

From: [Tom McCormick](#)
To: [Debbie Tarry](#)
Cc: [Doris McConnell](#); [Will Hall](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Chris Eggen](#); [Keith McGlashan](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [Chris Roberts](#); [Rachael Markle](#); [Bill Willard](#); [Tom Mailhot](#)
Subject: Re: Too much density
Date: Saturday, February 14, 2015 6:24:32 PM

Thanks Debbie.

I appreciate getting as much information as possible.

As noted in my email, the population and land area data in my email came from the 2010 census that the public is familiar with.

Here's the link: http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml
Click on "Population" on the left part of the page, then in the field toward the top, enter "Washington". Then click on "Compare Cities and Towns for Population, Housing, Area, and Density" on the right part of the page. Then you can view the data or download it. The spreadsheet I attached to my email was downloaded after following the foregoing steps.

The 2010 census shows that Shoreline's land area is 11.67 square miles of land.

The 2010 census yields one ranking, and the Office of Financial Management source that you cite yields another ranking.

Regarding Alex's point about growth in other cities, I did take that into account. Attached is a revised piece about "Too Much Density," which contains more detail. I revised it to be published in the RBCA newsletter. See, for example, the paragraph introducing the second table that says: "If, for the seven cities other than Shoreline, we assume that population will increase by 20% over the next twenty years, and for Shoreline we assume a 21,760 increase from the subareas mentioned above but no increase from other parts of Shoreline outside of the subareas, then the projected 20-year numbers would look as follows (note: even if the other cities' population grew by 50%, we would still be ranked second if we similarly calculated and included how Shoreline's population would grow outside of the subareas):"

Added growth of 21,760 over the next 20 years in the subareas will push us up the charts, whether using the 2010 census data as the baseline or the Office of Financial Management data as the baseline.

As noted above, my revised piece is going to be published in the RBCA newsletter. If it is not too late, I will try to add a line saying that another ranking source used by the City ranks Shoreline as the 7th most densely populated city (disregarding cities with < 5,000 residents). Note that the ranking in my email disregards Mattawa both because of its small size and because the 2010 census labeled it a town and not a city.

If you have any further comments, please let me know.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

===

To the City of Shoreline:

At an RBCA meeting Tuesday night, with City manager Debbie Tarry and Deputy Mayor Eggen present, I commented on how disappointed I was to discover that, based on 2010 census data, Shoreline has the 5th highest density of all cities in the state (density = population ÷ land area). Shoreline's density is 4,541 residents per square mile of land (= 53,007 population ÷ 11.673 square miles of land).

Here are the top eight cities per 2010 census data, ranked by density (disregarding cities with < 5,000 residents):

Population Density per sq. mile of land

1. Seattle 608,660 7,251
2. Mountlake Terrace 19,909 4,909
3. Lynnwood 35,836 4,573
4. Des Moines 29,673 4,564
- 5. Shoreline 53,007 4,541**
6. Kirkland 48,787 4,523
7. Burien 33,313 4,490
8. Edmonds 39,709 4,460

Shoreline's population is projected to grow by as much as 21,760 over the next 20 years, just from the following five subareas identified in the City's plans: 145th street station @ 5,314 new residents; 185th street station @ 5,399 new residents; Aurora Square CRA @ 2,447 new residents; Town Center @ 2,600 new residents; and Point Wells @ 6,000 new residents assuming annexation. With this growth in the five subareas, the City's population would increase to 74,767, with a density of 6,407 residents per square mile of land. (Source: I extracted the subarea population growth data from the relevant EIS, DEIS or SEIS.)

The increased density resulting from growth in the five subareas will make us the 2nd most densely populated city in the state, which is a most depressing development.

If, for the seven cities other than Shoreline, we assume that population will increase by 20% over the next twenty years, and for Shoreline we assume a 21,760 increase from the subareas mentioned above but no increase from other parts of Shoreline outside of the subareas, then the projected 20-year numbers would look as follows (note: even if the other cities' population grew by 50%, we would still be ranked second if we similarly calculated and included how Shoreline's population would grow outside of the subareas):

Population Density per sq. mile of land

1. Seattle 730,392 8,701
- 2. Shoreline 74,767 6,407**
3. Mountlake Terrace 23,891 5,884
4. Lynnwood 43,003 5,485
5. Des Moines 35,608 5,478
6. Kirkland 58,544 5,426
7. Burien 39,976 5,388
8. Edmonds 47,651 5,348

In my view, Shoreline residents don't want to move up the density charts, we want to move down the density charts. Up until now, the City has been meeting its goals under the state's Growth Management Act (GMA), including its goal of 200 new housing units/year with 480 new residents, without any targeted growth in the subareas. The City can continue to achieve its GMA goals with far less growth than it projects for the subareas. We need to slow down our projected growth. The City needs to listen to the residents of Shoreline, and chart a course of less growth, not more. LESS IS MORE. The City needs to listen to all of the informed residents who have been speaking up lately at meetings about the 145th and 185th street stations, wanting less density and traffic than is projected. When making zoning decisions involving the 145th and 185th street stations and other areas, the City should adopt minimal growth alternatives. LESS IS MORE. Less growth. Less congestion. Less traffic. Greater quality of life.

As density increases, traffic, pollution, noise, and crime increase, and there are other adverse impacts to our quality of life. Residents understand that there will be some growth, including some new housing developments and retail/office/commercial developments. But residents are extremely concerned about the rate of growth. In my view, in the interest of preserving the livability of our City, we should slow down the projected growth that the City is forcing upon us. While we welcome additional housing (especially affordable housing), and restaurants and shops, we should not be forced to tolerate the massive increase in traffic and other adverse impacts that go hand-in-hand with rapid and excessive population growth from huge housing and commercial developments, whether at Point Wells, the 145th street station, or the 185th street station.

The City should do everything that it can to constrain the rate of growth to the minimum that is required by the state's Growth Management Act. Most immediately, the City should follow the path of minimal growth when making zoning decisions involving the 145th and 185th street stations.

I want Shoreline to be the 40th most density populated city in the state, not the 2nd most densely populated city.

Tom McCormick

===

On Feb 14, 2015, at 3:33 PM, Debbie Tarry <dtarry@shorelinewa.gov> wrote:

Tom –

Thank-you for your e-mail. Below is some information that Alex put together that clarifies the current ranking of density in cities. I realize it does not address the philosophical differences of where you think Shoreline should be on the density chart, but wanted you to have information that we obtained from the State's Office of Financial Management. Not sure if your data came from a different source.

We were unable to open your spreadsheet attachment – it was noted as being corrupted.

The State’s Office of Financial Management (OFM) has data from the 2000 and 2010 censuses and postcensal 2011 to present. Out of all cities in Washington State, the highest density ranking that Shoreline has ever achieved is 8th in 2014 with a density of 4,232.3 persons per square mile. The data from OFM states that Shoreline has a land area of 12.76 sq. miles versus Mr. McCormick’s 11.673 sq. miles. Of course, the difference between the two land area figures has an impact on the calculation of density.

Below is a table of Shoreline’s population density and rank in the state over the years:

Year	Pop. Density	State Rank
2000	4177.9	9
2010	4155.2	9
2011	4170.4	9
2012	4175.8	9
2013	4207.2	8
2014	4232.3	8

Below are the top 10 most dense cities in 2014 according to OFM’s estimates:

2014 State Population Density Ranking

Rank	City
1	Seattle
2	Mattawa*
3	Mountlake Terrace
4	Burien
5	Des Moines
6	Kirkland
7	Edmonds
8	Shoreline
9	Toppenish
10	Fircrest

*Mattawa had a population of 4,437 at the 2010 census. An estimated population exists between 4500-6500 residents during

peak fruit picking/agricultural season(s) and subsides by approximately 2000 residents during non-picking seasons. The town has a total area of only .74 sq. miles, greatly affecting the density calculation.

Further, the assertion that the City will be the second most-densely populated city in the state with the 20-year projected population growth in the five subareas does not account for growth in other cities (other cities from those you list) in the state and assumes that the full growth potential projected in the sub-area plans is achieved. Presumably, other cities in the State will grow (perhaps at a similar pace, or even faster) during that 20-year period as will Shoreline which may change rankings.

Debbie Tarry

City Manager

City of Shoreline

17500 Midvale Ave N.

Shoreline, WA 98133

From: Tom McCormick [<mailto:tommccormick@mac.com>]

Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2015 10:58 AM

To: Debbie Tarry

Cc: Doris McConnell; Will Hall; Shari Winstead; Chris Eggen; Keith McGlashan; Jesse Salomon; Chris Roberts; Rachael Markle; Bill Willard; Tom Mailhot

Subject: Too much density

Debbie,

At the RBCA meeting Tuesday night, which you attended with Deputy Mayor Eggen, I commented how disappointed I was to discover that Shoreline currently has the 5th highest density of all cities in the state (density = population ÷ land area). This finding is based on 2010 census data (see attached spreadsheet, and the data shown below that I extracted from the spreadsheet). Shoreline's density is 4,541 residents per square mile of land (= 53,007 population ÷ 11.673 land

area).

If we add the 20-year projected population growth of up to 21,760 from the five subareas (145th street station @ 5,314 new residents; 185th street station @ 5,399 new residents; Aurora Square CRA @ 2,447 new residents, Town Center @ 2,600 new residents, and Point Wells @ 6,000 new residents; data extracted from relevant EIS, DEIS or SEIS), our population increases to 74,767, with a density of 6,407 residents per square mile of land. This increase in density would be even greater if we added in other expected population growth outside of the subareas. This increased density will move us up to the 2nd most densely populated city in the state, which is a most depressing development.

Shoreline citizens don't want to move up the density charts, we want to move down the density charts. Up until now, the City has been meeting its GMA targets (e.g., 200 new housing units/year) without any targeted growth in the subareas. The City can continue to achieve its GMA targets with far less growth than it projects for the subareas. We need to slow down our projected growth. LESS IS MORE. Please listen to the citizens of Shoreline, and set much lower growth targets. Listen to all of the informed citizens who have been speaking up lately at meetings about the 145th and 185th street stations, wanting less density and minimal traffic impacts. When making zoning decisions for the subareas, including the 145th and 185th street stations, please adopt an alternative that achieves the least growth possible. LESS IS MORE.

As density increases, traffic, noise, pollution, and crime increase, and there are other adverse impacts. Citizens understand that there will be some organic growth. Citizens understand that there will be some new housing developments and retail/office/commercial developments. But we want to slow down the pace of growth and development. We want far less growth and development than is currently being contemplated, not more.

We want to be the 40th most density populated city in the state, not the 2nd most densely populated city.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

=====

Here are the current top eight cities, ranked by density:

Population Density per sq. mile of land

1. Seattle 608,660 7,251
2. Mountlake Terrace 19,909 4,909
3. Lynnwood 35,836 4,573
4. Des Moines 29,673 4,564
- 5. Shoreline 53,007 4,541**
6. Kirkland 48,787 4,523
7. Burien 33,313 4,490
8. Edmonds 39,709 4,460

If, for cities other than Shoreline, we assume that population will increase by 20% over the next twenty years, and for Shoreline we assume a 21,760 increase from the subareas but no increase from other areas outside of the subareas (which understates Shoreline's population growth), the projected 20-year numbers would look like this:

Population Density per sq. mile of land

1. Seattle 730,392 8,701
- 2. Shoreline 74,676 6,407**
3. Mountlake Terrace 23,891 5,884
4. Lynnwood 43,003 5,485
5. Des Moines 35,608 5,478
6. Kirkland 58,544 5,426
7. Burien 39,976 5,388
8. Edmonds 47,651 5,348

