of replacing the Hidden Lake Bridge, but no capital dollars have been identified yet for the actual project.

Commissioner Moss asked if the 9.2% population increase identified in the draft plan was for the state, county or just Shoreline. Ms. Harris clarified that the Washington State Office of Financial Management indicates a 9.2% increase in population for King County.

Commissioner Moss requested clarification of the language that talks about Shoreline having an income of 200% of poverty. Chair Scully pointed out that the word “rate” is missing from the sentence. Ms. Harris agreed to seek clarification from the City’s Human Service Planner, who actually wrote the language.

Commissioner Montero requested more information about the Emergency Operations Center that is discussed in SH-4. Ms. Harris explained that when the center is activated, she becomes the emergency manager. The center has only been activated on a few occasions during storms when the power has gone out. However, they have yearly practice exercises. At the request of Chair Scully, Ms. Harris briefly explained how the various units of the Emergency Operations Center work together to coordinate response to emergency situations. She invited the Commissioners to attend the next practice exercise.

Commissioner Moss noted that Table 1.4 indicates that the City’s Flood Hazard Maps do not adequately address flood plain risk. It refers to an area identified several years ago by FEMA that the City would like to remove. Ms. Harris said Denny Creek and the area to the south have been designated as a flood plain, and people living there must purchase additional insurance. The City has asked that this requirement be removed because the problems have been mitigated and the area no longer floods.

Commissioner Malek said he lives in the Richmond Beach Neighborhood where flooding during heavy rain was a frequent problem. The City successfully mitigated the problems over the past few years, and the flooding no longer occurs.

Commissioner Moss asked for clarification about whether or not the City is participating in programs to be tsunami ready (Table 1.8). Ms. Harris explained that the City was required to rate its risk based on data and history. The only tsunami that has ever hit Puget Sound occurred on January 30, 1700. The risk for a tsunami is low compared to other things like landslides, earthquakes, etc. The National Weather Service’s Tsunami Readiness Program is only available for the Washington Coast. Puget Sound communities cannot participate in the program at this time because there is no funding to provide the necessary sensors. However, the City does participate in the Storm Readiness Program. She pointed out that the properties along Apple Tree Lane represent the City’s greatest risk for a tsunami, and City representatives have met with the owners to discuss the risk. In addition, the bridge was replaced as part of the last HMP.

Chair Scully asked if the HMP accounts for potential incidents that occur outside the City’s borders but have an impact on the City. Ms. Harris said the countywide plan will allow the jurisdictions to coordinate emergency plans. She noted the landslide issues that run from Everett to Seattle. Although there has not been a landslide in Shoreline for a long time, there was a landslide in Woodway in 1987, which allowed the City’s risk level to be elevated much higher. She further noted that Point Wells is covered under Snohomish County’s plan and was not addressed as part of the City’s HMP. Chair Scully said he understands the jurisdictional issues, but the City should work with Snohomish County to figure out what needs to be done from an emergency management standpoint.

Commissioner Moss asked that the City's Climate Action Plan be included with future information provided by staff regarding this topic.

### **Public Comment**

**Tom Jamieson, Shoreline**, recalled changes that were proposed during the 2012 Comprehensive Plan update. The text was amended to highlight the fact that Point Wells is a high-risk liquefaction area. In addition, several diagrams and the text were modified to rename Point Wells from a "potential annexation area" to a "future service and annexation area." A map was also provided in 2012 to identify the high-risk liquefaction area along Apple Tree Lane, but it was cropped and did not show Point Wells. At that time, he asked that the map be enlarged to highlight the risks at Point Wells. However, he was later informed that the map would be eliminated altogether because it would be more appropriate to include it in the HPM, which was to be updated in 2014. In March of 2013, City Staff assured him that, although the HPM would not ordinarily address Point Wells, it would be included in the plan because it is now a "future service and annexation area." However, the current draft plan does not discuss Point Wells or the liquefaction risks in Shoreline. He cautioned against waiting to address Point Wells until the plan is updated again in five years.

Ms. Harris said she was never given direction to include Point Wells in the HMP. King County negotiated a contract with the consultants to be county-line-to-county-line. The same consultant did Snohomish County's mitigation plan, which addresses the Point Wells property and is available on their website.

Chair Scully said he supports the regional plan and recognizes that the City can only manage emergencies within its jurisdiction, but the plan should look beyond the City's borders to address potential impacts from neighboring jurisdictions. Ms. Harris said that both she and the Fire Department have met with Snohomish County to talk about what the City's response would be to assist in an emergency at Point Wells. Most of the current concern deals with fuel spills. Point Wells is already covered in Snohomish County's plan as a high-risk landslide and liquefaction area, and she anticipates that the City's response plan would be similar. Staff has sent information to private property owners, offering free classes on how to mitigate the steep slopes and avoid landslides.

Commissioner Malek commented that Point Wells is unique. Although it is located in Snohomish County, access comes through King County. The County contracts with the City for certain services for the property, and it seems appropriate to reiterate the City's concerns. Ms. Harris said both jurisdictions are very aware of the concerns, and several practice exercises have occurred to coordinate how each jurisdiction will respond and assist. Chair Scully suggested that language should be added to the draft plan to explain why the City's involvement at Point Wells is limited and how the two jurisdictions are working together to address potential risks. The plan should also include a map that identifies the areas that are at high risk for liquefaction, including Point Wells. Ms. Harris agreed to seek feedback from the consultant on whether language related to Point Wells could be added to the draft plan and report back to the Commission.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Szafran did not have any items to report.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

No unfinished business was scheduled on the agenda.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Commissioner Maul, a member of the Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee, provided a brief report on the recent community design dialogue for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area. He said the meeting was well attended, and citizens provided great feedback. He said he also attended the developer workshop the week before where a consultant provided an interesting presentation on the recent market study for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area. Commissioner Malek said he attended the developer workshop, as well, and appreciated the information provided by the consultant and staff.

### **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Chair Scully announced that the Commission's regular meeting of July 3<sup>rd</sup> has been cancelled and a special meeting has been scheduled for July 10<sup>th</sup>. The agenda for the special meeting will include a public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Light Rail Station Area Plan. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission will be asked to forward a recommendation to the City Council regarding their preferred alternative. A public hearing on the Hazardous Management Plan Update is also scheduled for July 10<sup>th</sup>.

The Commission expressed concern about having both public hearings on the same agenda, given that they anticipate significant public interest in the DEIS. Mr. Szafran agreed to speak with Ms. Harris to determine if the public hearing on the Hazardous Management Plan Update could be postponed to a future meeting. If not, the Commission agreed that the meeting would have to be well managed to leave plenty of time for the public hearing on the DEIS.

Commissioner Moss said she doesn't remember that the Commission held a study session to discuss the preferred alternatives for the DEIS. Mr. Szafran clarified that the Planning Commission is required to conduct a public hearing, but a study session is not mandatory. Chair Scully noted that the study session was replaced with a series of information meetings the Commissioners were invited to attend.

The Commission briefly discussed the process for the public hearing on the DEIS. Chair Scully stressed the importance of specifically inviting those present in the audience to express their opinions regarding the three alternatives. The Commission asked the Light Rail Station Area Plan Committee to meet prior to the hearing and formulate an advisory recommendation regarding their preferred alternative.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

---

Keith Scully  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Lisa Basher  
Clerk, Planning Commission

**TIME STAMP**  
**June 19, 2014**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

**ROLL CALL:**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA: 0:47**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 0:53**

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 5:43**

**STUDY ITEM: HAZARDOUS MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE: 7:56**

**Staff Presentation: 7:56**

**Public Comment: 30:30**

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 39:03**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS: 39:12**

**NEW BUSINESS: 39:16**

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: 39:18**

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING: 41:45**

**ADJOURNMENT:**