

Station Area Planning Council Question Tracking

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
1.	1/29	What is the current timeline/workplan for developing a fee-in-lieu program for affordable housing? (ROBERTS)	<p>This would need to be placed on the Citywide Work Plan. Council may want to consider a new action step related to the Prepare for Two Light Rail Stations goal. There are many action steps, including setting the fee in lieu for affordable housing that will need to occur to successfully implement the plans. As usual, there are limited staffing resources. The action steps will need to be prioritized. Setting the fee could be fairly simple & should ideally be done within a year of adopting the affordable housing provisions. We anticipate the process taking three Council meetings. Initial research has been done by staff. Since it is a fee, we don't believe it would require a Planning Commission recommendation.</p>
2.	1/29	What money is potentially available as grants (or other money) to use to build affordable housing beyond what might be collected by the City? For each dollar collected by the city, how much leverage might those dollars bring back in terms of grants or other dollars (i.e. for every dollar the City collects, might we anticipate a match of \$2 or something different)? (ROBERTS)	<p>A City of Shoreline fee in lieu could become a source of funds that the City could invest in affordable housing. These funds would function as gap financing in affordable housing projects. A typical 60 unit affordable housing project in King County utilizes a mix of sources, including the Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit, Washington State Housing Trust Fund, King County Housing Finance funds, private debt and maybe some other smaller, private sources. The largest source is the Tax Credit, funding anywhere from 40% to 60% of the project, with the other sources making up the difference. It is hard to say what the leverage ratio for City of Shoreline funds could be because it would depend on the amount the City chose to invest in each project. A leverage ratio of 10 to 1 would seem like a possible ratio, but it could go higher to 15 to 1.</p> <p>The City of Seattle uses its fee in lieu payments along with its other funding sources to invest in affordable housing. The fee in lieu has given the City the opportunity to invest in a greater number of projects, although the fee in lieu is just one of the City's funding sources. The City's leverage ratio is between 10 or 15 to 1.</p> <p><i>Note: The Compass Housing Alliance assisted staff with this response.</i></p>

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
3.	1/29	How effective has the City of Seattle, or other regional cities, been in creating affordable housing units through their fee-in-lieu program? How does this compare to other affordable housing strategies used in the region (i.e. what has been the most successful program in creating affordable housing)? (ROBERTS)	<p>Success is subjective and depends on the goal of the jurisdiction's affordable housing program. We could not find a chart or a study that listed the number of affordable housing units created per jurisdiction & the method used to create the unit.</p> <p>Successful practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 15% of the units be affordable • Set the cost for the affordable housing requirement at a rate that will still yield a competitive profit (or else development may not occur producing no units affordable or market rate) • Monitor the success of the program & make adjustments periodically; respond to the market (every 5 years) • Setting the fee in lieu at a rate that is commensurate with the actual cost of constructing the affordable unit • Apply the program widely throughout a City (not just in up zoned areas) <p>Fee in lieu is a successful tool for creating housing for low and very low income households; whereas requiring development to include housing to low and very low income households is not successful.</p>
4.	1/29	What rates do other regional cities charge for the fee-in-lieu program? Can this be smoothed out so if one City charges by sq. foot and another by bedroom, we can compare fees easily? (ROBERTS)	<p>The fees are all over the board. The advice we have received and the recommendation from HDC & the Planning Commission is to establish a fee that is the same cost (including all costs) as choosing the option to construct a unit. The idea being that there is a choice for those developers that just don't want to deal with managing the affordable units over time or when there is a partial unit required. The fee is not intended to be a cheaper option. Will be answering this question with the effort to set the fee in lieu. This is a whole work product in and of itself. FYI: On February 12th from 11-12pm, Cornerstone Partnership is hosting a webinar called Inclusionary Housing – Fees vs. Units http://www.affordableownership.org/event/webinar-inclusionary-housing-fees-vs-units/. Cornerstone is the lead consultant preparing Seattle's study entitled DRAFT Policy Options for Refining Seattle's Incentive Zoning Program, which has been a resource for Shoreline staff.</p>

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
5.	1/29	How does the staff, at this time, feel it would determine (or recommend) a fee for a fee-in-lieu program for affordable housing? (ROBERTS)	We would rely heavily on the extensive study entitled “Policy Options for Refining Seattle’s Incentive Zoning Program” that Seattle has contracted with Cornerstone Partnership to prepare. The study contains a section on setting the fee in lieu. The report is in draft form. It is my understanding that Seattle has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on this study. We would also work with ARCH and HDC to develop a fee that meets Council’s policy direction. Policy direction could be “develop a fee that is = to the cost of constructing & maintaining an affordable unit” or “develop a fee that is competitive with surrounding jurisdictions”.
6.	1/29	How is a live-work unit different from a home occupation? Why is this distinction not addressed in the proposed development code? (ROBERTS)	It is defined in 20.20.016 D definitions – <u>Dwelling, Live/Work</u> <u>Live-work unit means a structure or portion of a structure: (1) that combines a commercial activity that is allowed in the zone with a residential living space for the owner of the commercial or manufacturing business, or the owner’s employee, and that person’s household; (2) where the resident owner or employee of the business is responsible for the commercial or manufacturing activity performed; and (3) where the commercial or manufacturing activity conducted takes place subject to a valid business license associated with the premises.</u>
7.	1/29	What was the rationale behind the staff (or the planning commission) recommendation that a micro-housing unit would be defined by a maximum floor area of 350 sq. feet? (ROBERTS)	The point is differentiate micro units from studio units.
8.	1/29	When is micro-housing scheduled as an item on the planning commission’s workplan? (ROBERTS)	It is not scheduled. Staff envisioned including the topic in an upcoming batch of Development Code amendments perhaps later this year.
9.	1/29	Assuming the Council passes the PTE program as proposed by staff, would the catalyst program described in SMC 20.40.235 not be allowed? (ROBERTS)	The Catalyst program would still be allowed. The Council will be considering PTEs for the Station Areas later this year. At that time the Council could authorize the 12 year PTE as an incentive for the creation of affordable housing and the 8 year PTE as an incentive for kick starting development in the Station Areas and purchasing TDR credits. The 12 year PTE cannot be used with the Catalyst Program, but the 8 year PTE can.

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
10.	1/29	Do we have a sense of how much the PTE program is costing the City (in terms of how much property tax the City has lost due to the program)? (ROBERTS)	<p>The total amount of property tax that has not been received by Shoreline’s General Fund as a result of PTE properties to date is \$188,242 - \$65,000 in the current year.</p> <p>Staff would note however that we would not categorize this as “property tax the City has lost”. It is possible neither of the properties that have been tax exempt thus far (Arabella and Polaris) would have developed without the exemption. In addition, the City continues to collect tax based on the original taxable value of the Arabella land, and the YMCA property (Polaris) was previously tax exempt.</p> <p>Staff would therefore suggest that we are not collecting new property tax based on the incremental increase in the taxable value of these two properties. Once the exemption expires, the City will of course collect tax on the full amount of taxable value from that point forward.</p>
11.	1/29	Are there other ways, besides incentivizing through an affordable housing program, for example, to ensure the construction of 2+ bedroom units? (ROBERTS)	The only one we can think of is somehow structuring the PTE to apply to 2+ bedroom units.
12.	1/29	Did the planning commission discuss “outside entertainment” in its deliberations? (ROBERTS)	No the Planning Commission reviewed the language. The language was proposed by staff in response to public comment.
13.	1/29	Are clearing, grading, and tree removal permits separate permits required for a development? Would a clearing (or grading permit) also include tree removal? Would all developments (with existing structures) be required to obtain a clearing permit? (ROBERTS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree Removal This permit is used only for removal of trees that exceed the partial exemption under 20.50.310.B and that are outside of Critical Areas and their buffers, and with no land grading or clearing involved. • Clearing and Grading A permit required for tree cutting, land clearing, grading activities, or construction of storm drainage facilities, when such activities are not a part of another permit and are over specified thresholds. (SMC 20.50.290 - 20.50.370) • Site Development permits are used to permit site work including clearing and grading in conjunction with subdivision and building permits.

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
14.	1/29	What efforts can the City undertake to facilitate LEED platinum construction? (ROBERTS)	LEED Platinum is required with Development Agreements in proposed SMC 20.30.355(D). The City could also require LEED Platinum in any of the MUR zones. However, this could slow redevelopment. In the proposed regulations, staff is recommending Built Green 4 star as the standard in the MUR Zones. This is based on advice from the MBA that this would be doable & consistent with requirements in other jurisdictions.
15.	1/29	Has the staff talked to mortgage lenders about any hurdles that may exist for a single-family buyers who to buy a single-family house in a mixed-use zone? (ROBERTS)	<p>By increasing density around the light rail stations, the City believes, and research backs this up, that the land surrounding the stations areas will become more desirable. While some people would not like to live near light rail stations, others would. Investors understand this. Those wishing to move out of the area will most likely find willing buyers.</p> <p>That being said, it will still depend on several different factors, including where your property is located, the condition of the property, whether it is possible to effectively redevelop the property, and the overall housing market in general. If the housing market is cold, selling your home could be difficult no matter where it is located.</p> <p>The City has spoken with mortgage experts and bankers, and all of them have stated that the proposed zoning changes would not prevent someone from being able to obtain a mortgage to purchase a single-family home in the station areas if they wished. The concern arose because of previous discussions about single-family homes being non-conforming in some of the up-zoned areas. The mortgage providers have stated that one of the primary considerations when determining the type of financing a buyer can get is the economic life of the property. Usually, lenders look at the "current highest and best use" to determine the economic life of a property. What the neighborhood looks like is more important than the zoning. If the neighborhood is primarily detached single-family homes, then, regardless of the zoning, a qualified buyer should expect to get a conventional residential loan. If a significant part of the neighborhood has converted to multi-family buildings (such as in a higher density zoned area) then someone who wants to purchase a remaining detached single family home to use for that purpose may have to consider a shorter term loan or other financing mechanism. As it stands now, there aren't any proposals</p>

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
			<p>that would prevent someone in a single-family home from selling their home in the future and a qualified buyer obtaining financing for a single-family home.</p> <p>The City has, and will continue to upon request, provide lending institutions with letters clarifying zoning regulations in the City. What this means is that if a bank is hesitate to lend to someone that wishes to purchase a single-family home in an up-zoned area, the City can provide the bank with a letter stating that the single-family home is a permitted use, or that non-conforming (grandfathered) regulations allow such a use or rebuild, or even expansion.</p>
16.	1/29	<p>Besides the Housing Development Consortium and Sound Transit, what regional non-profit or for profit organizations have the staff contacted for advice on the map, subarea policies, or development code? (ROBERTS)</p>	<p>OTAK, PSRC, City of Bellevue, Enterprise Community Partners, Seattle City Light, Compass Housing Alliance, Master Builders Association of King/Snohomish County, Forterra, North City Water, Senior Services of King County, City of Seattle, Smart Growth Seattle, Alliance for Innovation, Blair Underwood, Kidder Mathews (Market Assessment), Michael George, Kidder Mathews, BAE Urban Economics (Market Assessment), Fehr & Peers (Transportation), Janet Bacchus, Puget Sound Properties, Wyk Parker, Puget Sound Properties</p> <p><u>Developers we consulted included:</u> George Petrie, Goodman Development John Hempleman & Randall Olsen, Cairncross & Hempelmann Scott Clark and Lauren Nestrud, Clark Design Group PLLC Alicia Daniels Uhlig and David Cutler, GGLO Kerry Nicholson , Legacy Partners Residential, Inc Skip Swenson, Forterra Michael Taylor, Newmark Realty Capital, Inc Charlie Manger, DLB Associates Erik Ekstrom, Beachworks Maria Barrientos, Barrientos LLC Heartland</p>
17.	1/29	<p>Has Sound Transit commented on our subarea plan for 185th since the adoption of the preferred alternative? (ROBERTS)</p>	<p>Sound Transit staff provided written comments and commented to Shoreline staff at a meeting on 10/28/14 regarding the preferred alternative. Sound Transit and their consultant from Kidder-Matthews recommended a phased and</p>

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
			node development approach. The attached Phased Node Map was shown to staff at the meeting. The map basically zones for TOD on the four corners around the station and at the Shoreline Center and no other changes. <i>See Attachment - Sound Transit Phased Node Map</i>
18.	1/29	Why is Sound Transit (or the City) leery of including commercial applications in its parking structures? (ROBERTS)	It goes against Sound Transit's policies to pay for the planning, design and construction of commercial space. If the City wants commercial space in the garage, Sound Transit will consider an Interlocal Agreement with the City if the City pays all costs associated with the construction and maintenance of the commercial space. The City is leery of requiring commercial space due to the uncertainty associated with occupying the area verses the impact on the design of the parking structure and impact of the commercial space on the efficiency of the parking design. Staff also learned that Sound Transit did provide plaza space for commercial use, but would not build restrooms. The plaza space has yet to be permitted in Seattle for vendors due to having no restrooms.
19.	1/29	Beyond being in a R-6 zone with a comprehensive plan designation of something else, would our proposed phased approach to 185th have any affect on property owners (or mortgage lenders) in subsequent phases of the plan? (ROBERTS)	Not that we are aware of. It could still lead to developers buying property in anticipation of a future change as indicated by the Comprehensive Plan.
20.	1/29	In recognizing that comprehensive planning efforts, including Town Center and Ridgecrest, do not lead to develop overnight, what would be a realistic timetable to judge the success of the 185th subarea plan, especially the first phase (as proposed by the planning commission? (ROBERTS)	20 years.
21.	1/29	Recognizing there are subarea policies and required mitigation that have a financial impact to the City, does the staff have some early (or preliminary) thoughts about what CIP projects would be required (or desired) in the next 6 year	It is likely that one of the first projects would be the 185 th Corridor Study. It is likely that this project would need to be initiated and funded once the 145 th Corridor Study is complete – so probably for 2016/2017. 185 th is one of the City's growth projects in the City's impact fee program. The City will also need to update the PROS Plan to reflect the 185 th & 145 th Street Station

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
		CIP cycle? Assuming no (or little) additional revenue, are there preliminary thoughts about what projects would go from funded to unfunded in the CIP? (ROBERTS)	Subarea Plans. Other functional plans, such as TMP, Storm, Basin, Sewer, Water, Electric, Gas etc. would need to be updated to account for the changes approved in the Station Area plans. This will lead to a systematic identification of Capital Projects.
22.	1/29	What is a “potential noise disturbance” defined in 20.40.350? (ROBERTS)	Music, talking, shouting, horse shoes, tables & chairs clanging, trivia broadcasts.
23.	1/29	Are there requirements for bicycle parking facilities in the development code?	Yes. Applies Citywide. See SMC 20.50.440 Bicycle facilities – Standards.
24.	1/29	Has the City done a count of the number of vehicles parked “on street” near existing multi-family developments? (ROBERTS)	Sound Transit’s EIS did a parking survey within a ¼ mile of the stations (not specifically just multi-family (Page 4-96). A Parking survey was also done in the City’s EIS for the 185 th Street Station Area (Page 3-116) and the DEIS for the 145 th Street Station Subarea Plan (Page 3-109). The City requires a parking survey to initiate an Residential Parking Zone (RPZ). The City has one RPZ near Shoreline Community College. I don’t know if a parking study was done to establish this program years ago. I am not aware of any other formal parking studies conducted by the City.
25.	1/29	What are ways to ensure that the parcel(s) containing the soccer fields and tennis courts in/adjacent to Shoreline Park remain part of our park system? (ROBERTS)	<u>Staff is still working on this response</u>
26.	1/29	How can an outdoor performance center or theater work in the subarea if it is only allowed as an Accessory use (30% of gross floor area of a building)? (ROBERTS)	This is intended to “go with” a larger scale use where the 30% of the primary use makes sense. This does preclude a White Rive amphitheater. If this is the type of use the Council would like to see in the Subarea, then this needs to be amended.
27.	1/29	Under the current proposal, who is responsible for paying (and how might a developer be assessed [i.e. impact fee or connection charges]) for the following infrastructure improvements: 1) Frontage improvements? 2) Road improvements mentioned in the FEIS? 3) Water pipes owned by	(1&2) Frontage Improvements and Road improvements in FEIS – required to construct improvements in accordance with SMC 20.60.140 Adequate Facilities and 20.70.320 Frontage Improvements. (3, 4 & 5) SMC 20.60.040 Adequate Water Supply; and 20.60.030 Adequate wastewater disposal; 20.60.050 Adequate fire protection; 20.60.070 Adequate

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
		North City Water District? 4) Water pipes owned by Seattle Public Utilities? 5) Sewer improvements? Surface water improvements onsite? Surface water improvements offsite? Improvements to the electrical system? Are there distinctions in who pays between onsite and system-wide improvements which are necessitated because of the rezone? (ROBERTS)	<p>surface water management.</p> <p><u>Staff is still working on the response regarding electrical upgrades</u></p> <p>In terms of who pays, it is the developer that pays to mitigate for their project's direct impacts. If a larger utility/infrastructure project is ultimately required than is really attributable to the proposed development, then there are choices to be made. The project can be denied if the developer chooses not to pay for the installation of the necessary infrastructure; some utilities will enter into a cost sharing agreement with the developer; latecomer's agreements can also be used to repay the developer as future development fills in and utilizes the improved infrastructure (I believe this has a time limit).</p>
28.	1/29	In the planning commission recommendations, are there any requirements to plant trees to replace those taken down? (ROBERTS)	Yes. Same replacement standards that apply to all other zones. See SMC 20.50.360 Tree Replacement and site restoration.
29.	1/29	In the planning commission recommendations, what requirements if any, would Sound Transit have to replace trees in both the rezone area and outside the rezone area? (ROBERTS)	Sound Transit is required to follow the City's Code. NOTE: WASDOT has their own standards for tree removal & replacement. It would take me a while to track down this standard.
30.	1/29	What are the implications of the phasing recommendation from the Planning commission on transition areas between MUR-85 and R-6, especially when future phases will change the R-6 to MUR-85? (SALOMON)	This is a topic the Council may wish to address. Phasing does create periods of "no transition" between some Phase I MUR 85' and existing R-6 (not that much though). However, it could be argued that rezoning the entire area will also create even more instances to a new development being surrounded by existing R-6 development without the additional setbacks or stepbacks being afforded between the old & the new uses. I believe Council touched on the topic of requiring setbacks from new MUR developments built next to existing R-6 and decided that it did not meet the intent of the Subarea creating setbacks or stepbacks based on existing uses, but rather based on future uses.
31.	1/29	Should the allowance of development agreements in the station area be delayed to a later time? (SALOMON)	This is a policy question for the Council. From a staff perspective, the Council needs to make sure the list of required elements & the "pick two" elements yield a community benefit that is clearly worth trading the extra height. Further, based on the market reports that have analyzed the 185 th Street station,

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
			the difficulty of assembling parcels and our knowledge of construction costs over 7 stories; staff does not anticipate this provision to be employed anytime soon.
32.	1/29	Please clarify the sub-area plan policies that would assure adequate park space to balance out increased density during the build-out of the sub-area plan. (SALOMON)	<p>Page 7-28 of Subarea Plan The City intends to move forward with the following specific actions, with the first three proposed to be adopted in the Planned Action Ordinance, the fourth as part of development regulations. The other items listed will be explored as redevelopment occurs and as part of development agreements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Investigate potential funding and master planning efforts to reconfigure and consolidate existing City facilities at or adjacent to the Shoreline Center. Analyze potential sites and community needs, and opportunities to enhance existing partnerships, for a new aquatic and community center facility to combine the Shoreline Pool and Spartan Recreation Center services. 2. Considering potential acquisition of sites that are ill-suited for redevelopment due to high water table or other site specific challenges for new public open space or stormwater function. 3. Explore a park impact fee or fee in-lieu of dedication program for acquisition and maintenance of new parks or open space and additional improvements to existing parks. Funds from this program would allow the City to purchase property and develop parks, recreation, and open space facilities over time to serve the growing neighborhood. 4. Proposed development regulations for the station subarea should be adopted to require and/or encourage the provision of public space and recreation facilities with redevelopment projects, as part of Development Agreements (Chapter 20.30.355) and site design (Chapter 20.50.240). As part of negotiating Development Agreements, the City could ask developers to select from a list of needed facilities. (See list of needed facilities earlier in this section, on pages 3-180 and 3-184.) 5. The City will work toward creating a variety of public spaces and

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
			<p>recreational opportunities to serve the multi-generational needs of the growing transit-oriented community and capable of connecting to other facilities the subarea and throughout the city.</p> <p>6. As the City develops capital improvement projects in the subarea, funding should be retained for implementation of public park and recreation facilities that could be accommodated within public rights-of-way or utility easements (in cooperation with the utility providers). For example, in a conceptual analysis of the potential redevelopment of 8th Avenue NE completed as part of the subarea planning process, it was determined that sufficient right-of-way exists for development of community gardens, pedestrian/bicycle trails, or other features that would be compatible within the Seattle City Light right-of-way.</p> <p>7. The City would continue to monitor parks, recreation, and open space needs in the subarea and update the PROS plan in the future to address these needs.</p>
32.	1/29	Should phasing be more than two phases and should the phasing be spread into 15 year increments? (SALOMON)	Staff recommends that the Phases be in 10 year increments if in three phases. No particular recommendation on 2 or 3 phases.
33.	1/22	Is there a problem with having distinct EIS reports for 185 th and 145 th ? Does the EIS recognize or take into account the impacts from the other project? (ROBERTS)	<p>Staff does not anticipate a problem with having two separate EIS documents because the two sets of analysis are being looked at by the City collectively and cumulatively. The same team of experts did the analysis and preparation of the EIS documents for both station subareas. As such, they were able to integrate key assumptions and aspects of the analysis and work efficiently in making sure both EISs were coordinated.</p> <p>For the 145th DEIS, “upstream” and “uphill” redevelopment of the 185th subarea was a consideration in the utilities and surface water analysis and as addressed in those sections of Chapter 3. The transportation analyses of both EISs considered known cumulative traffic forecasts (so inclusive of both subareas, traffic forecasted in the City’s transportation master plan, and traffic related to Point Wells). Public services analysis quantifies the level of impact and mitigation measures expected with each subarea in the separate EIS documents. To understand the full impact to the City and community, the City is</p>

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
34.	1/22	<p>What responsibilities does the wastewater or stormwater utility have for impacts outside the City? Are those impacts, if any, accounted for in the EIS for both station areas? Does Ronald Wastewater have a cap on the maximum capacity on the amount of sewage it can put in the King County system? (ROBERTS)</p>	<p>considering these two separate analyses together.</p> <p>Regarding wastewater, there is no cap on the amount of flow the Ronald Wastewater sewer utility can discharge outside their service boundary. The King County Wastewater Division is responsible for planning and constructing the infrastructure necessary to receive those flows as land uses change and population increases. King County is actively incorporating the proposed changes in their long range capacity planning efforts. City staff is working directly with the Wastewater Division to convey population projection information from the expected land use changes.</p> <p>Regarding the stormwater, the 185th station area is served by both the McAleer Creek drainage and Thornton Creek drainage basins. Those surrounding entities to each of the basins (the Cities of Lake Forest Park and Mountlake Terrace) were provided an opportunity to participate in the EIS process. As long as the City adheres to Federal, State and local regulations for the management and treatment of stormwater, then the City has met our legal obligations for the management of stormwater. However, the City has been coordinating with Seattle regarding Thornton Creek and Lake Forest Park for McAleer Creek in finding ways to minimize our long-term impacts. Some of the coordination has been physical projects such as Cromwell Park stormwater detention basin and low impact development projects (e.g. drainage swales) in Thornton Creek. This coordination continues with Lake Forest Park as we pursue our basin planning for McAleer Creek and Ballinger Creek (aka West Lyons Creek).</p>
35.	1/22	<p>Does our planned action for the station areas change any responsibility of Sound Transit for their SEPA process or required mitigation? (ROBERTS)</p>	<p>No.</p>
36.	1/22	<p>In designing the stormwater facility at Cromwell Park, can the staff provide the background analysis of the amount and location of the inputs to the facility? Did the analysis and design of the facility map or account for where and the amount of water entering Cromwell? The Thornton</p>	<p>Yes the stormwater facility at Cromwell Park accounted for the flows entering the park. More specifically, the attached drawing shows five (5) subbasins used in the analysis. Subbasins 2, 3 and 5 directly outfall into the constructed wetland facility. The facility was primarily designed to maximize the storage volume, thereby attenuating flows at Ronald Bog. It is worth noting that only a small portion of the 185th station area plan drains to Cromwell Park.</p>

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
		Creek basin plan does not recognize any streams north of Cromwell but there is a significant amount of water entering the facility. (ROBERTS)	<i>See Attachment - Cromwell Park Drainage Subbasins Map</i>
37.	2/2	Do we have examples of other jurisdictions that have adopted phased zoning in 2 and 3 phases? How have they worked in general? (SALOMON)	Planning Staff researched this question for Council's September 2nd dinner meeting and couldn't find a jurisdiction that has phased zoning before. Economic Development staff also looked at two professional journals (American Planning Association and Urban Land Institute) and couldn't find any research or examples for it either. Staff also posted on the Alliance for Innovation website a request for information regarding this topic from its members and received no replies.
38.	2/2	Does the 37% increase in surface water runoff projected in the FEIS already account for required on site mitigation? (ROBERTS)	<p>The percentages of increased surface water flow calculated for each alternative are the unmitigated expected increases in flow. These expected increases MUST be mitigated and are required to be by both the City and the State (flow control requirements).</p> <p>It was important to calculate flows in this manner in case the City ever decides to implement regional or subregional facilities. We would be able to know what the full flow control needs might be. Absent regional or subregional facilities, flow would be mitigated through on-site control with redevelopment projects.</p> <p>Surface water runoff is also required to be treated and cleaned (water quality requirements). The increases in flow DO NOT equate to increases in flooding because redevelopment projects MUST control flows to acceptable levels.</p> <p>The DOE and the City of Shoreline administer stringent surface water runoff requirements. These requirements were not in place when the subarea originally developed into single family. As such, there are flooding and drainage problems today. With redevelopment, we would expect these problems to be addressed over time and surface water drainage conditions to improve much more than current conditions.</p>

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
39.	2/2	Assuming that the FEIS for Sound Transit will be available in April, does staff currently think that that process will inform our FEIS for 185th or illustrate required mitigations that would affect our development code? (ROBERTS)	<p>Sound Transit and the City have been steadily sharing information about each of our projects: Light Rail + Stations + Garages (Sound Transit) and Station Area Planning (City of Shoreline). In fact, Sound Transit allowed the City's consultant's access to the data and analysis related to Shoreline from Sound Transit's DEIS.</p> <p>In addition, the City carefully reviewed Sound Transit's DEIS and provided detailed comments on the analysis and potential mitigation. City Staff have incorporated this knowledge into the development of the 185th Street Station Area Plan and Planned Action Ordinance.</p> <p>The City does not yet know to what extent the mitigation called out in the City's comment letter to Sound Transit will be incorporated into Sound Transit's FEIS. However, the important step of identifying the impacts and mitigation needed to address the proposed light rail facilities and station area plan/zoning has occurred. If Sound Transit doesn't incorporate all of the mitigations the City has identified for impacts associated with the provision of light rail services and these impacts effect areas that overlap with development within the City's Station Subareas, the mitigations are still required. The cost of addressing the deficiency is then shifted to the developer to correct or to the City as part of a Capital Project.</p>
	2/2	Will (is it likely) Freddie Mac/Fannie Mae purchase a mortgage with a use that is "legal non-conforming" ? What does it mean for a single family property owner trying to sell if Freddie Mac will not purchase that mortgage if their house is grandfathered in? (ROBERTS)	<u>Staff is still working on this response</u>
41.	2/2	Do you have any thoughts about an up-zone affecting Salmon creeks in Shoreline? Redevelopment would have to be up to NPDES permit requirements, which in theory could actually help clean up the creeks. Do you have any views or data on whether that holds up?	<u>Staff is still working on this response</u>

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
		Even if not, considering this is urban infill, and considering the alternatives for where people would go, is this good for Salmon as a whole? (SALOMON)	
42.	2/5	Comment has come from the community that the station area rezones were unlike all previous rezones in their scale and in going from fairly low density to very high density. Can I ask staff to identify other examples of similar rezones? Also in similar rezones are there case studies of lessons learned and impact on the neighborhood and on single family residents ability to sell their homes? (EGGEN)	<u>Staff is still working on this response</u>
43.	2/5	Compared to our proposed preferred alternatives at 185th and 145th, how much larger or smaller have our neighboring/regional jurisdictions re-zoned around light rail or for urban villages (number of blocks/acreage/overall density). (SALOMON)	This is not information that we have readily available - and not sure what it would take to get it. Staff is not sure that we will have a response for this. We are seeing if there is some information based on early research by OTAK on any "like" rezones of single family to higher density.
44.	2/5	Can you explain to me again why R-6 in MUR zones doesn't lead to a decrease in development potential? I do understand what R-6 is in terms of density. Are you saying that since it's already R-6 it won't increase land values when a developer tries to purchase/aggregate? (SALOMON)	This answer is based on the assumption that this question is about whether or not allowing single family detached dwellings as a permitted use in the MUR zones will decrease development potential. The thought is the market will drive development potential. If there is a market for the redevelopment in the MUR zones, then detached single family dwellings will not be the highest and best use for the property. By limiting new single family detached dwellings to the dimensional standards for the R-6 zone & the minimum density of 4 units per acre, the City would be precluding the development of new large scale single family homes. We do not expect that there will be much of a market for new single family detached units in zones that are approved for higher density – as this will not be the highest and best use.