



PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING - PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA

Thursday, July 10, 2014
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber • Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Ave North

	<u>Estimated Time</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	7:00
2. ROLL CALL	7:01
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	7:02
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7:03
a. June 5 Regular Minutes - DRAFT	
b. June 19 Regular Minutes - DRAFT	

Public Comment and Testimony at Planning Commission

During General Public Comment, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not specifically scheduled later on the agenda. During Public Hearings and Study Sessions, public testimony/comment occurs after initial questions by the Commission which follows the presentation of each staff report. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the podium to have their comments recorded, state their first and last name, and city of residence. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Generally, individuals may speak for three minutes or less, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. When representing the official position of an agency or City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes. Questions for staff will be directed to staff through the Commission.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	7:05
6. PUBLIC HEARING	7:10
a. Hazard Mitigation Plan Update	
• Staff Presentation	
• Public Testimony	
b. 185th Street Station Subarea DEIS	7:25
• Staff Presentation	
• Public Testimony	
7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT	8:30
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	8:40
9. NEW BUSINESS	8:45
10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS / ANNOUNCEMENTS	8:50
11. AGENDA FOR July 17, 2014	8:52
12. ADJOURNMENT	8:55

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 801-2236

This page intentionally blank

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

**SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING**

June 5, 2014
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Scully
Vice Chair Craft
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Maul

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Paul Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Moss
Commissioner Strandberg

CALL TO ORDER

Chair 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 and Maul. Commissioners Montero, Moss and Strandberg were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 17, 2014 and May 1, 2014 were adopted as submitted.

PUBLIC HEARING: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT BATCH

Chair Scully noted that most members of the audience are present to comment on proposed Amendment 26 that would exempt the Seattle Golf Club from the clearing and grading standards in Shoreline

Municipal Code (SMC) 20.50.310, and the amendment is likely to generate the most Commission discussion. Therefore, he suggested the Commission consider it first. He also recommended that the remaining amendments be considered in bundles of 10, allowing the public to comment and the Commission to take action on each bundle before moving forward. The remainder of the Commission agreed with that approach. Chair Scully reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and opened the hearing.

Amendment 26

Mr. Szafran recalled that some Commissioners questioned portions of Amendment 26 (SMC 20.50.310), which was submitted by the Seattle Golf Club. They specifically discussed:

- ***Item 7c would allow land surface modifications, including changes to the existing grade by four feet or more.*** Mr. Szafran reviewed that the Commission discussed adding an upper limit to Item 7c instead of the proposed language, which would allow an unlimited change of the existing grade. Staff is recommending against the applicant's proposal to allow a change in the existing grade of up to 40 feet without a clearing and grading permit. Instead, staff recommends a limitation on land surface modifications of up to four feet.
- ***Item 7e would allow the removal of significant trees as required to maintain and provide reasonable use of a golf course.*** Mr. Szafran advised that staff supports the applicant's proposal to raise the significant tree retention requirement to 50%. He noted that 50% is greater than what the applicant originally proposed and greater than what is currently required.
- ***Item 7f would exempt golf courses from the tree replacement requirements in SMC 20.50.360.*** Although the applicant has not proposed any alternative language to address the Commission's concerns, Mr. Szafran said the Staff Report recommends some alternative language such as reducing the number of replacement trees, providing the trees in different locations, or paying a fee in lieu of.
- ***Item 7h is related to the stockpiling and storage of organic materials.*** Mr. Szafran advised that the applicant is proposing an amendment that would allow golf courses to stockpile and store organic materials without a permit. Currently, the threshold for stockpiling and storage is 50 cubic yards without a permit. Staff is not recommending any changes to the proposed amendment, but the Commission could choose to increase the requirement if they see fit.

Mr. Szafran explained that, to date, the City has received three public comments specific to the golf club's proposed amendment (SMC 20.50.310), and the comments are outlined on Page 9 of the Staff Report. He summarized that the comments expressed concern about offering preferential treatment to just one property owner, as well as the lack of critical area review. In addition, it was suggested that a vegetative management plan might be a more equitable way to address tree issues on large properties. Lastly, concern as expressed that because an inventory has not been done, the City does not know how many significant trees are on the property.

George Treperinas, Seattle, said the applicant (Seattle Golf Club) is trying to come up with an approach that makes sense for the City, as well as the golf club. He reviewed the comments that were

submitted in opposition to the proposed code amendment. Regarding preferential treatment, he commented that it is not fair to treat the average property owner in the City of exactly the same as a property owner of a parcel that is 155 acres in size. The club's intent was to come up with an amendment that is meaningful, under the circumstances, yet allow them to better utilize the resources of the Planning & Community Development Department. He recalled that about three years ago, the club was able to get a multi-year permit from the City to remove multiple trees. At that time, it was determined that the replanting requirements should be relaxed because of the special nature of the golf course and the code requirement that allows the club reasonable use of its property.

Mr. Treperinas emphasized that the proposed amendment is not intended to allow the club to wholesale cut trees. Although one of the comment letters suggested that the club would remove the trees from the bluff, that would not be normal or routine. As he suggested in the supplemental materials he submitted after the Commission's May 1st study session, it would be very easy for the Planning & Community Development Department and/or Planning Commission to see what is done, and there would likely be sanctions if the club breaches its duties under the terms proposed.

Mr. Treperinas pointed out that other similar municipalities (i.e. Kirkland, Snoqualmie, Sammamish, Seattle, and King County) provide that golf courses can do normal and routine maintenance and do not expound on it. He noted that he previously shared examples of routine and normal maintenance to provide insight into what things the club would be permitted and not permitted to do. He briefly reviewed the changes the club is proposing:

- SMC 20.50.310.A.7 – Introduction. As requested by a Commissioner, the words “of existing golf courses” would be removed from the introductory paragraph.
- SMC 20.50.310.A.7.c – A dump truck holds about 10 cubic yards of dirt. The club believes it needs flexibility to allow changes in the existing grade of at least 40 feet without a clearing and grading permit in order to move materials around to create fairways and greens and to store organic material so it can be reused. They are currently stockpiling sand because their supplier went out of business. This would no longer be allowed if the grade change is limited to just four feet.
- SMC 20.50.310.A.7.e – The applicant proposed two alternatives for the language in this section, one of which would change the percentage that was originally proposed from 35% to 50%. The intent is to provide flexibility so the club does not have to tax City officials with issuing a permit each time. As long as they do a good job of managing the golf course, this extra requirement is probably unnecessary.
- SMC 20.50.310.A.7.f – The proposed amendment would mandate the club to do certain things.

While they do not offer a perfect solution, Mr. Treperinas asked the Commissioners to view the changes in a positive way. In addition, the club is open to looking at other compromises.

Peter Eglick, Attorney for the Innis Arden Club, commented that there is a reason they are called the Planning Commission and not the Exemption Dispensation Committee. He said the Innis Arden Club is

concerned that the proposed amendment would abdicate the planning responsibility. He recalled that the Innis Arden Club has asked the City on numerous occasions to adopt code language that would allow for planning for large tracts. The club consists of more than 300 acres, 50 of which are open space recreational tracts with approximately 8,000 trees. They have surveyed the site and provide this information to the City each time they apply for a clearing or grading permit. He said the Innis Arden Club believes the code should allow for planning of large tracts and not special exemptions. Even if the exemption concept were appropriate, the proposed exemption is flawed and would be impossible to enforce because there is no baseline data available and the code does not require it.

Regarding the proposal to amend the tree replacement requirement, Mr. Eglick pointed out that the Innis Arden Club has spent thousands of dollars on tree replacement to meet City requirements, and it does not understand why the City is considering allowing an exemption to just one property owner. He suggested the code should include provisions that deal equitably with the replacement requirement for all large tract owners. He pointed out that, because the proposed amendment does not provide a specific definition for “golf course,” the Innis Arden Club could change its name to the Innis Arden Golf Club to take advantage of the proposed exemption.

Mr. Eglick summarized his belief that the proposed amendment is not good planning. He suggested the Commission direct staff to work with the golf club and the Innis Arden Club on a code provision that would authorize a framework for vegetation management plans that would include an inventory of existing trees and performance standards. This provision would work for all large tract owners. He noted that, although other jurisdictions allow for exemptions, the City’s Comprehensive Plan does not support the approach. The City’s Comprehensive Plan and Development Code pays a lot of attention to establishing a framework for how tree removal and replacement must occur, and there may be legal issues with the proposed amendment that would allow an exemption for just one property owner.

VICE CHAIR CRAFT MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT 26 AS PROPOSED. CHAIR SCULLY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Maul agreed that, on one hand, golf clubs should be allowed to manage their courses without having to come to the City for a permit every time they want to move dirt. On the other hand, Innis Arden has the same issue. They need to come up with something that works for all large property owners.

Vice Chair Craft pointed out that the Seattle Golf Club is unique in its location and use. It is very difficult to assess that other portions of the City could be deemed golf courses, but it is probably best to clearly define the use. He agreed with Commissioner Maul that it is important to afford some opportunity for the golf course to manage its property as it sees fit, but creating the process through an exemption rather than a defined and clearly stated process would be the wrong approach.

Chair Craft agreed that the current one-size-fits-all approach does not make a lot of sense for the golf club, and there is not enough evidence to determine whether or not it is working for the Innis Arden Club. There is no reason the golf club should have to come to the City for a permit every time they need to replace bunker sand. He is convinced they are doing their best to safeguard trees, and they may not be able to do a one-for-one replacement given the topographical limitations of the site. However, he

expressed concern that, even with the caveats and restrictions, the proposed amendment turns over all control to the golf club. The tree ordinance was passed after a lot of public comment and discussion, and the resolution was that the City wanted some control over how clearing and grading and tree retention was managed. It troubles him to allow an exemption for just this one property. He suggested it would be appropriate for the Innis Arden and Seattle Golf Clubs to work together with other large property owners to come up with a proposal that incorporates a plan rather than an exemption approach.

THE MOTION FAILED UNANIMOUSLY.

Amendments 1 through 10

Mr. Szafran reviewed each of the proposed amendments as follows:

- Amendment 1 (SMC 20.10.050) relates to the roles and responsibilities of the Planning Commission and would simply strike the language regarding quasi-judicial matters.
- Amendment 2 (SMC 20.20.012.B) provides a definition for “binding site plan.”
- Amendment 3 (SMC 20.20.016.D) updates the department name to Planning & Community Development. It also adds a definition for “Director.”
- Amendment 4 (SMC 20.20.040.P) would change the definition of a “public utility office” and a “public utility yard.”
- Amendment 5 (SMC 20.30.040) provides a reference to SMC 20.30.045.
- Amendment 6 (SMC 20.30.045) adds “neighborhood meetings” for certain Type A proposals.
- Amendment 7 (SMC 20.30.060) deletes “street vacations” from the table of Type C Actions and refers them to Chapter 12.
- Amendment 8 (SMC 20.30.085) updates the name of the Planning & Community Development Department.
- Amendment 9 (SMC 20.30.090) also updates the name of the Planning & Community Development Department.
- Amendment 10 (SMC 20.30.120) adds public comment periods for a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit.

No one in the audience offered comments regarding Amendments 1 through 10

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS 1 THROUGH 10 AS WRITTEN. VICE CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Amendments 11 through 20

Mr. Szafran reviewed each of the proposed amendments as follows:

- Amendment 11 (SMC 29.30.315) updates the name of the Planning & Community Development Department.
- Amendment 12 (SMC 29.30.340) also updates the name of the Planning & Community Development Department.
- Amendment 13 (SMC 20.30.370) deletes “units,” “condominiums” and “interests” from the definition of a subdivision.
- Amendment 14 (SMC 20.30.380) strikes “condominiums” from the subdivision categories and adds “mixed use.”
- Amendment 15 (SMC 20.30.390) deletes language from the “subdivision” section.
- Amendment 16 (SMC 20.30.480) revises the language related to “revised site plans.”
- Amendment 17 (SMC 20.30.680) strikes Item 5 related to Type C Actions, which all go to the Hearing Examiner.
- Amendment 18 (Table 20.40.130) updates the Nonresidential Use Table to add “Daycare II Facilities” as permitted uses with indexed criteria in the R-4 through R-12 zones.
- Amendment 19 (Table 20.40.140) updates the “Other Use Table” to strike “regional stormwater management utility facility” and revises the uses of a “public utility office” and/or “public utility yard.”
- Amendment 20 (SMC 20.30.320) provides indexed criteria for daycare facilities.

No one in the audience offered comments regarding Amendments 11 through 20.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS 11 THROUGH 20 AS WRITTEN. VICE CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Amendments 21 through 30 (excluding Amendment 26)

Mr. Szafran reviewed each of the proposed amendments as follows:

- Amendment 21 (SMC 20.40.320) deletes the index criteria for “public agency” and utility offices” and “public agency and utility yards.”

- Amendment 22 (SMC 20.40.600) strikes “Conditional Use Permit (CUP)” and adds “Special Use Permit (SUP)”
- Amendment 23 (SMC 20.50.020.1) adds “R-18” to the table of dimensional requirements.
- Amendment 24 (SMC 20.50.090) adds “and related assessor structures,” thus allowing additions to existing single-family homes and related accessory structures to extend into a required yard when the house is already nonconforming with respect to the yard.
- Amendment 25 (SMC 20.50.090) addresses the Commission’s concern by adding “12-foot height” back into Item C.1.b. As per the Commission’s recommendation, clarity was also added to Item F.1, setting the public space required for the commercial portions of development at a rate of 4 square feet of public space per 20 square feet of net commercial floor area. In Item J.2, the word “strictly” was inserted at the request of a Commissioner.
- Amendment 27 (SMC 20.50.440) provides ratios for bicycle facilities.
- Amendment 28 (SMC 20.50.532) identifies when a permit is required for an electric changing message center sign.
- Amendment 29 (SMC 20.50.550) provides an exemption for electronic changing or reader board signs if they do not have moving messages or messages that change or animate at intervals less than 20 seconds.
- Amendment 30 (SMC 20.55.90) changes the term “outdoor advertising signs” to “billboard signs.”

No one in the audience offered comments regarding Amendments 21 through 30 (excluding Amendment 26).

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS 21 THROUGH 30 (EXCLUDING AMENDMENT 26) AS WRITTEN. VICE CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Amendments 31 through 36

Mr. Szafran reviewed each of the proposed amendments as follows:

- Amendment 31 (SMC 20.50.600) was changed at the recommendation of the Commission to state that temporary business signs shall be limited to not more than one sign per street frontage per business, place of worship or school.
- Amendment 32 (SMC 20.50.610) updates the name of the Planning & Community Development Department.

- Amendment 33 (SMC 20.80.240) updates the reference to the “International Building Code.”
- Amendment 34 (SMC 20.80.310) renames the purpose section for “wetlands.”
- Amendment 35 (SMC 20.80.320) has a new title, “Designation, delineation and classification.” It also provides additional language for delineating wetland buffers.
- Amendment 36 (SMC 20.80.330) also provides language for delineating wetland buffers.

No one in the audience offered comments regarding Amendments 1 through 10

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS 31 THROUGH 36 AS WRITTEN. VICE CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Scully expressed concern about Amendment 31, which limits schools and places of worship to just one temporary sign per street frontage. He does not have a problem allowing additional signs around schools and places of worship during special events. Vice Chair Craft said he would like to limit the number of large temporary signs allowed per street frontage. Mr. Cohen explained that there have been problems with temporary signs throughout the City, and not just at schools and churches. It is difficult to define what is temporary and what is permanent. The proposed amendment is a step towards allowing churches and schools a reasonable opportunity to put up temporary signs.

Mr. Cohen reminded the Commission that signs are typically enforced on a complaint basis. Vice Chair Craft agreed it would be appropriate to allow churches and schools to have one large temporary sign per street frontage, but he would be opposed to allowing an unlimited number of signs. Mr. Cohen noted that, as currently written, temporary signs can only be in place for 60 days. He checked with several schools, and all indicated that the proposed language seems reasonable to meet their needs.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Continued Discussion on Amendment 26

Julie Ainsworth-Taylor clarified that the Commission’s previous recommendation related to Amendment 26 was to strike Item 7, related to exemptions for the Seattle Golf Course. The remaining amendment is a housekeeping item that would update the Planning & Community Development Department’s name.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF THE PORTION OF AMENDMENT 26 (SMC 20.60.310.A.1.b), WHICH UPDATES THE NAME OF THE PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. VICE CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Markle reported that the City Council discussed the topic of “impact fees” on June 2nd, and it appears they are looking favorably on the concept. Staff expects that an impact fee ordinance will be adopted after the Council’s break in July.

Director Markle announced that the Bothell City Manager is scheduled to make a presentation to the City Council on June 9th, regarding the new development that is taking place there. She further announced that the 145th Street Station Design Dialogue Workshop is scheduled for June 12th from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., and Commissioners are invited to attend.

Director Markle reported that there was a public meeting earlier in the week for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the 185th Street Station Area Plan, and a few Commissioners attended the event. She explained that the DEIS, itself, has not been issued. Staff hopes to release the document on June 6th or June 9th, which will allow more time than is required for public review and comment before the public hearing on July 10th. She advised that a developer focus group on the 145th Street Station Area Plan was held earlier in the day, and a couple of Commissioners attended. In addition, staff met earlier in the day with a consultant for the 185th Street Station Area Plan. The City will move forward this summer with drafting regulations that will implement the vision.

Director Markle announced that the Stay Out Drug Area Ordinance was adopted by the City Council on June 2nd. The ordinance covers the Interurban Trail and offers the City another tool to make the community safer. She also reported that staff is preparing to utilize the newly adopted Chronic Nuisance Ordinance for the first time.

Director Markle announced that a new Permit Services Manager has been hired and will start on June 23rd. Jarrod Lewis comes to the City from King County, where he has worked for the past 15 years. He served as King County’s Permit Services Manager for 6 to 7 years.

Director Markle recalled that Commissioners received notice to attend a training session for the Open Government Training Act on August 11th at 5:30 p.m. Dinner will be served, and all the Councilmembers and other City Commissions and Boards will attend. Assistant City Attorney, Julie Ainsworth-Taylor reminded the Commissioners that the training is a requirement of the new State Law that was adopted during the past Legislative session.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no reports or announcements.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran advised that the Planning Commission is responsible for conducting a study session and making a recommendation to the City Council regarding updates to the Hazardous Management Plan, which occurs every five years. This item is scheduled on the Commission's June 19th agenda, and the City's Emergency Management Coordinator will be present to introduce the plan.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Keith Scully
Chair, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission

TIME STAMP
June 5, 2014

CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL: 0:38

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: 1:03

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 1:08

PUBLIC HEARING: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT BATCH: 1:17

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 43:28

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 43:35

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: 47:43

NEW BUSINESS: 47:43

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: 47:50

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING: 47:55

ADJOURNMENT:

This page intentionally blank

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 1st meeting minutes were transcribed from memory because the recording did not work. They were approved on June 5th. 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 1st 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 1st 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.

4.b - June 19 Draft Meeting Minutes

- 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 (10th 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 145th 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 145th 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 3rd has been cancelled and a special meeting has been scheduled for July 10th. The agenda for the special meeting will include a public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the 185th 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 10th.

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:

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
DEPARTMENT: Planning & Community Development
PRESENTED BY: C. Ray Allshouse AIA, CBO, Building Official
 Rob Flaner, CFM, Hazard Mitigation Program Mgr., Tetra Tech
 Kristen Gelino, Junior Planner, Tetra Tech

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> Study Session | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation Only |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion | <input type="checkbox"/> Update | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

INTRODUCTION

The goal of the City of Shoreline Hazard Mitigation Plan 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. These identified projects and programs are termed “mitigation initiatives” and constitute the principal component of the plan. The fundamental purpose of the Plan is to guide, coordinate, and facilitate the efforts of the agencies, organizations, and individuals participating as they seek funding, authority, or other resources necessary for implementation of mitigation initiatives.

After a review of the Planning Commissions Duties and Responsibilities under SMC 2.20.060 (B), namely, “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”, it was determined that because this Plan does deal with land use management we are asking for your review. In 2004, the City of Shoreline formally adopted their first Washington State and FEMA approved Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Plan was a five year plan and it was renewed in 2009, expiring this year, 2014. The City must have an up to date FEMA approved Hazard Mitigation Plan in order to receive any post-disaster funding to help recover loss after a significant event that impacts our community and to apply for pre-disaster mitigation grants. After the initial briefing on June 19, 2014, staff incorporated feedback received from the commission and a citizen comment, clarifying the population and poverty statements in 1.2. In addition, a statement referencing the City interest in Pt Wells property in Snohomish County was added to 1.8 as well as the soil classification map at the end of the Annex as an exhibit.

BACKGROUND

The 2004 Plan identified 28 mitigation strategies. All 28 have been accomplished in the intervening five years. The 2009 plan had 26 mitigation strategies for the City to focus

Approved By: Project Manager _____

Planning Director _____

6a - Staff Report - Hazard Mitigation Update

on and we completed them as well. In 2013, we joined a King County wide initiative to have a King County Hazard Mitigation Planning effort and each jurisdiction have an Annex to their plan. To prepare the Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City signed on to participate in a Pre-Mitigation Planning Grant with Tetra Tech. The scope of work included developing all elements of the Plan, coordinating efforts with City stakeholders and key agencies, and submitting the Plan to the State/FEMA.

This update includes a review of work done to implement the 2009 Plan, an evaluation of new information as to the current hazards we face as a city and experience gained in recent events that impacted the City. Examples of those events include the severe winter snow and ice storms in January 2009 and January 2012. This Annex identifies 16 Mitigation Strategies that we will be working toward in the next five year period.

Per the requirements from FEMA on the development and renewal of the Plan, opportunity for public comment was required. The City hosted a well attended Community Meeting in September 2013, did an online survey, and has had a link to the draft plan on the City's Web site for public review and comment. Finally the Plan has received extensive review by City staff and the Emergency Management Council.

This update focuses on the City's risk assessment, which described the risks that the City is likely to experience from hazardous events. Sixteen specific strategies are identified that the City should focus on in the next five years to mitigate these risks to community members. Maintenance of this Plan lies with staff working with all of the other participating agencies as outlined in the Plan. In addition, the City uses the Shoreline Emergency Management Council as a stakeholder group to update them as to our progress on these strategies. The Emergency Management Council was established as a community based multi-disciplined administrative group, under the direction of the City Manager, to implement the emergency plans and policies established by the City Council.

The sixteen mitigation strategies identified in the Plan to be implemented over the next five year period are listed below. More specific discussion of the strategies is found in the full plan available at City Hall and on the City's web site.

Hazard mitigation action plan matrix							
Applies to new or existing assets	Hazards Mitigated	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Included in Previous Plan?
<p>SH-1—Continue to maintain compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance Program. This will be accomplished through the implementation of floodplain management programs that, at a minimum, will meet the minimum requirements of the NFIP, which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement of the adopted flood damage prevention ordinance, • Participating in floodplain identification and mapping updates, and • Providing public assistance/information on floodplain requirements and impacts 							
New and existing	Flood	2,4,10,12	Public Works	Low	Surface Water Utility Fund	Ongoing	No

6a - Staff Report - Hazard Mitigation Update

<p>SH - 2 - The City of Shoreline City Hall facility, which is approximately 4 years old, doesn't have an alternate power supply. The City will be researching funding opportunities and will endeavor to have an alternative power supply in place by 2016.</p>							
New	All Hazards	1, 3	Central Services	700,000.	CIP and other	2016	No
<p>SH - 3 - Continue to do public education outreach to our neighborhoods using the Map Your Neighborhood" tool so ensure communities can take care of themselves and those who live around them during a disaster event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the Neighborhood Associations • Utilize CERT members to assist in this outreach • Use materials from the "What to Do to Make it Through" and "Take Winter by Storm" Campaigns • Identify those homes within the neighborhoods that have vulnerable or isolated populations living in them, specifically the Adult Family Homes and Boarding Homes • Utilize Social Media and Emergency Alert Systems to communicate preparedness and emergency messaging 							
Existing	All Hazards	6, 8, 11	Community Services Division (CSD)	Low	General and Grant funds	Ongoing	Yes
<p>SH - 4 - Continue to ensure operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center and establish the backup EOC in a new location at the Washington State Public Health Lab.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify technologies that will support communications internally and externally at the EOC • Reduce the noise level in the EOC by moving the Communications Team to a new location and researching sound proofing technologies • Establish a floor plan, communications plan, and technology issues for the back-up EOC • Activate the EOC at least once a year for an exercise and activate the back-up EOC once it is established at least every 2 years 							
New and Existing	All Hazards	1, 3	CSD	Med	General and Grant Funds	EOC by end of 2015 and back-up EOC by mid-2016	No
<p>SH - 5 - Salt Water Park Pedestrian Bridge Repair - replacing the decking and improving the structural integrity of the only access to Richmond Salt Water Beach Park. This bridge is the only way to access the beach and it crosses the Burlington Northern Railroad lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides safe crossing for public access to the beach • Provides safe access for first responders to fight fires on the steep slopes and provide for rescue operations associated with medical emergencies and landslides 							
New and Existing	All Hazards	1, 3, 5	Parks	300,000.	CIP	2015	No
<p>SH - 6 - Storm water pipe replacement program - replace aging storm water infrastructure throughout the city.</p>							
Existing	Flooding, Earthquake	1	Public Works	5.28 million	Surface Water Utility	2019	No
<p>SH - 7 - Surface Water Basin Planning - identify drainage, water quality, and habitat issues within specific drainage basins, and prioritize mitigation strategies.</p>							
New and Existing	Flooding, Severe Weather	1, 5, 7, 8, 12	Public Works	730,000.	Surface Water Utility	2016	No
<p>SH - 8 - City of Shoreline will consider participating with Community Rating Systems for communities who participate in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).</p>							
Excising	Flooding	6, 8	Public Works	Low	General Fund	2016	No

6a - Staff Report - Hazard Mitigation Update

SH – 9 – Study the feasibility of replacing the aging Hidden Lake bridge on 10th Ave NW that is built on a ravine as its structural sufficiency rating is at a point that will require replacement soon. We will need to seek opportunities for funding the project.							
Existing	Earthquake , Landslide	1, 5, 8	Public Works	150,000.	Roads Capital	2015	No
SH – 10 – Begin implementing strategies identified in the City of Shoreline Climate Action Plan.							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the new water utility, consider rate structures or incentives for customers to encourage water conservation • Utilize zoning and permitting methods to concentrate new growth in proximity of services and transit. • Identify opportunities for habitat improvements to reduce the urban heat island effect and support carbon sequestration in City open spaces. 							
New and Existing	All Hazards	1, 2, 4, 6, 10, 12	Public Works & Planning	High	Funding unknown	2019	No
SH – 11 – Require new development to be designed and constructed to reduce or eliminate flood damage by requiring use of Low Impact Development techniques as required under the existing City Code.							
Existing	Flooding	2, 4, 10, 12	Planning & Public Works	Low	General Fund	Ongoing	No
SH – 12 – Implement updated international building and residential codes.							
New	Flooding, Earthquake	2, 7, 10	Planning	Low	General Fund	2016	No
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.							
Existing	All Hazards	5,7,9	Planning & Public Works	High	FEMA Grant funding, local match	Long-term	No
SH-14 —Continue to support the county-wide initiatives identified in this plan.							
New and Existing	All Hazards	4,6,11,12,13, 14, 15	City	Low	General Fund	Short term	No
SH-15 —Actively participate in the plan maintenance strategy identified in this plan.							
New and Existing	All Hazards	4,6,11,12,13, 14, 15	KCOEM City of Shoreline	Low	General fund	Short term	No
SH-16 - Integrate the Mitigation Plan findings into planning and regulatory documents and programs.							
New and existing	All	2,10	Planning	Low	Local Budget	Short Term	No

PROPOSAL & ANALYSIS

This plan has been approved by the Washington State Emergency Management Office of Hazard Mitigations and has been given tentative approval by FEMA. Final FEMA approval will come after the City Council adopts the plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Following the Public Hearing the Planning Commission will be requested to make a formal approval recommendation to City Council.

LINKS

[King County Hazard Mitigation Plan 2014 Draft](#)
[City of Shoreline Annex to the Plan Draft](#)

Planning Commission Meeting Date: July 10

Agenda Item

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Public Hearing on 185 th Street Station Subarea Plan- Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Recommendation on Preferred Alternative		
DEPARTMENT:	Planning & Community Development		
PRESENTED BY:	Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, P&CD Rachael Markle, AICP, Director, P&CD		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing	<input type="checkbox"/> Study Session	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation Only	
<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> Update	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	

BACKGROUND

The last update to the full Commission regarding light rail station subarea planning was at the April 17 meeting. Since that time, the City hosted a community meeting about the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan (185SSSP) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on June 3, and published the DEIS document on June 9. The DEIS comment period will close following this public hearing, and the Commission will make a recommendation to Council regarding the Preferred Alternative for zoning, which will be analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Attachment A contains all Scoping and DEIS comments received as of July 27.

A supplemental packet will be sent to the Commission on July 3 containing:

- DEIS comments received between June 27 and July 3;
- Additional analysis from the Clark Design Group, which has been commissioned by the City to "ground-truth" zoning alternatives analyzed in the DEIS;
- A memo prepared by OTAK explaining the DEIS/FEIS/Planned Action process, including points for the Commission to consider as they decide whether to include additional zoning changes in the Preferred Alternative; and
- A map prepared by OTAK showing where zoning changes beyond what was analyzed in the DEIS have been requested.

DEIS comments received between July 3 and 10 will be provided to the Commission in a desk packet prior to the start of the public hearing.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A- Scoping and DEIS Comments received as of June 27

Approved By:

Project Manager 

Planning Director 

Attachment A: Scoping and DEIS Comments received through June 27, 2014

Scoping comment; received February 20, 2014; from Jason Cetina, 849 NE 195th St., Shoreline

Hello Miranda & Steve.

I went to the light rail workshop this evening, and I wanted to voice a concern about a couple of the alternatives for my neighborhood.

Alternatives 2 & 3 (particularly alternative 3) sort of put the area to the north of 190th St on the east side of I-5 (the area north of North City Elementary) in an isolated situation. In alternative 3, there will be more dense zoning up to 195th on the west side of I-5, and up to 190th street on my side of I-5, but then that's it. The transition from the dense housing near the light rail station will be sort of abrupt as it goes from dense housing to the school to the woods and then single family homes. As such, I believe it will be potentially difficult to either re-sell or re-invest in this isolated little pocket. I'd urge you to reconsider the island that could be created here as a result.

If possible, I would consider rezoning all of the property north of 190th, and west of 10th (including houses on the east and west side of 10th). I would also include Sky Acres in any rezoning. This is going to be the most opportune time to reconnect this neighborhood somehow to the rest of North City, from which we are somewhat isolated.

I'd be happy to discuss this further if you are interested. Thank you for your attention to our city, and your diligence in ensuring all points of view are heard during the re-zoning process.

Regards,

Jason Cetina

Scoping comment; received March 3, 2014; from Mike Usen, King County Metro Transit

Steve,

Below are King County Metro's scoping comments on the 185th Street Light Rail Station Subarea Plan/planned action EIS:

King County Metro Transit strongly supports the City of Shoreline's efforts to leverage development opportunities near future light rail stations through subarea planning around the NE 185th Street Link Station. We believe that high capacity transit should act as a catalyst for growth that enhances the value of high capacity transit and have consistently encouraged Sound Transit to work with local jurisdictions like Shoreline to facilitate Transit Oriented Development (TOD). Preparing a Subarea Plan and Planned Action EIS will lay the foundations for a well-

planned, gradual transition of existing neighborhoods into the transit-supportive community appropriate for this corridor.

Because this is a Planned Action EIS, the following comments consist of suggestions for both the Subarea Plan and the environmental analysis, with a focus on the needs of public transportation.

Transit supportive land use: Within walking distance of the future Link station, land use should emphasize higher density housing, employment, mixed uses and community services to build transit ridership and support other non-single occupant vehicle travel. The subarea plans should contain special transit-oriented regulations and/or incentives to encourage less car-dependent lifestyles such as affordable housing with carshare and bikeshare; residential transit passes; un-bundling parking price from the price of rent, parking management, and market-based parking requirements.

Non-motorized access: Walkability is especially important in the vicinity of light rail stations, therefore all future redevelopment opportunities within the subarea should enhance the pedestrian environment including provisions such as tight street grids, safe and continuous sidewalks, grade separation for pedestrians and cyclists, lighting, wayfinding, signage and traffic calming. Sidewalks along NE 185th Street between commuter parking on the west side of I-5 and the Link station on the east side of I-5 will be particularly important. Bicycle access should be enhanced through provision of bike paths or on-street bike lanes as well as sufficient secure and weather protected bike parking near the Link station.

Local bus service: The NE 185th Street corridor is currently served by Metro's Route 348. Metro is exploring ways to provide additional connecting service to the future Link station through the study area. The Subarea Plan should prioritize transit access on NE 185th Street and other bus route arterials by including in-lane transit stops and transit signal priority for better transit flow and bus and van access to the light rail station. It should also address in coordination with the transit agencies other transit supportive elements, such as opportunities for passenger facilities and layover. It is also important to coordinate with Community Transit on plans they may have for transit service in and around the station.

Study area boundaries: The proposed subarea is a ½ mile radius around the light rail station. Due to practical walkability limitations, this distance may be appropriate for land use. However, the study area for transportation should be extended further, especially along important corridors such as 185th Street. For instance, bike access can extend to a three mile radius or greater. Some roads, particularly those east of the freeway could be subject to increased future traffic volumes generated by the station and by subarea and background growth. The plan should improve connectivity throughout the vicinity of the station between Shoreline Town Center to the west and the North City business district to the east.

Transportation analysis: The analysis should address traffic growth, increased levels of connecting bus service provided by Metro and Community Transit and improved bicycle and pedestrian travel pathways. Specifically, it should measure the impacts to peak period transit flow due to increased traffic to and around the Link station and parking facility. It also needs to identify appropriate mitigation measures to traffic growth such as ways to encourage general purpose traffic to use streets with little or no bus service in order to improve the speed and reliability of local and connecting transit service. The analysis should also address non-motorized access and safety issues including an inventory of sidewalks on arterials and local streets within at least one-half mile of the future Link station.

We look forward to continuing coordination with the City of Shoreline and Sound Transit to help address the types of transit facilities and service that will be needed to make the sub area plan successful.

Mike Usen, AICP

Senior Environmental Planner

King County Metro Transit

New phone number: 206.477.5986

Scoping comment; received March 7, 2014; from Andrew Reay-Ellers

Dear Miranda Redinger--

The other night we were discussing the way that the City of Shoreline is approaching the examination of potential zoning changes in regards to the Light Rail Station Area at NE 185th. You said that it would be best if I could submit my comments in writing, so here you go:

The city has created what is being called “bookends” for the re-zoning discussion – two end points to define the spectrum and/or range of what is being discussed and considered. One end of this range is said to be the “no change” option; and the other end is the maximum of what is being examined and considered. Because the materials from the meetings on Feb 19 + 20 are not yet posted online I do not have access to detailed specifics of this “maximum” which is being discussed; but I think that we can speak to the general gist of what that proposed.

As you mentioned, there has already been some feedback that this limit of the “maximum to be considered” does not go far enough, and that a broader scope of options should be examined. I am definitely one of those who feel that a greater allowance for growth and development should be analyzed, but to do so will require that the city increase the upper end of what is considered – to “move the bookend” further out.

On Monday you explained that a business and real estate analysis was done on the area, and the current “bookend” represents the maximum development which can be expected in this station area for the foreseeable future. You said that the results were not as large as many people expected, because this analysis took into account the fact that in the coming decade there will be some 74 (I think you used that number) different 'Transit Hubs' developing in the Puget Sound Region, so commercial and residential growth and development can be expected to be spread amongst these many areas.

I feel that framing the analysis in this way leads to calculating results which mis-judge and under-value the uniqueness of the NE185th Street Station Area. The two principle factors that should be better appreciated is the higher level of stability and permanence of a rail station; and the scarce quantity of residential properties adjacent to the stations of the Light Rail System north of Seattle.

For the first part, the probable and potential amount of development near the station of fixed-guideway transit is almost not comparable to that of a bus stop, bus station, or even a transit center. The frequency and even the very presence of buses and their routes are constantly in flux, and are subject to change or even cancellation. This impermanence creates uncertainty, and that lack of certainty leaves developers and residents unsure as to the wisdom of locating in these areas. Compare that to a Rail Station with the permanence inherent to the built and installed infrastructure. Developers, residents, and businesses can all locate within a rail station sub-area with confidence in not only the enduring presence of the station, but the predictability and regularity of the service. So any discussion of development within transit areas throughout the region needs to expect much heavier favor-ability of rail station areas. By the time Lynnwood Link is complete there will be some 22 rail stations in the Sound Transit Light Rail System, so rather than considering the potential development at 74 'transit hubs', any development analysis should focus much more on this lower number. This is especially true because although the bus system will be serving to bring riders to connect to the light rail, the strong preference of users is to locate in an area where making a connection is unnecessary. So again, the rail station areas are certain to be the much more popular sites for development, residents, and businesses.

And looking at that lower number of about 22 (not an exact number as several proposed stations are not yet certain) brings me to the second point which I feel the analysis did not properly consider – the existing condition and location of the various station area sites.

The development and build-out of the Light Rail System is principally moving north at this time. This is especially important because after downtown it will soon to be serving the second-largest contributor of riders to the system, the University of Washington. So with commuters needing to come and go from downtown, and from the university, they will look outwards at the station areas for potential places to live. Coming North out of Seattle, neither of the University District Stations have significant residential areas adjacent to the stations which exist, or have not already seen substantial development, so there is limited density growth potential there. The next station

north, Roosevelt, has significantly up-zoned (multiple blocks to 85' and 65'), and is already seeing major construction of multiple developments all while the station is still years from opening. (in fact, the growth and development seen in Roosevelt –even in a down economy-- should serve as a lesson of what can be expected.) But growth and development even in this station area is somewhat constrained – by the high school grounds next door, to the already existent high rises and business district.

Continuing to work north, the next station will be at Northgate. With the already existing huge commercial space(s) and extensive planned parking garages, there is potential for only a small amount of additional growth within its station area. With the possibility of a station at NE 130th still an unknown, the next two stations north are those which will be within the City of Shoreline – at NE 145th, and NE185th – and neither of these station areas currently have any significant development. The city needs to realize, and the analysis of potential growth needs to recognize, this reality: **the most significant transit system in the region is going to stretch north from the two biggest drivers of ridership (workers downtown, and students & workers at UW), and the closest station areas with the greatest amount of potential growth are both within Shoreline.**

An examination of the two Shoreline station areas reveals a further truth: the 185th Street station has much more room and potential for growth. The 145th Street Station site is limited, just like 185th, by having Interstate 5 occupy all of the land immediately adjacent to the west – but unlike 185th, the land adjacent to the 145th Street site is further encumbered by the ramps necessary for the freeway interchange, and by the land devoted to a golf course.

With review of the facts above: the preference of development at rail stations; and the availability of develop-able land near the stations which are closest to serving the highest frequency destinations, it is no exaggeration to say that the NE 185th Street Station Area could very well see the greatest growth of any transit area in the region during the next decade. The City of Shoreline should plan accordingly, and would be wise to consider making the most of this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. Done well, the station and the surrounding area has the ability to become a dynamic and vibrant area, with many new residents and services; with the station supporting the community and the community supporting the station.

Step number one has to be to allow for the consideration of a greater amount of up-zoning which would allow for greater potential growth. Hopefully people will also remember that if Shoreline up-zones “to big”, the market will simply dictate that some buildings will be built that simply are a bit smaller than they could have been – but do too little of an up-zone and there will be pressure in the near future to re-zone again, resulting in relatively new buildings to be torn down – forcing the neighborhood to endure near-endless turmoil....

Please encourage the Planners to “move the bookend” which defines the upper end of the “maximum up-zone” option.

Thanks for your attention and consideration--

andy

Scoping Comment; received March 25, 2014; from Judy Parsons

Hi Miranda,

I talked to you about my concern with the multi-housing zoning surrounding my house in the design that has the highest impact. I would like to know statically what would happen to the small group of homes on 10th & 11th between 175th & 180th. It would seem to me that those homes would end up being an area of less desirable location. My address is 17535 11th Ave NE, and I do have this concern.

Anyway, I guess I want to know if there is any thought in just having all that property from 175th to 180th on 10th & 11th considered at least multi family zoned instead of in a dead zone.

I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Judy Parsons

DEIS Comment; received June 9, 2014; from Patrick Ducey, 19502 14th Ave. NE, Shoreline

Hi Miranda,

I reviewed the Draft EIS of the 185th street station, and all of the maps in the document show that 195th street is open from 15th NE to the I-5 pedestrian bridge. Actually, the road right-of-way between 14th and 15th is overgrown with blackberries, and is fenced off. The road right-of-way between 10th and 11th is a steep path that is essentially a muddy goat trail. Both of these locations are not slated for improvements, but map 3-3-7 on page 3-17 shows them as part of the pedestrian routes. Please ask the contractor to correct the maps, or add the cost of improvements to the budget.

Patrick Ducey

DEIS Comment; received June 9, 2014; from Jesse Walters

Dear Mrs Miranda Redinger,

Here are some of my thoughts on the North LR system.

Now that the US is experiencing more affordable gas and more available alternative fuel (electric) vehicles, our tendency here to prefer independence in travel and time management has more of a supporting framework.

It is my hope that the Pacific Northwest continues to prosper and improve without the need for growth for its own sake. Population growth is projected to level off.

When there are large scale projects it is my hope that the impact be kept to a minimum to sustain traditional neighborhoods and a connection to family and neighbor ties. If forced to choose, I go for sprawl over concentration or congestion.

Specific to this project I would like to see plans that include state of the art dedicated secure covered (perhaps stacking or elevator shelf parking pods for bicycles, mopeds and scooters, to provide an incentive for low impact transportation. A rail system generally takes up a lot of space in relation to the number of travelers per square foot on it at a given time. For more appropriate modal comparison, this statistic could be further charted by average traveler speed.

I found this picture and website in a quick Google search of anything stack parking related, the mechanical forklift style looks economical. <http://www.alibaba.com/car-stack-parking-system-promotion.html>

The rotary ones would probably be more demanding of proprietary maintenance and parts.

Access: N of 177th 8th NE avenue is wider and less populated than most adjacent N/S streets, more conducive to development/travel. I would really rather see a station at Ballinger (1/2 block off on SE side) than near traditional residential neighborhoods. A park-like setting at the station with benches, picnic tables, swings and gardens would be nice.

Regards

Jesse Walters (retired mechanic, Shoreline on 10th NE at NE 182nd).

DEIS Comment; received June 11, 2014; from Amy Walgamott

Hi Miranda,

I would like to officially submit my comments on the 185th SA DEIS.

1. Alternative 2 is the best option. It allows planable growth and density around the station but doesn't completely alter the existing neighborhood. Buildings up to 145 feet tall, such as proposed in Alternative 3, would not fit at all into this residential neighborhood that has nothing now around it at that scale. I would propose a height limit of 65 feet in Alternative 2 (this is

similar to the Roosevelt SA and is a more livable scale). (This height limit only if residents in the immediate area agree with Alternative 2 rather than 1).

2. Any public services to be removed for development should be moved or rebuilt PRIOR to being removed. In other words, if the Shoreline Center will be redeveloped, the city needs to make sure they can offer the services people receive at the location (pool, recreation center, playing fields, senior center, auditorium, park) at another place before they lose the services.
3. The city should NOT use existing green spaces within the SA to relocate services or allow any existing green spaces for redevelopment. As density grows, the city must provide MORE green spaces.
4. The city should have specific provisions for retaining large existing trees (more than the city currently has, which allows owners to cut all trees within 4 years). Retaining large trees should be a top priority (not replacement).
5. Mitigation for impacts of the light rail and rezoning need to be addressed BEFORE construction and rezoning. In other words, traffic issues should be dealt with now, as well as environmental damages foreseen. I would like the city to spell out to people how they can hold the city accountable if the city fails to properly mitigate.
6. How will the city make sure developers build in a style the current residents prefer? OTAK has shown photos of potential structures and asked for feedback on them. But how can the city guarantee or even strongly encourage that developers build these preferred types of structures rather than boxes such as along Lake City Way? I would like to see a code that clearly describes these guidelines available to the public.

Thanks!

Amy

DEIS Comment; received June 16, 2014; from Jay Davis

Dear Ms. Redinger,

I attended the meeting on June 3rd, and received a copy of the DEIS in my email.

We have lived in Shoreline for 28 years. We are not in the effected area, but a few blocks north of it. We are actually excited about the light rail station, and hope it gets here sooner. I understand that under the State's growth plan all towns, cities, and counties must plan for the expected new residents over the coming decades. The idea of concentrating the growth near the new light rail station makes very good sense.

But what doesn't make sense to me is to change the zoning in the area now, so many years before the real demand will start. I see no current demand for big apartment blocks as envisioned in either alternatives 2 or 3 until the light rail station is completed. What I see

happening is a few builders buying up individual lots here and there as soon as the zoning change goes into effect, tearing down the existing house, and putting up 4 small houses on each lot. Such a piecemeal approach seems contrary to the vision in the City's plans. And will be very unpleasant for the other residents who would like to stay in their homes another 5-10 years.

And I am appalled at the plan to change the zoning of the Shoreline Center. This is a community resource that will be needed even more as the population increases.

There was some nice dancing around this at the meeting. But the comments about how long all the developing would take while builders try to acquire adjoining lots, plus a remark that the Center is "key opportunity site" makes it seem that it will be the first to go. (I told some friends who lived here in the 70's and 80's about the meeting, and they cynically said it was clear to them that the sale of the Shoreline Center must be a done deal already and everything else is window dressing. And to expect bulldozers in January. Otherwise why the rush? I hope they are wrong.) After the meeting I was fogged nicely by one of the officials there, as he explained it belonged to the School District, and maybe they wouldn't want to sell it? Right. Turn down \$22 million for a surplus group of buildings they don't use.

I am sure the site could be re-designed to be more productive. But there is something very neighborly about a single-story sprawl of buildings with all the open space and fields around it, and all the community uses it gets.

---Jay Davis

DEIS Comment; received June 15, 2014; from Sarah Jaynes, 1641 N 185th St., Shoreline

I think any zoning changes should occur only within a half mile of the station. Based on the studies that is the limit where most people will stop walking to the station. Right now it is all hypothetical that anyone would want to develop and that the area could support commercial (your market assessment didn't believe it could support any large commercial interests). If there is a lot of interest and the area gets fully development and it is an asset to the community zoning further out could be addressed at that later time. I used to live on Greenwood Ave. It is ugly and not functional to have lines and lines of hastily built and ugly construction. Development needs to be well thought of and a boon to the community.

I also don't like the largest growth plan. I don't believe the area could support such large scale growth and that it would hurt the character of the neighborhood.

DEIS Comment; received June 16, 2014; from Tony Gale

Dear Miranda,

I am in favor of increasing the hook area of NE Perkins Way to the highest density housing possible, with the buffer step down density along 15th Avenue. Also, I believe that most

residents from Ballinger and Lake Forest Park will use NE Perkins Way as a main route to the 185th Street Station. So, I think it would be deemed necessary to fix this dangerous section of roadway by making it wider and including bike lanes on both sides of the road.

Additionally, I want to make the Shoreline City Counsel aware of bicycle groups that use NE Perkins Way as an amateur bicycle competition route. I found a cycling web site that compares riding times. The route starts at Lake City Way and ends at the NE Perkins Way hook...at my mailbox at 1121/1123!

The following website shows details:

<http://www.mapmyride.com/us/shoreline-wa/perkins-way-and-brookside-blvd-hill-shorcourse-1363021>.

I lived at 1019 NE Perkins Way for five years and witnessed how busy, and dangerous, this hook area can be. While I currently live in Edmonds, I do own four properties on the hook area of NE Perkins Way that total .9 acres. Following is a list of my properties and also a map highlighting the locations:

- Parcel# 3972300194
- 1019 NE Perkins Way
- 1121 & 1123 NE Perkins Way
- 1024 190th Street



I believe that if the former North City school continues to be used as a school it would be ideal to have more family housing across the street, hence the high density housing designation. If it were not used as a school, townhomes or other high-density higher end solutions would support a large tax base for the city, as this complex would include view properties.

Thank you for your consideration. I find this process very interesting and look forward to learning more about the project at upcoming meetings.

Sincerely,
Tony Gale
8516 214th Place SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
tonygale1@gmail.com

DEIS Comment; received June 16, 2014; from Jeanne Small

I like option 3 - most growth - best, followed by option 2.

Thank you for your commitment to diverse housing for varying income levels.

I am very excited about having light rail nearby.

I'm still worried about traffic on 185th - and I wish there would be another traffic light put in between Meridian and 1st.

Thanks,
Jeanne