

ORIGINAL

RESOLUTION NO. 180

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, APPROVING THE COMPREHENSIVE SEWER PLAN OF RONALD WASTEWATER DISTRICT, KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of Ronald Wastewater District, King County, Washington (the "District") by Resolution No. 01-19, adopted the District's Comprehensive Sewer Plan, as added to and amended, and set forth as Exhibit A to such resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of the District was provided to the City of Shoreline on April 13, 2001, as required by RCW 57.16.010; and


WHEREAS, the City has reviewed such plan and provided comments to the District as attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to approve the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of the District;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. After due consideration, and fully being advised, the City Council finds that the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of the District should be, and it hereby is, approved subject to the comments articulated in the letter attached hereto as Exhibit A.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2001



Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:



Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk



August 21, 2001

Diane Pottinger
Ronald Wastewater District
PO Box 33490
Shoreline WA 98133

RE: City of Shoreline Comments regarding Ronald Wastewater District
Comprehensive Sewer Plan, Vol. I, Dated April 2001

Dear Diane,

The intent of this letter is to provide you with City of Shoreline comments regarding the Ronald Wastewater District Comprehensive Sewer Plan, Volume I, dated April 2001. In addition, we have tentatively scheduled a City Council consent calendar item on September 10, 2001 to consider a resolution on your plan. Although it is a consent item, which typically are not discussed, it may be prudent to have a representative attend the meeting should the Council elect to pull the item from consent calendar for discussion. For the record, the transmittal letter (April 13, 2001 from Rodney Langer) that accompanied this plan did not clearly identify a specific action requested or a timeframe for that action; hence our confusion over the process.

Our comments on this plan are focussed on consistency between your plan and the City of Shoreline Comprehensive Plan policies, and land use assumptions.

The following policies from the City of Shoreline Utility Element should be addressed in your plan, and followed as you implement your plan:

U-1: Promote the provision of utility services city-wide that meet service levels established in the Capital Facilities Element at reasonable rates.

U-4: Support the timely expansion, maintenance and replacement of utility infrastructure at designated service levels in order to match and meet expected demand for service.

U-17: Support efforts which will correct existing water and wastewater system deficiencies where deficiencies exist and ensure adequate infrastructure and services for all areas of the City.

The following comments respond to your *Population and Land Use* section. The comments are organized by the page number of your plan and we have included the portion of the text of that we are commenting on in italics followed by our comments.

3-5 Current zoning maps do not reflect the approved land use designations throughout the City of Shoreline.

We have been working with the Planning Commission and City Council since last fall to reconcile the two maps. The City Council adopted a consistent set of Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning maps on July 23, 2001.

3-6 Table 3.2 Land Use Population Density


The units per acre listed in your table assumed the "worst case" scenario for each land use designation. For example the table indicates that "Medium Density Residential" would result in 12 dwelling units per acre. Consistent zoning districts for this designation can either be R-8 (8 dwelling units/acre) or R-12 (12 dwelling units/acre). In the Final EIS (November 2, 1998) that was prepared for our Comprehensive Plan, the City assumed that on average (because both R-8 and R-12 designations would be used) we would see a density of 9 dwelling units per acre. We have included a copy of page 85 of our Final EIS so you are aware of all of our density assumptions for each Land Use Designation. Perhaps a statement could be added to your report indicating that "the highest intensity use was assumed for each land use designation in the City of Shoreline."

7-1 At this time there are only 19 known homes not connected to the District's system...16 are located in the City of Shoreline.

Your plan identifies a number of alternatives that current septic system owners could choose to utilize in order to secure sewer services from the District. We are concerned that this falls short of providing a plan to "correct existing wastewater system deficiencies where deficiencies exist and ensure adequate infrastructure and services for all areas of the City" consistent with policy U-17 above. The development of such a plan and how the City can support such an effort is a key issue that needs to be addressed.

We have no further comments at this time. Please contact Kristoff Bauer for information relating to our Council actions. Kristoff's number is 546.1297. If you have any other questions please call me at 546.3901.

Regards,



Kirk McKinley
Planning Manager

c. Phil Montgomery, General Manager, RWD

Attachment: Page 85 City of Shoreline Final EIS dated November 2, 1998.

Description	Max FAR	DUs per Acre
R-1 - Low Density Residential (Single Family)	0.5	6
R-2 - Medium Density Residential (Duplex/Townhome)	0.6	9
R-3 - High Density Residential (Multi Family)	0.7	20
Mixed Use (3 separate in FEIS, combined in comp plan)	0.75	8
• MU1	1.0	12
• MU2	2.5	15
• MU3		
Comm1 - Community Business	2.5	1.5 (avg.)
Comm2 - Regional Business	2.5	1.5 (avg.)
Public Facilities, Single Family Institution	projections case-by-case	
Public Open Space, Private Open Space	0	0
Special Study Area	to be determined	

The process for determining redevelopable land is as follows.

RDV Factors

RDV (Redevelopment) Factors were assigned to every parcel. Because of the different development potentials for each of the three land use options, each parcel actually has three RDV Factors for this project. The RDV Factor was determined by determining a Value Ratio (Building Value divided by Total Value). The Value Factor was then given to each parcel based upon the Value Ratio, per the following table:

Value Ratio	Value Factor
0	0.99
$0 < x \leq 0.20$	0.95
$0.20 < x \leq 0.30$	0.90
$0.30 < x \leq 0.40$	0.80
$0.40 < x \leq 0.50$	0.71
$0.50 < x \leq 0.75$	0.60
$0.75 < x \leq 1.00$	0.30
> 1.00	0.10

FARs (Floor-Area Ratios) were then calculated for each parcel by dividing the building floor area by the land area. The FARs then needed to be adjusted by the potential land use option. For example single family developments generally are allowed a maximum FAR of 0.5. If a parcel has a FAR of 0.49, the FAR would be adjusted by dividing the actual by the maximum allowed, to result in an adjusted FAR of 0.98, to show that it is very close to the