

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

July 5, 2018  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

### **Commissioners Present**

Vice Chair Mork  
Commissioner Davis  
Commissioner Lin  
Commissioner Maul  
Commissioner Malek

### **Staff Present**

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development  
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Uki Dele, Surface Water & Environmental Services Manager  
Nora Daley-Peng, Senior Transportation Planner  
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

### **Commissioners Absent**

Chair Montero  
Commissioner Craft

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chair Mork called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL**

Upon roll call by Ms. Hoekzema the following Commissioners were present: Vice Chair Mork, and Commissioners Davis, Maul and Malek. Commissioner Lin arrived at 7:05 p.m. and Chair Montero and Commissioner Craft were absent.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of June 21, 2018 were approved as amended.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no general public comments.

**STUDY ITEM: 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT – 2018 SURFACE WATER MASTER PLAN**

**Staff Presentation**

Ms. Dele advised that for the past few years, staff has been working with consultants, Brown and Caldwell and FCS Group to update the 2011 Surface Water Master Plan, which is a supporting component of the City's Comprehensive Plan. She referred to the draft 2018 Surface Water Master Plan, noting that in addition to the updated plan, the Capital Facilities Element will be amended to reference the 2018 Surface Water Master Plan instead of the 2011 plan. She also advised that the Surface Water Master Plan is intended to implement the policies of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, and no policy changes are recommended.

Ms. Dele explained that the City has been doing basin planning since 2009 to identify needs in each basin, as well as activities that will help address those needs. The basin planning identified 116 projects at an estimated cost of \$50 million to address them. The update includes a process for implementing these projects. It also addresses drainage and water quality challenges associated with growth, increasing regulations and aging infrastructure. The plan will guide the utility for the next 6 years and provides recommendations for the City Council to consider relative to capital improvement projects, rate structure, and policy.

Ms. Dele advised that the updated plan uses an asset management approach that manages the utility's assets and programs at the lowest lifecycle costs, while meeting the expectations of the customers. The 2018 Surface Water Master Plan represents the progress in master planning and provides a transparent process for articulating how the elements of the plan will be implemented. The draft plan updates the Level of Service (LOS), evaluates the operations and drainage system conditions, identifies the gaps and develops recommendations for meeting the gaps, creates a plan and process for implementing the recommendations, and analyzes the cost of implementation.

Ms. Dele advised that a key objective of the draft 2018 plan is to match the LOS provided by the utility with the expectations of the customers. LOS for the draft 2018 plan was developed through a series of interdepartmental workshops. In addition, community meetings and a web survey were offered to gauge the understanding of the customers, as well as their preferences for the LOS service targets. The information gathered during this process was used to identify the final LOS and associated LOS targets for the next six years. The LOS targets were used to develop a matrix of performance targets and performance measures, both of which provide a much higher level of detail and specificity. Performance targets were used to develop prioritization criteria for capital improvements projects and programmatic recommendations. Linking the prioritization criteria back to levels of service enabled the utility to better determine which projects and programs were likely to provide the greatest benefit toward achieving LOS. The results of the prioritization, in combination with estimated costs, were used to select and assemble projects and programs into solution sets or management strategies. Using this approach, they were able to combine the 116 projects into 40 high-priority projects, 6 new studies and 15 new programs.

Ms. Dele advised that the minimum management strategy would be to provide the current programs and projects that meet the minimum terms and the anticipated regulatory requirements. The proactive

management strategy builds on minimum management strategy to include the high-priority projects and new programs to meet the LOS the customers expect. The optimum management strategy would include all of the projects identified in the plan. She summarized that when developing the management strategy, it was helpful to articulate how the strategies relate to the projects and programs the City provides, the rates, and meeting the LOS.

Ms. Dele reported that, on August 7, 2017, the City Council approved the proactive management strategy and rates to manage the utility at that level for the next six years. The proactive management strategy addresses all LOS. It provides incremental improvement for LOS 1 at a reasonable cost, addresses the high-priority projects and positions the utility to be able to be at an optimum level over time. As part of the proactive management strategy, the City will be constructing 25 new projects, implementing 15 new programs and enhancing 9 existing programs that address the high-priority, long-term needs that were identified. She referred to the list of programs that will be implemented over the next six years.

Ms. Dele explained that the plan includes performance measures for each of the programs the utility will be implementing based on the proactive management strategy. These measures will be used to monitor the success of the programs to ensure they are effectively meeting the LOS targets and expectations. She briefly explained the rating system and how it would be used to collect data to evaluate and assess each of the programs. At the end of the six-year planning period, staff will be able to document and show how the utility is meeting the expectations of each LOS.

Ms. Dele advised that the public process for updating the plan included two open houses, one in 2016 and another in 2017. The open houses helped staff understand the residents' expectations for the utility. Web surveys were also used to reach out to residents who could not attend the open houses. About 49% of the surveyed residents indicated they preferred a proactive management strategy as opposed to the optimum management strategy. She reported that the project and the approach that was used received national recognition. It was presented at the National Stormwater Conference in 2017 and is featured in the May issue of the Stormwater Magazine. The public comment period on the draft plan ends July 9<sup>th</sup>. The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing on the draft plan and the associated Comprehensive Plan amendment on October 4<sup>th</sup>. The City Council will have a discussion of the draft plan and Comprehensive Plan amendment on October 29<sup>th</sup>. Adoption is scheduled for November 26<sup>th</sup>.

Vice Chair Mork asked how the Salmon Safe Program interacts with the draft plan. Ms. Dele answered that the draft plan was provided to Salmon Safe for the certification process, and they are providing final recommendations for implementation. The initial recommendations have already been incorporated into the plan. She emphasized that LOS was developed to go beyond just meeting the permit requirements to include expectations for water quality, aquatic habitat, etc. These elements were not included in the previous plan.

Commissioner Maul noted that the City Council has already approved funding for 25 projects and asked when the remaining 15 high-priority projects would be addressed. Ms. Dele answered that the 25 projects are those that will be addressed during the next six years. The remaining 15 projects will be addressed as part of a later plan.

**Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

**STUDY ITEM: 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT #4 MASTER STREET PLAN UPDATE AND #9 PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE**

**Staff Presentation**

Ms. Daley-Peng reviewed that the City Council’s 2018-2020 Goals and Work Plan includes the following goal and action step:

- **Goal 2:** Improve Shoreline’s infrastructure to continue the delivery of highly-valued public services.
- **Action Step 8:** Update the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Pedestrian System Plan and sidewalk prioritization process and move the Master Street Plan from the TMP to Title 12 of the Shoreline Municipal Code.

Ms. Daley-Peng explained that in both the Master Street and Pedestrian System Plans there are some elements that are too specific for a policy document and are much better suited for a regulatory document. In addition, there are parts that are redundant with the Engineering Development Manual (EDM), and there is inconsistency or the possibility of future inconsistency with the recent Sidewalk Prioritization Plan. The removal of these parts from the TMP would allow for future updates to the EDM’s street matrix and the Sidewalk Prioritization Plan outside of the Comprehensive Plan amendment process’s annual limitation. She stressed that public scrutiny would still be part of any update to either of the two documents. She reviewed the proposed changes, noting that they would be prepared in legislative format during the summer for a public hearing in the fall.

**Amendment 4**

Ms. Daley-Peng explained that the Comprehensive Plan’s Transportation Element references the TMP as a supporting analysis document, and Chapter 7 and Appendix D of the TMP are specifically related to the Master Street Plan. The Master Street Plan is structured as a Comprehensive Plan document, which includes policies and implementation strategies. In contrast, Appendix D is more similar to development regulations, serving to implement the policies and strategies contained in Chapter 7 and other sections of the TMP. It consists primarily of a table that identifies specific street segments and their functional classifications, as well as specific roadway cross-sections, existing right-of-way width, existing curb-to-curb width, required right-of-way width and planned curb-to-curb width. The current EDM, which was last updated in 2016, contains Appendix F (Street Matrix). The biggest difference between Appendix D of the TMP and Appendix F of the EDM is in their tables. The EDM’s Street Matrix includes additional columns that denote required widths (on both sides of the road) for sidewalks, amenity zone, curb, parking, travel lane, bicycle lane, etc. In other words, the EDM’s Street Matrix is used to regulate development activities and operates appropriately as a development regulation.

Ms. Daley-Peng explained that, as proposed, Amendment 4 would incorporate the Master Street Plan, Appendix D, into the EDM, which sets forth minimum engineering requirements for site and right-of-way work related to development within the City.

### **Amendment 9**

Ms. Daley-Peng reviewed that after a year-long process, the City Council approved the 2018 Sidewalk Prioritization Plan (SPP) on June 4<sup>th</sup>. The project started with the baseline of the TMP's Pedestrian System Plan, which was created in 2011. She provided a map, which illustrates a combination of 75 miles of existing sidewalk and 70 miles of new sidewalk. She explained that although the map does not differentiate between existing and new sidewalks or identify priorities, there are elements in the TMP that address prioritization based on seven criteria that focused primarily on proximity to key destinations (schools, parks and transit) and projects that could be combined with other funding or capital improvement projects. The criteria did not address safety or equity. The 2018 SPP expanded the criteria to address both safety and equity, while still addressing proximity and connectivity.

Ms. Daley-Peng advised that staff worked closely with the Sidewalk Advisory Committee (SAC) and solicited public input to develop the 2018 SPP, which included measurable metrics for each of the four criteria. For example, for safety, they reviewed the City's collision history and mapped the hot spots where there is need for additional safety and protection for pedestrians. Other metrics under safety include looking at the volume and speed of traffic on streets. For equity, they looked at income levels across the City, and they also mapped communities with concentrated populations of disabilities, communities of color, communities with limited English speaking, and age. The idea was to find out where there is the most need and dependency on sidewalks. For proximity, they studied quarter-mile walksheds around parks, and they also mapped schools, transit and shopping/retail. For connectivity, they looked at how it all comes together and where the City can leverage its investments. It was important to find the gaps in the existing sidewalk network that could be filled to provide more value. She summarized that using the criteria, each project was scored based on a point system.

Ms. Daley-Peng explained that the SAC consisted of 15 members who were appointed by the City Manager. They met for 12 meetings over a year and formed four committees around the following topics: funding, communications, prioritization process, and sidewalk treatments. There were two open houses, and the SAC met with the City Council at two dinner meetings. They produced a video of how it is to navigate the City's current sidewalk network and put together final recommendations to the City Manager. The public outreach process included two open houses, which were followed by on-line surveys. They prepared a "frequently answered questions" document and maintained a webpage. She also presented to the Council of Neighborhoods. She briefly explained the content and participation of the open house meetings, as well as the on-line surveys. In all, 577 members of the community participated.

Ms. Daley-Peng said the scorecard was applied to the projects that were developed in 2011 and the projects were reprioritized based on the updated set of criteria. She briefly reviewed the high-priority, medium-priority and long-term priorities. The priorities were also measured by quadrants in the City to recognize the importance of a geographic distribution of improvements across the City. She explained that the package of 33 high-priority projects equates to \$95 million, and full build-out of the vision (70 miles)

would cost \$414 million. She referred to the matrix, which lists each of the projects and documents how each one scored based on the metrics. It also includes a brief description of each projects. The matrix will be used over the next many years to implement the SPP.

Ms. Daley-Peng advised that Amendment 9 includes updates to the Comprehensive Plan's 2011 TMP Pedestrian System Plan, specifically Chapter 5, Pedestrian Plan, based on the recently approved SPP. In addition, Chapter 9, which brings together all of the recommended transportation improvements, would be updated to identify the new prioritizations. Other changes include updating the Comprehensive Plan's Element 4, specifically Policy T-49, and deleting Appendix H, which is a Pedestrian Projects Prioritization Plan. Instead of Appendix H, amendment 9 would reference the recently-approved Sidewalk Prioritization Plan.

Ms. Daley-Peng said the next step is to prepare the legislative format of the proposed changes and present at the public hearing on October 4<sup>th</sup>. The amendments would be presented to the City Council for discussion and adoption in the fall.

Commissioner Maul suggested it would be helpful for staff to provide a comparison of the two charts (Appendix D of the TMP and Appendix F of the EDM). Ms. Daley-Peng agreed to send links to the two documents.

Commissioner Malek noted that a lot of projects are happening on the border of Shoreline. For example, there is a 37-home project in Woodway that will requires access through Richmond Beach. He asked how the City is preparing to address these interlocal changes. Ms. Daley-Peng advised that the City will begin updating its TMP in 2019, looking not only at the street network, but also at traffic volumes, etc. She agreed that consideration of anticipated growth areas on the border of the City should also be discussed as part of this process.

Commissioner Malek voiced concern on behalf of the building community regarding potential "sidewalks to nowhere." It is difficult for some of the smaller residential streets that are historic and narrow to comply with all of the street and sidewalk improvement requirements. Hopefully, these streets can be identified as very low priority or some alternative, more modest measure could be allowed. Ms. Daley-Peng agreed that this issue needs to be addressed as part of the TMP update.

### **Public Comment**

Brynn Smith, Shoreline, said she lives in Richmond Beach and is 15 years old. She directed her comments towards the intersection of 205<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW. She suggested that rather than the current prioritization of 67<sup>th</sup>, the sidewalk project in this location should be at least in the top 10% of priorities given its close proximity to the Klahaya Swim and Tennis Club, Hickman Park, and Syre Elementary School. She said she would have loved to be able to walk to the pool, park or school as a young child or even as an older youth, but it is not safe and there are no good alternative routes. She noted that there are a number of young children in her neighborhood who would benefit from a pedestrian improvement in this location.

Roger Smith, Shoreline, clarified that his daughter's comments were specifically related to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW between 204<sup>th</sup> and 205<sup>th</sup> Streets. He explained that the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW corridor has already been identified as a pedestrian access, with a walkway that is separated by a line from the traveled way up to Kruckeberg Botanic Garden. Beyond that, there is steep hill with a blind corner and it is not safe to walk. There are no good alternative routes for pedestrian and bicycles, either. He suggested that this spot improvement is unique compared to the other corridors that have been identified and prioritized. He and his daughter came to the meeting to highlight this location and ask that it be reprioritized higher.

### **Continued Commission Discussion**

Director Markle advised that unless the Commission would like to receive another presentation on the proposed amendments, staff will move forward to prepare the strike-through legislative language as part of a staff report for a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan amendments. The Commission agreed that no additional study session is needed prior to the public hearing on October 4<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Davis asked what opportunities the citizens have to bring forward smaller, spot areas for the City to address. Ms. Daley-Peng said the opportunity will be ongoing to reach out to staff and Council. The Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program also addresses issues such as needed spot improvements, crossings, traffic calming, etc. She said she took some notes of Mr. and Ms. Smith's comments. She is not sure if the issue could be addressed via a spot improvement or if a full-corridor or corridor-segment project would be needed. She emphasized the need to think about pedestrian improvements comprehensively.

Commissioner Malek said his comment about "sidewalks to nowhere" was intended to address low-traveled roads, but the Smiths were referring to a segment that could qualify as a collector-arterial, with a public park, school, etc. There is more interest in visits to the street other than just people living there, making the street faster moving and more dangerous for pedestrians.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Director Markle reported that the Hearing Examiner issued his decision on June 29<sup>th</sup>, denying BSRE's request for an extension of their Urban Center Permits. He also upheld the Snohomish County staff's position that they would deny the permit applications before even proceeding to an Environmental Impact Statement because there were substantial conflicts with the application and County code. The Hearing Examiner's decision can be appealed to Snohomish County Superior Court, and an appeal would need to be filed within 21 days of the decision. The decision means that the Urban Center application that had been vested all of these years is expired unless it is appealed and succeeds. The Hearing Examiner's decision can be accessed via the City's webpage and Snohomish County's webpage.

### **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 July 19<sup>th</sup> agenda will include study sessions on two more Comprehensive Plan Docket items: Point Wells Subarea Plan Update and Transportation Policy T-44 Update. Both of these amendments were citizen initiated.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.



Laura Mork  
Vice Chair, Planning Commission



Carla Hoekzema  
Clerk, Planning Commission